



## League of Women Voters of Minnesota Records

### **Copyright Notice:**

This material may be protected by copyright law (U.S. Code, Title 17). Researchers are liable for any infringement. For more information, visit [www.mnhs.org/copyright](http://www.mnhs.org/copyright).

January 8, 2001  
Editor, Minneapolis Star Tribune

To the Editor:

Your recent editorial, "A new year—After the deluge, mulling democracy" are words to be considered and discussed on an ongoing basis. A few weeks ago, Harry Boyte, co-director of the Center for Democracy and Citizenship, wrote on these pages about the responsibilities of citizens. While Boyte gave us much to think about, his overriding conclusion is that citizenship is work for all of us and takes more than occasionally casting a ballot. A healthy and vital democracy requires our constant attention—attention to the direction our elected leaders follow.

The recent election, while now fresh in our minds, deserves thought, comment and a recommitment by citizens to the election process. In Minnesota, we led the nation with a 68% voter turnout—certainly the best in the nation. However, we cannot rest on our laurels and suggest that we've done our best and democracy in Minnesota is ok. There are those who suggest that because some ballots in the election were not counted (for a variety of reasons), they will never vote again. That is irresponsibility at its height. Voting is a basic responsibility to citizenship—it is the very least, not the very most we should do as citizens. Educating ourselves on the issues, reacting and communicating those thoughts to our elected officials and being involved in the everyday workings of this democracy needs to become an expectation of each and every one of us in this democratic society to which we belong.

One would hope that the recent election and the protracted conclusion would re-energize each of us and confirm the need to engage and invest in our democracy for the long term. Yes, it does take work but considering the risks of a disengaged citizenry, I think it's worth the attention of each one of us who calls ourself a citizen. Mulling democracy should be a national pastime.

Judy Duffy, President  
League of Women Voters of Minnesota

*Saved in Word*  
*Letter to the editor - Citizenship*

# A new year

## *After the deluge, mulling democracy*

So how does it feel — this still-new year called '01? Rather like the year before? No surprise there, for that's life — one year heaped upon another, until what was new has grown old. The strange becomes ordinary; dimpled chads give way to new fads. Even so, the coming of each new year stirs up wild hopes: This one will be different, we say. This year, we'll do it right.

.....

***A blizzard of botched ballots, rickety machines, squelched recounts, curbside quarrels and dubious rulings made the world's greatest democracy look feeble and flighty.***



## **Partially Scanned Material**

The remainder of this page/item has not been digitized due to copyright considerations. The original can be viewed at the Minnesota Historical Society's Gale Family Library in Saint Paul, Minnesota. For more information, visit [www.mnhs.org/library/](http://www.mnhs.org/library/).



## LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS

### TALKING POINTS: ELECTION 2000 IMPACT

Information/statistics to help LWV members in analyzing the impact of Election 2000

#### TURNOUT:

##### Overall Turnout (% of Voting Age Population [VAP])

- Election 2000: 50.7% (change from last presidential election is 1.6 % increase)<sup>1</sup>
- Election 1998: 36.4% (source: FEC for 1998-1990)
- Election 1996: 49.1% (lowest since 1924)<sup>1</sup>
- Election 1994: 38.8%
- Election 1992: 55.1%
- Election 1990: 36.5%
- Change in turnout due to: GOTV (see below) effort + tight race, esp. FL, NH, DE<sup>1</sup>
- Top Five States: MN 68.7%, ME 66.7%, WI 66%, VT 63.5%, NH 62.2%<sup>2</sup>
- Bottom Five States: AZ 36.9%, CA 39.4%; HI 40.5%, WA 40.5%, NM 41.5%<sup>2</sup>

##### Voting Turnout (source: Exit Poll Data as conducted by Voter News Service and posted on CNN.com; 1976-1996 figures from NYT, 11/12/00.)

