

the contrary. There is another peculiarity with reference to the submission of this question that as far as I have noticed—I do not now give this positively—as far as I have noticed in my hurried consideration of this measure and this book in the majority of cases, I believe in all cases, the votes taken by the people on different subjects, constitutional amendments, and otherwise, have been taken on the day there was another election going on. That is the case in Massachusetts, New York, and Arkansas.

#### THE VARIOUS VOTES IN THE UNITED STATES.

In the State of Massachusetts there was a constitutional amendment proposed to the people on which 115,000 in round numbers voted for it, and against it 161,000, the total votes being 276,000. For the Presidential election of the same year there were 401,000 people voted, so that the number of those who voted on the referendum was 124,000 less than the vote at the general election. So that there they do not ask the people who are in favor of the amendment proposed to get a majority of the votes cast at the last general election, or at any other election, and in this case they got 124,000 less than the number of votes cast at the general election. New York State furnishes similar proofs of the point I am now making, viz., that the vote in all these cases is much less on questions submitted to the vote of the people than the votes cast in the State elections which are held at the same time. In the case of New York State, 320,000 voted for an amendment, and 710,000 against it, making in all 1,030,000. The vote for the Presidential electors was 1,423,000 or 391,000 more than the votes cast on the constitutional amendment.

Take the case of the State of Arkansas. A liquor license law was voted on and was carried, though the majority was less by 5,878 than a two-thirds vote. The vote stood: for, 36,088; against, 61,862; or a majority of 24,226. In the State of Texas two amendments were voted on, one being carried and one defeated. The one which was carried had a large majority, but there was no provision requiring anything more than a bare majority. In the State of Missouri four amendments were voted on and all defeated. The highest vote on any of them fell 20 per cent. below the vote for the Presidential electors. In the State of Minnesota, while voting upon laws and amendments a majority were voted on and carried because they received a simple bare majority. Now, if the honorable gentleman had consulted this book, he had before his eyes every word I have said here, and could not possibly have been mistaken in every instance I have brought before the House. In the State of North Dakota a prohibitory liquor law was voted on and carried, the vote being: for, 18,552, and against, 17,393; or a majority in favor of it of 1,159. This was carried and had the force of law at once without a further majority. The vote at the political election was 38,083, so that with what I may call the Ross Handicap the prohibition law would have been defeated by a large majority. In 1894 an amendment prohibiting lotteries was carried on the following vote: for, 10,579 and against, 5,309, or a majority of 5,270. Here, though the opponents of lotteries were victorious by nearly two to one, they would have been beaten by 8,920, since the vote for Congressmen that year totaled 38,997, had the Ross handicap prevailed.

Then, let me refer to the book itself in one or two cases. Take the case of Nebraska (on page 175): "More than one-half—to be exact, an average of 51.16 per cent.—of those voting for Presidential electors did not vote on the amendment. This varied from 45 to 53 per cent." Then in Colorado (page 176): "The vote stood 25,327 in favor and 39,790 against, or a total of 65,117. It was thus defeated by 14,463, or 22 per cent. against, to less than 40 per