

complete library on industrial relations, the nucleus of which will consist of publications describing, illustrating, or otherwise growing out of the relations of employers and employees, and especially that proceeding from the participants in industry themselves. More specifically it will include the publications of labor organizations, of industrial and railroad organizations, and of organizations representing one or another of these interests or the public interest. Dr. Robert F. Foerster, formerly of Harvard University, has been appointed professor of economics and director of the industrial relations section. While it is expected that he will ultimately give some instruction on matters connected with the section, he will devote his time during the current year to building up the library and to making contacts in the field designed to enlarge his own understanding of existing relationships and to supplement the collections in the library. Digests or other publications will in time be issued. The library itself, it is hoped, will prove useful in promoting the sober and dispassionate study of industrial relations. Its resources will be available to responsible students everywhere, who may wish to consult it by correspondence or personal visits, and, not least, to representatives of employing and labor interests.

Activities of the Colorado Electorate—In an attempt to determine how far the experience of Colorado might illustrate the need of applying the principles of the short ballot, the writer has made a study of the abstracts of votes cast at elections in the state from 1910 to 1920 inclusive. The study included the votes cast in the state at large, those in all districts larger than counties, and those in Boulder and Las Animas counties. The answers to two questions were sought: What proportion of the eligible voting population of the state is usually interested in the elections? And, how intelligent are the voters at the polls?

The eligible voting population has been estimated from the United States Census figures, for the number of registered voters was not available. This estimate was made by excluding from the total of the population all persons under twenty-one years of age and all persons who were foreign born, no account being taken of those persons of foreign birth who were eligible because of naturalization nor of those persons who were ineligible because of minor disqualifications.

It was found that of the estimated numbers of the eligible voters of the state, from 71 per cent to 77 per cent appeared at the polls in presidential elections, and from 55 per cent to 72 per cent in the interven-

ing elections. Moreover, in the direct primary elections only about 30 per cent of the electorate takes part, notwithstanding the obvious fact that if the primary is to function efficiently the primary election must be participated in by at least as many persons as vote at the general election. It is, moreover, in the primary election that precinct

TABLE I—AVERAGES OF VOTES CAST IN COLORADO ELECTIONS,
1910 TO 1920 INCLUSIVE

ORDER ON BALLOT	OFFICE FILLED	POPULARITY RANK			PRIMARY ELECTIONS		GENERAL ELECTIONS	
		General rank	District offices	State at large	Votes cast	Per cent of highest vote cast	Votes cast	Per cent of highest vote cast
1	Presidential Electors.....	1		1			286,616	100.0
2	Senator (U. S.).....	4		3	101,732	93.1	251,872	87.5
3	Representative in Congress.....	11	2		96,751	88.5	246,245	85.9
4	Justice of Supreme Court.....	13		10	101,039	92.4	240,277	83.8
5	Governor.....	3		2	109,321	100.0	260,085	90.8
6	Lieutenant Governor.....	5		4	93,747	85.7	249,314	86.9
7	Secretary of State.....	6		5	91,119	83.4	249,286	86.9
8	Auditor of State.....	9		8	92,815	84.9	247,868	86.5
9	State Treasurer.....	7		6	92,994	85.1	248,582	86.7
10	Attorney General.....	10		9	79,848	73.0	247,188	86.2
11	Superintendent of Public Instruction.....	8		7	91,806	83.1	248,252	86.7
12	Regents of the University of Colorado.....	14		11	62,134	56.8	227,511	79.3
13	District Judges.....	15	4		86,029	78.7	220,036	76.7
14	District Attorneys.....	2	1		94,637	86.5	265,799	92.7
15	State Senator.....	16	5		67,628	61.8	181,463	63.3
16	State Representative.....	12	3		85,510	78.2	243,999	85.1
17-28	Inclusive, County offices.....							
29	Initiated and referred measures:							
	Enactments.....						141,384	49.3
	Amendments.....						137,274	47.9

committee members are elected. These committee members, who serve in the party assemblies, are so little considered by the voter that never do more than 12 per cent of the eligible voters participate in their election. In 1918 only $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent of these voters in Boulder county participated in the election of all the committee-members in the county.