- Women voting: 52%
 

Republican:	43%	'96 38%	'92 37%	'88 50%	'84 56%	'80 47%	'76 48%
Democrat:	54%	54%	45%	49%	44%	45%	50%
Third party:	2%	7%	17%			7%	
- Men voting: 48%
 

Republican:	53%	44%	38%	57%	62%	55%	48%
Democrat:	42%	43%	41%	41%	37%	36%	50%
Third party:	3%	10%	21%			7%	
- Gender gap (point spread between how women vs. men voted for the major candidates) was 22 points (11-point difference for each) in 2000 vs. 17 points (16 points for women and 1 for men in 1996) (source: Women Vote 2000)

##### Under-Represented Populations (source: Exit Poll Data, see above)

- African American: 10% - targeted states saw dramatic voter increases; MO 283,000 vs. 106,000 in 1996<sup>3</sup>; FL 15% of election day voters vs. 10% in 1996---893,000 vs. 530,000 in 1996 (source: washingtonpost.com, 11/16/00)
- Hispanic: 7% (La Raza notes: 40% increase over the 5% turnout in 1998)
- Asian American: 2%
- Youth (18 -29): 17%
- First-timers: 9%<sup>2</sup>

#### FUNDING: Estimated \$3 billion<sup>4</sup> total hard and soft money spent highest in history

##### Total Hard Money Raised

- Republicans: \$294.9 million (January 1, 1999 through October 18, 2000), 6% increase over same period in 1995-1996 presidential cycle<sup>5</sup>
- Democrats: \$172.7 million (January 1, 1999 through October 18, 2000), 24% increase over same period in 1995-1996 presidential cycle<sup>5</sup>
- Breakdown by states<sup>4</sup>: Most raised for Senate - NY \$83.7 million; NJ \$71.4 million; MN \$23.7 million. Most raised for House - CA District 27 \$10.1 million; IL \$9.6 million; WV \$8.8 million - figures rounded off
- Presidential candidates<sup>4</sup>: Bush \$184.2 million; Gore \$133.3 million; Buchanan \$29.5 million; Nader \$7 million; Browne \$1.8 million - figures rounded off

##### Total Soft Money Raised<sup>5</sup> (January 1, 1999 through October 18, 2000)

- Republicans: \$211 million, 74% increase over same period in 1995-96 presidential cycle
- Democrats: \$199 million, 85% increase over same period in 1995-96 presidential cycle
- In 1992, soft money made up 19% of the parties' overall fundraising; in this cycle it accounts for at least 40%<sup>4</sup>

## RESULTS:

### Race Results

- Senate: 4 new women (MI/MO/NY/WA) to total 13<sup>6</sup>, new record. First NY woman senator. 3 all-female Senate delegations (CA/ME/WA)
- House of Representatives: 7 new women elected and 52 reelected to total 59 (+ 2-DC and US Virgin Islands)<sup>6</sup> - 59 is new record. First Republican women ever from PA, VA, WV. (Six states have never sent a woman to Congress - AK, DE, IA, MS, NH, VT; women will hold 72 seats in House and Senate compared to 32 in 1990 - source: *Washington Post*, 11/11/00)
- Governors: 2 new women elected + 1 reelected to total 5 (+ Puerto Rico)<sup>6</sup> - New record of 5 women serving as governors at the same time; DE, MT, Puerto Rico - first women governors
- State legislatures: (source: National Conference of State Legislatures) Total seats in the country - 7,424; 21.9% held by women after 2000 election (no change from 22% in 1999)
  - House - 1,165 women elected + 73 holdover = total 1,238
  - Senate - 261 women elected + 127 holdovers = total 388

### Election Issues/Initiatives (source: CNN.com.election 2000)

- School Vouchers - MI/CA - both defeated
- Gay Marriages - NE/NV - both passed to prohibit.
- Gun Control-background checks - CO - passed; OR - passed (unofficial)
- Medicinal marijuana - CO - passed; NV - passed
- Campaign Finance Reform - OR measure defeated 60% - 40%; MO measure defeated 65% - 35%

