

Total Soc.....	15,637	12,194
Prohibition.....	4,275	6,207
People s.....	1,235	None.

Presidential returns, as thus far revised, show that the electoral vote (p. 563) will be as follows:

States.	Rep.	Dem.
Alabama.....	..	11
Arkansas.....	..	9
California.....	10	..
Colorado.....	5	..
Connecticut.....	7	..
Delaware.....	3	..
Florida.....	..	5
Georgia.....	..	13
Idaho.....	3	..
Illinois.....	27	..
Indiana.....	15	..
Iowa.....	13	..
Kansas.....	10	..
Kentucky.....	..	13
Louisiana.....	..	9
Maine.....	6	..
Maryland.....	?	?
Massachusetts.....	16	..
Michigan.....	14	..
Minnesota.....	11	..
Mississippi.....	..	10
Missouri.....	18	..
Montana.....	3	..
Nebraska.....	8	..
Nevada.....	3	..
New Hampshire.....	4	..
New Jersey.....	12	..
New York.....	39	..
North Carolina.....	..	12
North Dakota.....	4	..
Ohio.....	23	..
Oregon.....	4	..
Pennsylvania.....	34	..
Rhode Island.....	4	..
South Carolina.....	..	9
South Dakota.....	4	..
Tennessee.....	..	12
Texas.....	..	18
Utah.....	3	..
Vermont.....	4	..
Virginia.....	..	12
Washington.....	5	..
West Virginia.....	7	..
Wisconsin.....	13	..
Wyoming.....	3	..
Total.....	335	133
Plurality.....	202	

The totals omit the eight votes of Maryland, which are still in doubt. It thus appears that the States carried by the Democrats in 1900 but lost to them in 1904 (p. 503), in addition to all that they lost in the former year, are:

Nevada.....	3
Idaho.....	3
Montana.....	3
Missouri.....	18
Colorado.....	5
Maryland.....	Doubtful

In an after-election address, Thomas E. Watson, the People's party candidate for President,

outlines the following political plans for the future:

My own plans for the future embrace a complete organization of the people along the lines of Jeffersonian democracy, the re-establishment of reform papers, and a systematic propaganda of Jeffersonian principles, in order that in 1908, there shall be a party of genuine opposition to the Republican party and its present policies. I have no faith whatever that reforms will be accomplished by the Democratic party. It is discredited in the eyes of the people by a series of crushing defeats, but it has been so vacillating in its course, it has changed its principles so often, has run from one extreme to another so recently, had such a magnificent opportunity in 1892 to work out the reforms to which it stood pledged and made such a wretched use of that opportunity that it cannot inspire the confidence which leads to success. Since 1892 the Democratic party has almost entirely boxed the compass in political profession of faith. It has been for pretty much everything until this year, when it stood for everything or nothing, according to the interpretation which the voter chose to put upon its ambiguous platform.

It is now estimated that in the next Congress (p. 505) the Republican majority will be 26 in the Senate and 110 in the House. Illinois will be represented by but one member—H. T. Rainey, of the Twentieth district.

In the Wisconsin delegation to Congress, Congressman J. W. Babcock, of the Third district will reappear. He is reelected by a plurality of only 369, where he had 8,250 two years ago. Mr. Babcock is the Republican Congressman whose connection with the railroad interest in postal adjustments Congressman Baker, of Brooklyn, exposed in Congress (vol. vi, pp. 802, 807), at the last session. Mr. Baker is defeated for reelection, but his vote is 543 greater than that for Parker in his district.

In explanation of his defeat Congressman Baker says:

An analysis of the vote by election districts shows that the reports which came to us in advance of election, that certain of the Democratic election district workers were in the pay of my opponent, were well founded. In no other way is it possible to account for the great disparity in the vote cast for me in a few of the election districts as compared with that cast throughout nearly the entire Congressional district.

The Congressional district is made up of two whole Assembly districts and nearly all of two others. In three of the Assembly districts and in one-half of the fourth, i. e., in 83 out of 97 election districts, I ran ahead of Judge Parker to the extent of 734 votes, while my opponent received in these districts 504 votes less than Roosevelt. In seven-eighths of the territory I was relatively 1,238 votes stronger than Parker. In these election districts Watson received 296 votes, so that even if all who voted for Watson voted for me I was still 942 votes stronger than Parker. In four of the remaining districts my opponent received 155 votes more than Roosevelt. As these election districts are sandwiched in between districts where I ran ahead of my ticket it is obyious that this great disparity cannot be accounted for on the ground either of his being popular or my being the reverse. My defeat, however, was not due primarily either to the lavish expenditure of my opponent or to Democratic treachery. It is chiefly due to our system of voting. If we had in this State the Australian system—the alphabetical arrangement of the names of candidate for the various offices—I am confident that even in this landslide I should have been elected. The reason for this confidence is founded in the fact that a few days before election I received letters from more than 20 Republicans announcing their intention of voting for me, while voting for Roosevelt; at the same time I received not less than 200 letters of the same nature from Democrats, at least one-half of whom reported that among their Republican friends they knew of two, three, or more, who intended to vote for me. All of these letters were from strangers. If the same proportion held good over the district it meant that not less than 5,000 Republicans intended to vote for me. That they did not do so is largely because the act of voting, recurring only once a year, a large proportion become flustered in the voting booth and fearing to spoil their ballot vote a "straight" ticket. The election of Douglas in Massachusetts, where a "straight" vote is not provided for on the ballot, shows that the people will discriminate in their voting when the opportunity exists.

Although the Republican candidate for President is now conceded to have carried the State of Colorado (p. 503) by 15,788 plurality, the Democratic candidate for Governor, Alva Adams, claims election by a plurality of 25,434 over Gov. Peabody. This is the fact on the face of the returns. But Gov. Peabody is contesting the election on the ground of fraudulent ballots in sufficient