In the ten-year average of the votes cast in the general election in the state at large there was no great difference among the offices to be filled, save that presidential electors had a good lead (except in 1920, when the votes cast for governor exceeded those for presidential electors) with an average of 286,616 votes. The office of governor was next, receiving 260,085 votes, followed in order by United States senator, lieutenant governor, secretary of state, state treasurer, superintendent of public instruction, auditor of state, attorney general, justices of the

TABLE II—AVERAGE OF VOTES CAST IN ELECTIONS IN TWO COLORADO COUNTIES, 1910 TO 1920 INCLUSIVE

ORDER ON BALLOT	BOULDER COUNTY		POPULARITY RANK	OFFICE	POPULARITY RANK	LAS ANIMAS COUNTY	
	Primary Elections	General Elections				General Elections	Primary Elections
County offices							
17	3,888	10,837	1	Judge	2	8,925	4,337
18	3,220	9,959	5	Clerk	1	9,656	4,027
19	3,605	10,043	2	Sheriff	3	8,605	4,125
20	3,402	9,986	3	Treasurer	5	8,535	3,655
21	3,201	9,975	4	Assessor	6	8,462	3,671
22	2,819	9,789	6	Superintendent Schools	4	8,574	4,054
23	2,967	9,707	8	Surveyor	7	8,414	3,258
24	3,506	9,619	9	Coroner	8	8,370	3,895
25	3,411	9,711	7	Commissioners	9	8,291	3,618
Precinct offices							
26	1,549	7,772	10	Justices of the Peace	11	6,030	2,386
27	1,311	6,887	11	Constables	10	6,054	2,173
28	1,288			Committee-People			2,493

supreme court, and regents of the University of Colorado—the last receiving an average of 227,511 votes. (See Table I.)

A little wider range of popularity appears in the list of district offices than in that of state offices. District attorneys, ranking higher than the governor in the aggregate of votes cast, had a good lead with 265,799 votes, followed in order by members of Congress, members of the state house of representatives, district judges, and, lastly, by state senators, who received but an average of 181,463 votes.

Among county offices there seemed to be no great divergence in popularity among those offices which are filled by the county at large.

In fact, in the two counties studied, no one office held the same popularity rank in both counties. Fewer votes were cast for county commissioners, coroner, and surveyor than for the county judge, clerk, sheriff, treasurer, and county superintendent of schools. Only from two-thirds to three-fourths of those voting for county officers, however, cast a ballot for either of the two precinct officers, justice of the peace and constable. In some precincts, the election of a justice of the peace had to be decided by lot because but one vote was cast for each candidate. (See Table II.)

There was a large disparity, nevertheless, between the popularity of those offices voted for in the state at large and the initiated and referred measures, which received an average of but 139,142 votes. The proposed constitutional amendments were accorded slightly fewer

TABLE III—AVERAGE VOTES CAST IN COLORADO ON INITIATED AND REFERRED MEASURES

YEAR	NUMBER OF MEASURES	NUMBER OF MEASURES CARRIED	VOTES CAST ON:		PER CENT OF "ELIGIBLE VOTERS"	PER CENT OF HIGHEST VOTE AT ELECTION
			Amendments	Enactments		
1910	5	5	81,163		23	36
1912	32	9	91,716	95,030	25	33
1914	16	4	141,105	125,213	38	49
1916	8	3	174,202	191,326	49	63
1918	5	5	147,482	113,152	37	57
1920	10	4	187,978	182,197	46	63

votes, for and against, than were statutory enactments, although they were scattered among the enactments. Initiated and referred propositions are listed as the last items on the ballot in the following order: amendments and enactments proposed by popular initiative in the order in which the petitions are filed, amendments proposed by the legislature, and finally enactments referred by the legislature.