### IMPACT OF LWV ACTIVITIES:

#### GOTV - Significant voter turnout increases in tight race states:<sup>7</sup>

Increase - FL	+837,838	15.8%	1996 - 5,300,927 (source: FEC) vs. 2000 - 6,138,765 (source: Sec. of State Website)
IA	+ 74,113	6.0%	1,234,075
MN	+246,045	11.2%	2,192,640
MO	+203,521	9.4%	2,158,065
NM	+ 59,533	10.7%	556,074
OR	+152,515	11.1%	1,377,761
WA	+263,538	11.7%	2,253,837
			2,517,375

#### DNET Use - Over 289,000 page views and up to 27,000 page views per hour on November 7, Election Day

Over one million page views in the first week of November

1.2 million page views in the month of October

2.5 million page views since mid-September

#### LWV Web Use - 25,600 visitor sessions on November 7, Election Day

19,886 visitor sessions on November 6

7,729 visitor sessions on November 5

5,255 visitor sessions on November 4

4,277 daily average between October 26 and September 29

### RELEVANT LWV POSITIONS:

#### Abolish Electoral College

##### Statement of Position on the Election of the President, as Announced in January 1970 and Revised March 1982:

*The League of Women Voters believes that the direct-popular-vote method for electing the President and Vice-President is essential to representative government. The League of Women Voters believes, therefore, that the Electoral College should be abolished. The League also supports uniform voting qualifications and procedures for presidential elections.*

#### Most expensive election in history points to need for campaign finance reform:

*Campaign Finance: Improve methods of financing political campaigns in order to ensure the public's right to know, combat corruption and undue influence, enable candidates to compete more equitably for public office and promote citizen participation in the political process.*

<sup>1</sup>ABC News: Wire (Curtis Gans)

<sup>2</sup>Newsweek 11/20/00

<sup>3</sup>David Bositis, Joint Center for Political & Economic Studies, cited in *WP* 11/9/00, p. A35

<sup>4</sup>opensecrets.org (CRP); same source for breakdown by states and presidential candidates

<sup>5</sup>News release, November 3, 2000, fec.gov (FEC)

<sup>6</sup>Center for American Women and Politics, Rutgers Eagleton Institute of Politics

<sup>7</sup>caveat: population growth, mail-in ballots for OR, low voter turnout in 1996, etc., not accounted for

**Subj: Statement on 2000 Elections**  
**Date:** 11/9/2000 5:55:25 PM Central Standard Time  
**From:** NTate@LWV.Org (Nancy Tate)  
**To:** SLPresidents@LWV.Org (State League presidents), BoardofDirectors@lwv.org (Board of directors)

Dear State League Presidents:

To support you in responding to questions from the public, press and League members, and to assist in generating some uniform themes, the following League statement has been prepared. Please feel free to use this general statement and weave related state and local nuances, challenges, and issues, into it.

There will be additional statements and fact sheets forthcoming that will offer more details about issues, statistics and our history on topics like 30 years of calling for the abolition of the Electoral College, or the need for other systematic reforms to be enacted, and we will keep you posted for your use.

We also realize that you are getting calls and emails and are facing various challenges that may be unique to your system or state. Please let us know what types of questions and issues you're facing. Please direct your calls to Cheryl Graeve at (202) 263-1306 or email her at CherylG@lwv.org. She will forward your issues on to both board and appropriate staff.

Please be aware that due to the Veterans Day holiday, the national office will be closed on Friday, November 10.

Thank you and here is the statement.....

---

Statement by Carolyn Jefferson-Jenkins, Ph.D.  
 President of the League of Women Voters of the United States  
 November 9, 2000

The uniquely American story now being played out in Florida illustrates two key points about our political system.

First, in the age of the Internet, we still rely on a horse-and-buggy election system.

Second, despite the uncertainty and confusion surrounding the outcome of the presidential election, our democracy is strong and stable.

The League believes wholeheartedly that the current legal steps being taken to determine the outcome of the 2000 presidential election should be deliberately pursued to their final conclusion. There is no rush. There is no need to short-circuit that process. The rule of law must prevail. The process is proceeding appropriately and peacefully, and all parties have pledged to abide by the eventual result. Even so, the American people are deeply and appropriately concerned.

