

---

---

## Letter to the Editor

To the editors: Since the publication of my article, “A Party System Perspective on the Interstate Commerce Act,” *Studies in American Political Development* 6 (Spring 1992), I have become aware that a computational error entered into the construction of Table 14. Appended to this letter is a corrected version of that table. In contrast to the original table, the results presented here give weight to non-voters. As a result of the inclusion of non-voters into the analysis, the dependent variable (SHIFT IN SUPPORT) is no longer binary, but rather a 5 point scale that captures not only movement, but variations in the intensity of that movement. Accordingly, standard regression techniques are employed here in lieu of LOGIT.

In the article, I argued that New York was the pivotal swing state in the presidential elections of the latter half of the third party system; and that to avoid disruption to the narrow coalitional majority that brought them to power in 1884, Democratic party elites were forced to attend to the regulatory policy preferences of groups located in that state, even though those preferences violated long standing policy commitments to the party’s agrarian base. Consistent with this, the results in the appended table suggest that eastern swing state representatives generally, and New York congressmen in particular, did move to greater levels of support for an interstate commerce bill. This as a result of the substantive changes that distinguished the final ICA from the Reagan bill. Moreover, in the revised analysis the party effect attains statistical significance. As a consequence, it more effectively captures the trend among Republican congressmen—in the main, supporters of the Senate commission bill—who moved toward greater levels of support as a result of the changes embodied in the ICA. Finally, the influence of ROI, a variable measuring the economic stake of the railroads in a given district, is diminished.

Scott James  
University of California, Davis

Table 14. Shift in Support for an Interstate Commerce Bill from the Final Vote on the Reagan Bill to the Vote on the ICA

| Variables      | Shift in Support from Reagan Bill to ICA |                   |                   |
|----------------|--|-------------------|-------------------|
| PARTY          | -.283**<br>(.097)                        | -.271**<br>(.097) | -.275**<br>(.097) |
| SWING          | .214<br>(.132)                           | —                 | —                 |
| EAST SWING     | —  | .365*<br>(.157)   | —                 |
| NEW YORK       | —  | —                 | .652**<br>(.211)  |
| ROI            | .010<br>(.010)                           | .013<br>(.010)    | .020*<br>(.010)   |
| FARMERS        | -.281<br>(.159)                          | -.237<br>(.160)   | -.225<br>(.160)   |
| WEST           | -.124<br>(.178)                          | -.132<br>(.177)   | -.127<br>(.177)   |
| CAPITAL        | .174<br>(.195)                           | .070<br>(.204)    | -.168<br>(.235)   |
| CENTER         | -.225<br>(.149)                          | -.224<br>(.148)   | -.241<br>(.149)   |
| Constant       | .295<br>(.200)                           | .254<br>(.201)    | .215<br>(.201)    |
| r <sup>2</sup> | .07**                                    | .08**             | .09**             |

\*Significant at the .05 level.

\*\*Significant at the .01 level.