The votes, for and against combined, on these measures have, in these ten years, been cast, on the average, by not less than 23 per cent nor more than 49 per cent of the qualified voters of the state. Certainly it is a small portion of the eligible voting population of the state which carried or defeated these measures. It is a smaller portion, by more than one-half, than is represented in measures passed or defeated in regular fashion by the legislature. It was very evident that the fewer the measures and the larger the issues involved, the more votes were

cast on them. Previous to 1912 there was no provision for the use of the initiative, and the referendum was employed for constitutional amendments only. In that year thirty-two measures were before the people and but 33 per cent of those voting voted on these propositions; while in 1920, when only ten measures were presented, they received the attention of 63 per cent of those voting at the polls. (See Table III.)

The relative importance of the issue presented deserves special mention in regard to its effect on the size of the vote. Matters of large public policy are generally given wide publicity and often draw relatively high numbers of votes, regardless of the position on the ballot. (See Table IV.) Such measures are represented by the prohibition proposals (No. 1 in 1912, No. 2 in 1914, No. 3 in 1917, No. 1 in 1918), the amendment establishing the initiative and referendum (No. 1 in 1910), provisions for the care of dependent and neglected children (No. 17 in 1912), for the construction of railway tunnels under certain mountains for public or semi-public purposes (No. 32 in 1912, and No. 5 in 1920), for better roads (No. 7 in 1914), for a widely advertised measure relating to the running of stock at large (No. 6 in 1916), for a widely advertised hospital for the curable insane (No. 6 in 1920), and for an equally well advertised raising of the tax limit for the benefit of the state educational institutions (No. 7 in 1920).

On the other hand, technical measures, or measures gaining little publicity, or those involving a slight change in governmental administration, poll few votes; and the great majority of the measures on the ballots are of this class. A few will suffice as illustrations: A method of amending the constitution (No. 10 in 1912), a measure concerning contempt proceedings to enforce a proposed election law (No. 12 in 1912), a civil service act (No. 18 in 1912), a bill relating to the public funds (No. 23 in 1912), public service commission acts (Nos. 9 and 13 in 1914), a provision for replacement of the state tax commission by a state board of equalization (No. 5 in 1916), a proposal for holding a constitutional convention (No. 8 in 1916), one for reducing the time for the introduction of bills in the legislature (No. 5 in 1918), and one relating to a detail concerning county judges (No. 9 in 1920).

It is also interesting to note in regard to this group of technical measures that the voter seems very much inclined to vote against any measure he does not understand, provided he votes on it at all. A few voters do have a decided attitude toward certain types of measures, as is evidenced by the decisive defeat of these measures in spite of the low vote cast on them. Among them are provisions for the increase of

salaries of certain officials, for the modification of the initiative and referendum amendment, for the raising of debt limits, and for the appointment of justices of the peace and constables. But while such

TABLE IV—PERCENTAGE OF VOTES CAST ON PARTICULAR MEASURES, BASED ON THE HIGHEST VOTE CAST AT EACH ELECTION

ORDER ON BALLOT	1910	1912	1914	1916	1918	1920
	100	100	100	100	100	100
1	52	69	62	61	81	67
2	31	51	92	55	53	66
3	33	50	53	82	64	60
4	28	34	45	70	50	59
5	35	36	51	56	39	78
6		30	48	82		70
7		32	64	58		73
8		34	47	42		58
9		33	39			45
10		26	40			55
11		27	48			
12		26	43			
13		28	37			
14		30	38			
15		33	41			
16		34	39			
17		43				
18		26				
19		36				
20		32				
21		36				
22		27				
23		23				
24		31				
25		28				
26		25				
27		26				
28		26				
29		25				
30		28				
31		32				
32		50				

measures stand a good chance of defeat, social legislation proposals are treated very favorably. In those elections in which few measures are presented, each measure stands a much larger chance of being carried. (See Table III.)