And that is why, after the outcome of this election is determined, we must make reforms to ensure a broad-based representative democracy in 21st century America.



Americans elections are a crazy quilt. Ballots and administrative procedures vary from state to state, and even from county to county. Our system is a relic of the past that is lagging behind the rest of our 21st century democracy. For example, the next President of the United States may be determined by the placement of names on a ballot made by one county's officials. Voters in several states who registered when they renewed their drivers licenses found their names missing from the rolls on election day. We need a technology upgrade.

The course of American history has been an inexorable trend toward greater fairness, uniformity and inclusiveness in our democracy. Yet, the systems for electing the most important representative of the American people are stuck in a time warp.

The Electoral College, a curious vestige of the 18th century, violates the principle of one-person, one-vote. The time has come to abolish it.

It's time to bring our elections into the 21st century. It's time to streamline the confusing patchwork system that undermines voters' faith in their government. It's time to ensure that the President of the United States is directly elected by the people he or she will represent. It's time to guarantee that, across the country, every person's vote counts-and counts the same.

----- Headers -----  
 Return-Path: <NTate@LWV.Org>  
 Received: from rly-yg01.mx.aol.com (rly-yg01.mail.aol.com [172.18.147.1]) by air-yg02.mail.aol.com (v76\_r1.23) with ESMTP; Thu, 09 Nov 2000 18:55:25 -0500  
 Received: from lwvexch.lwv.org (lea001-dc09a05-02.arcommunications.net [64.18.134.51]) by rly-yg01.mx.aol.com (v76\_r1.19) with ESMTP; Thu, 09 Nov 2000 18:54:55 -0500  
 Received: by lwvexch.lwv.org with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)  
 id <WSWP84D3>; Thu, 9 Nov 2000 18:29:12 -0500  
 Message-ID: <C13399968F40D3118095009027860C7C6BE45F@lwvexch.lwv.org>  
 From: Nancy Tate <NTate@LWV.Org>  
 To: State League presidents <SLPresidents@LWV.Org>,  
 Board of directors  
 <BoardofDirectors@lwv.org>  
 Subject: Statement on 2000 Elections  
 Date: Thu, 9 Nov 2000 18:28:27 -0500  
 MIME-Version: 1.0  
 X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)  
 Content-Type: text/plain;  
 charset="iso-8859-1"



DIRECT  
ELECTION

August 14, 1901

MINORITY VIEWS OF MESSRS. EAS

AND

*I think a case can be made for the  
most deeply radical amendment to the  
States.—Charles Black, Henry L.*

*will be the  
United*

I.

No more important business has come before the consideration of our system of presidential election. Among the plans proposed are those which recommend moderate change, those which recommend extensive alteration, and those which demand complete abolition. We believe that the Judiciary Committee, in recommending the destruction of the electoral-vote system in favor of direct election, has embraced a scheme that will adversely affect the entire constitutional and political structure of the United States.

We realize that the present system has its defects. We believe, however, that remedies are available short of its wholesale destruction. In his statement in opposition to direct election, former Attorney General Nicholas De B. Katzenbach commented:

I strongly feel that on a matter so basic to the confidence and structure of the country, we ought not to abandon the familiar and workable for the new and untried without the clearest demonstration of need. In my judgment, no such demonstration has been made. We should not substitute untried democratic dogma for proven democratic experience.

Direct election of the President, we believe, would—

- Destroy the two-party system and encourage the formation of a host of splinter parties;
- Undermine the Federal system by removing the States as States from the electoral process;
- Remove an indispensable institutional support for the separation of powers;
- Radicalize public opinion and endanger the rights of all minorities by removing incentives to compromise;
- Create an irresistible temptation to electoral fraud;
- Lead to interminable electoral recounts and challenges;
- Necessitate national direction and control of every aspect of the electoral process.

How, it will be asked, could an idea which enjoys such widespread popular support be so dangerous? The answer, we believe, is to be found in an examination of certain influences which have attended the current debate over electoral reform.

It must be acknowledged, first, that direct election is a simple and easily communicable idea. That fact alone may account for its great popularity and for the widespread and uncritical support it has had from the communications media. Simplicity in the governance of human affairs, however, is not always a virtue; nor is it the distinguishing characteristic of this 200-year-old Republic which seeks to secure the blessings of liberty for 200 millions of people. Human hopes and fears are complex; politics is complex; and the Constitution is complex. Still, simplicity has its charms, and not the least of them is the capacity to conceal danger.

To the appeal of simplicity must be added two other factors: the influence of the recent one-man, one-vote rulings, and the furor which has arisen from the presidential candidacy of Gov. George Wallace of Alabama. These have produced, on the one hand, a curiously abstract conception of democracy which has concealed difficult problems of representative government beneath an impenetrable mathematical screen; and, on the other hand, an emotional catch-all argument which has enabled proponents of direct election to avoid answering hard questions about their proposal.

### ***Burden of proof***

These three otherwise unrelated factors—the simplicity of the ideas, the impact of the “one-man, one-vote” slogan, and the Wallace phenomenon—have combined, as chance would have it, to obscure the truly radical nature of direct election. They have cast such a talismanic charm over the discussion that the burden of proof traditionally assigned the proponents of change has been, for all intents and purposes, thrust onto the opposition. As Congressman William L. Clay of Missouri told the Judiciary Committee:

It is uncanny that the burden of proof in this debate has been assigned to those of us who defend the electoral system which has served us well, and that the proponents \* \* \* of direct election, which is untried and necessarily unproven, do not discuss the need for change but only change itself.

This extraordinary attempt to transfer the burden of proof is without parallel in our constitutional history and must be condemned.

It is well known that the framers deliberately made the process of constitutional amendment a complicated and lengthy matter. They did so on the wise assumption that men can seldom be absolutely confident about the full range of consequences which may flow from even a seemingly minor alteration in the Constitution. Those who would amend the Constitution, therefore, are properly obliged to demonstrate that their proposal is salutary, not only for some apparent immediate purpose, but for the permanent and aggregate interests of the Nation.

The proponents of direct election, we believe, have not only failed to meet this obligation; they seem scarcely to be aware of it at all. Having fallen victim to the very forces which obscure the dangers of direct election from the public eye, they have grievously underestimated what is at stake in the matter of electoral reform. They have undertaken belief that the alteration is a mere housekeeping detail. With invincible innocence, they have reduced the manifold considerations which attend electoral reform to only one—the desire for a mathematical purity—without understanding what is implied by the application of “one-man, one-vote” to presidential elections. They would thus alter the most successful frame of government in history on behalf of a future the barest outlines of which can be only dimly perceived. Mr. Richard Goodwin, former advisor to President Kennedy and Johnson, was quite correct when he testified that it is here proposed “for



## **Partially Scanned Material**

The remainder of this page/item has not been digitized due to copyright considerations. The original can be viewed at the Minnesota Historical Society's Gale Family Library in Saint Paul, Minnesota. For more information, visit [www.mnhs.org/library/](http://www.mnhs.org/library/).

Levin  
FYI

---

**What it is - How it works**

# **The Electoral College**

*by Lori Rickert and Pat Macartney*

The President and Vice President of the United States are the only elected federal officials not chosen by direct vote of the people. They are elected by members of the Electoral College, as required by the U. S. Constitution as amended.

the candidate receiving the most popular votes in a state receives the entire electoral vote for that state. The unit rule is not prescribed by the Constitution or federal law, but is the result of individual State laws.

According to the Constitution, the President and Vice President must be elected by an absolute majority of the votes of the electoral college. At present, that would be 270 votes.

If no candidate receives a majority, the election is decided by the newly-elected members of the House and Senate. The House of Representatives chooses the



## **Partially Scanned Material**

The remainder of this page/item has not been digitized due to copyright considerations. The original can be viewed at the Minnesota Historical Society's Gale Family Library in Saint Paul, Minnesota. For more information, visit [www.mnhs.org/library/](http://www.mnhs.org/library/).