In addition to this, public opinion seems to be much better expressed when but a few measures are submitted to the voters; for in 1912, when the thirty-two measures were on the ballot, only four of them, the first three and the last, received as many as 50 per cent of the highest number of votes cast, whereas in other years, when fewer measures were submitted, not only were larger percentages of votes cast on the measures, but also a much larger proportion of the measures received 50 per cent or more of the highest votes cast at the elections. (See Table IV.) The influence of the position on the ballot is noticeable here, in that the last few measures of the group never receive as many votes as do the first few.

Some emphasis should be placed on the arrangement of the ballot which puts the prominent offices before the voter first. Candidates for national offices are listed first, those to be voted upon by the state at large next, followed by those elected in districts (except for representative in Congress), then by nominees for county positions, followed by precinct officers, and finally the list of direct legislation measures. (See Tables I and II.) It is not strange, then, that in general, from the first to the last of the ballot, the farther down on the ballot list the candidates' names appear the fewer will be the votes cast for them. The first item or two in each successive group of offices or measures on the ballot seems to arouse a little more interest, but the last items of each group suffer a greater decline than do the intermediate ones.

These figures indicate how much the voter is interested in the election of prominent officers, a national officer or representative, or the governor, and how prone he is to forget local offices, especially if they come far down on the ballot list. In the ten-year average, for every one hundred persons who voted for presidential electors, eleven failed to vote for one or more state officers, and thirty-seven failed to vote for one or more district officers. Moreover, the voter seemed to be interested in personalities rather than in measures, for out of the above one hundred voters fifty-two failed to vote "yes" or "no" on initiated or referred propositions. Although occasionally a high vote was cast on a particular proposition of tremendous importance as a state-wide policy, it never reached higher than 93 per cent of the highest vote cast for candidates for a particular office.

The question now to be answered is: Are the voters indolent? Possibly so. But this we cannot determine definitely until they are no longer asked to do the impossible. Even though city and general elections are held separately (and to say nothing of the advisability or

inadvisability of the added election, the direct primary), the voter is asked at the general election to choose one from among several candidates for each of some thirty offices, and to do it wisely, according to the merits of the candidates or their party standing. In addition to this he is asked to take a positive or a negative stand on from five to thirty-two statutes or amendments in which he has little interest, and many of which are about matters requiring a high degree of technical information. He is in no position to decide such questions. Surely only matters of large public policy should be placed before him.

Not until the voter has fewer offices to fill, and not until he has fewer propositions to determine, will we be able to tell whether or not he is indolent. But this may be said, that if he availed himself, as democracy demands, of all the information necessary to select candidates and issues properly, for all the offices and matters presented to him now, he would be a busy voter indeed.

R. C. SPENCER.

Linville College.

Annual Meeting, 1922. The eighteenth annual meeting of the American Political Science Association was held at Chicago, December 27 to 29, 1922. The attendance was unusually large; one hundred and thirty members were registered, and it is probable that more than one hundred and fifty were in attendance. The interest was well sustained and altogether the meeting was regarded as one of the best in the history of the association. The American Economic Association, the American Sociological Society, and other related organizations were in session at Chicago at the same time, and a smoker was tendered the members of the various groups conjointly by the University of Chicago and Northwestern University.

The meeting opened on the forenoon of December 27 with a round table conference on public administration, under the chairmanship of Professor Leonard D. White of the University of Chicago. Dr. Luther H. Gulick, of the National Institute of Public Administration and Professor C. P. Patterson of the University of Texas took part in the discussion. This was followed at noon by a subscription luncheon, jointly with the American Association for Labor Legislation, at which the principal speaker was M. Albert Thomas, director of the international Labor Office at Geneva.

At an afternoon session devoted to the general subject of political theory, Professor Walter J. Shepard of Ohio State University presided,