June 1992

MY

## ELECTORAL COLLEGE

The Constitution of the United States requires that an Electoral College, a group of electors, select the President and Vice-President. Some delegates at the Constitutional Convention in 1787 favored direct election of the President by the people. Others believed that the President should be elected by the national legislature (Congress). The idea of election by an Electoral College was actually a compromise. The states would choose electors, who in turn would elect the President. Changes made by the Twelfth Amendment in 1804. The plan works as follows:

1. Each state chooses as many presidential electors as its total of senators and representatives in Congress.

In 1992, NY State will have 2 senators and 31 representatives, for a total of 33 electors. With 100 senators and 435 representatives plus 3 electors for the District of Columbia the total will be 538. *MD has 10 electors.*

2. State legislatures decide how to choose electors.

States may choose their own method of selecting electors. In practice, the "Winner-take-all" system has operated in all but two states. In other words, the political party with the most popular votes within the state, wins the total electoral vote for that state. However, in 1992 at least eight states including New Jersey and Connecticut have proposals to allocate their electoral votes on the basis of the winner of the popular vote in each Congressional district. Thus the state's electoral votes could be split. Such reforms will affect the current presidential campaigns and the outcome of November's election. *MD is winner take all*

3. A majority of 270 votes is needed to win. If no candidate for President receives a majority of the electoral votes, members of the newly elected House of Representatives, VOTING BY STATES—ONE STATE = ONE VOTE, elect the president from among the 3 candidates having the largest number of votes. A majority of all the states is required.

The last time that this happened was in 1824 with the election of John Quincy Adams over the popular-vote getter Andrew Jackson.

### Timetable 1992-93

Nov. 3	Election Day
Dec. 14	Electors cast votes in state capitols
Jan. 3	New Congress meets
Jan. 6	Electoral votes opened and counted in front of Congress
Jan. 20	President Inaugurated

\* For more information see the League publication *Choosing the President 1992, A Citizen's Guide to the Electoral Process*. \$9.95 plus \$2.00 shipping & handling. (Member price \$7.95.)

**The Constitution** *NY Times 5/10/92*

## And if Perot Produces a Deadlock? The House Will Decide

By MARTIN TOLCHIN

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, May 9 — Should Ross Perot do well enough in the November election to prevent either President Bush or the Democratic nominee from winning a majority in the Electoral College, the election would be decided

If the Electoral College fails, Congress is waiting in the wings.

lowed by the President pro-tempore of the Senate and cabinet officers starting with the Secretary of State.

Democrats control the current House, 268 to 166, with one independent, and have majorities in 31 state delegations. Ten states have Republican majorities, eight are evenly divided and Montana's sole representative is also the





## **Partially Scanned Material**

The remainder of this page/item has not been digitized due to copyright considerations. The original can be viewed at the Minnesota Historical Society's Gale Family Library in Saint Paul, Minnesota. For more information, visit [www.mnhs.org/library/](http://www.mnhs.org/library/).

## WHO ELECTS THE PRESIDENT?

### Questions and Answers

**Q:** What does a college have to do with the '92 presidential election?

**A:** The Electoral College chooses the President and Vice President of the United States. According to the Constitution, "electors shall meet in their respective States, and vote by ballot for President and Vice President ..." (Amend. XII) "and the day on which they give their votes...shall be the same throughout the United States." (Art. II). These quadrennial formal gatherings in each state capitol are known as a "college."

**Q:** How are these electors chosen?

**A:** Although Congress says WHEN they are chosen, the Constitution allows each state legislature to decide HOW. In practice, electors are named by state party organizations. Serving as elector is considered an honor, a reward for faithful service. When voters in each state go to the polls on November 3, each one casts a ballot for president/vice president; the vote is actually cast for the slate of electors pledged to support the candidate whom the voter prefers.

**Q:** How many electors is each state entitled to?

**A:** Under the Constitution each state chooses as many presidential electors as its total of senators and representatives in Congress. With 100 senators and 435 representatives plus three electors for the District of Columbia, the total is 538.

**Q:** How many votes in the electoral college does it take to win?

**A:** A majority, one more than half, is required. 270 is the magic number.

**Q:** If no one gets 270 votes, how are the president & vice president chosen?

**A:** *The president:* In January, the newly elected House of Representatives, voting by states — one state equals one vote — elects the president from among the three candidates having the largest number of votes. A majority, 26 votes, is required. (The last time that this happened was in 1824 with the election of John Quincy Adams over the popular vote-getter Andrew Jackson.)

*The vice president:* The Senate picks from the top two vice presidential vote-getters in the Electoral College. Each senator has one vote; a majority - 51 - of the whole Senate is needed for election. It is possible, particularly in a three-way

race, that the House might select a president from one party, and the Senate could select the vice president from another.

**Q:** Must electors vote for their party's candidate?

**A:** Although most states have laws binding electors, this is not mandated by federal law. There have been cases of "defector electors" but such votes have never affected the final outcome of an election.

**Q:** Could we elect a president who is not from one of the two major parties?

**A:** It is possible but not likely, as the present winner-take-all system supports the presidential two-party system. As it now works, the political party that receives the most popular votes within the state, wins the total electoral vote for that state. (In 1980 independent candidate John Anderson received 5.7 million votes nationwide, but since he did not receive a plurality in any one state, no electoral votes were awarded.)

However, a state's electoral votes could be split. In 1992 at least eight states including New Jersey and Connecticut are considering the allocation of some of their electoral votes on the basis of the

(over)

winner of the popular vote in each Congressional district. Maine and Nebraska already do this. Such reforms by state legislatures could affect the 1992 presidential race.

### Why did the framers set up such a complicated system?

Some delegates at the 1787 Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia favored a direct election by the people while others believed that the president should be elected by the national legislature (Congress). The idea of election by an Electoral College was actually a compromise. In modern times political parties control presidential politics and the function of the electoral college has changed drastically. "Rather than having individuals seek to become electors and then vote for whomever they please for president, the parties have turned the process upside down by arranging slates of electors, all pledged to support the candidate nominated by the party."\*

### Why don't we change the system?

Proposals for change have been made, especially in years when third parties or independent candidates received substantial popular votes. While a constitutional amendment would be required to eliminate or change the system, state

legislatures may alter the process by which their electors are chosen. Those in the "If it ain't broke..." school point out that every twentieth century president has won the popular vote AND electoral vote.

**Q:** How does the 1990 census affect the '92 election?

**A:** As a result of population shifts indicated by the 1990 census, the number of electoral votes allocated to many states differs from the previous two presidential elections. New York State will have 33 votes, a loss of three, and California will have 54, a gain of seven and Texas 32, a gain of three. While Pennsylvania, Illinois and Ohio lost votes, many southern states (NC, Ga, Va, Az) gained. Remember that electoral votes are based on the census count and not on the actual number of voters casting ballots in November.



### Timetable 1992-93

- Feb-Aug Political parties choose their candidates in primary elections and caucuses and nominate them at conventions
- Sept. 30 Independent candidates qualify for the ballot in New York State
- Nov. 3 Election Day
- Dec. 14 Electors cast votes in state capitols
- Jan. 3 New Congress is sworn in (Jan. 3 is a Sunday so Congress may set a later date, presumably Jan. 4 or 5)
- Jan. 6 Electoral votes opened and counted in front of Congress
- Jan. 20 President inaugurated

\*For more information, *Choosing the President 1992, A Citizen's Guide to the Electoral Process*, is available from the League of Women Voters (212-677-5050) Single copy: \$7.95 plus \$2.00 shipping/handling.

①  
FEC  
Journal  
Fall 188  
②

State Law Controls  
Popular Vote to Electoral  
Vote

Winner take all

Britanica Political Parties

Rep & Dem elect ~~elect~~ electors at  
State Convention.

up to parties + for Candidates

file for Ballot, name electors

Const. Amend. XII

Tie Vote - Sec. of State  
by lot.

---

Fed. 51% of vote

House of Reps. choose  
by ballot.

each state gets 1 vote  
Senate for Veeper.

The Electoral College elects the president of the United States.

Citizens vote for members of the electoral college when they vote in a Presidential Election.

There are 538 members of the electoral college - one for each united states representative and one for each senator.

It takes 270 electoral votes to elect a president.

Minnesota has 10 electoral votes in a presidential election.

In the case of a tie vote, the secretary of states chooses the winner by lot.

The Electoral College meets at the State Capitol on December 14, to cast their presidential votes.

State law dictates how the electoral votes from a given state are decided. In Minnesota, it is winner take all.

Major political party electors are elected at their state conventions (Reps. & Dems) in Minnesota. Minor party and individual candidates register their electors with the secretary of State when they file to place themselves on the ballot.

If no candidate wins at least 51% of the electoral votes in an election, the United States House of REps elects the president and the Senate elects the vice president. Again, 51% of possible votes must be cast for the winning candidate.



Seminars Committee Report

No Report.

Publications Committee Report

No Report.

Bylaws & Ethics Committee Report

No Report.

Surveys & Statistics Committee Report

No Report.

Building Usage Committee Report

No Report.

General Manager's Report

Jim Reineke presented the General Manager's Report.

1. It has been discovered that, in addition to the cardboard that UMAGA presently recycles, a other kinds of paper can now be recycled as well. Since garbage costs are based on tonnage, those costs can be reduced if more paper is recycled. Additional recycling containers and information will be provided. The will be reevaluated after a one year trial.
2. As of August 1, 1992, corporate rates on automobile rentals will be available to UMAGA members through the Hertz and Budget rental agencies.
3. Walmart's policy of not using reps so they can reduce their costs is being examined at by governmental agencies for possible violations of federal laws. Further information will be made available as the investigation progresses.
4. It has been determined that a 1990 property tax credit of \$8,000 is due UMAGA. A tax assessor from Minnetonka will be examining the property for a reduction in the assessed valuation so that UMAGA can gain additional savings on its taxes.

The Board praised and thanked the General Manager for the excellent work he has done and the contributions that he has made to UMAGA.

Q. where electoral College  
meets.

(10) for mn

1 per Rep + 1 per Senator

nationally 538

270 needed to elect.





► **Campaign '96**

*White House*



Also on  
PoliticsNow

## The Electoral College

[Electoral  
College 101](#)

[Understanding  
The Electoral  
College](#)

[1996 Electoral  
College  
Breakdown](#)

[Electoral  
College Map](#)

President Clinton was formally declared the victor of the 1996 presidential election on Nov. 5, but the contest isn't over until the Electoral College votes. The popular vote showed only a narrow win for the president, but the electoral votes each candidate accumulated (Clinton: 379; Dole: 159) told a different story. The 538 presidential electors representing the states meet on Dec. 16 and finalize the race for the White House. Confused? PoliticsNow has the answers, including an [Electoral College primer](#), the final [tally of votes](#), how many [electors](#) each state is allotted and just [who](#) these presidential electors are.

### The Electors:

[ [Alabama](#) - [Arkansas](#) | [California](#) | [Colorado](#) - [D.C.](#) | [Florida](#) - [Hawaii](#) | [Idaho](#) - [Iowa](#) | [Kansas](#) - [Massachusetts](#) | [Michigan](#) - [New Hampshire](#) | [New Jersey](#) - [New York](#) | [North Carolina](#) - [Oklahoma](#) | [Oregon](#) - [South Dakota](#) | [Tennessee](#) - [Vermont](#) | [Virginia](#) - [Wyoming](#) ]

### State-By-State Presidential Returns



[ [State-By-State Text Links](#) ]



## **Partially Scanned Material**

The remainder of this page/item has not been digitized due to copyright considerations. The original can be viewed at the Minnesota Historical Society's Gale Family Library in Saint Paul, Minnesota. For more information, visit [www.mnhs.org/library/](http://www.mnhs.org/library/).