



**State of Connecticut**  
**HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**  
STATE CAPITOL  
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT 06106-1591

**JAMES M. ALBIS**

STATE REPRESENTATIVE • DEPUTY MAJORITY LEADER

LEGISLATIVE OFFICE BUILDING  
CAPITOL: (860) 240-8585  
CELL: (203) 435-8927  
E-MAIL: James.Albis@cga.ct.gov

**MEMBER**

FINANCE, REVENUE AND BONDING COMMITTEE  
JUDICIARY COMMITTEE  
INSURANCE COMMITTEE

March 19, 2018

Senator Michael McLachlan  
Senator Mae Flexer  
Representative Daniel Fox  
Government Administration and Elections Committee  
Legislative Office Building, Room 2200  
300 Capitol Ave  
Hartford, CT 06106

TESTIMONY IN SUPPORT OF HB 5421

**AN ACT ADOPTING THE INTERSTATE COMPACT TO ELECT THE PRESIDENT OF THE  
UNITED STATES BY NATIONAL POPULAR VOTE**

**HB 5421**

Senator Flexer, Senator McLachlan, Representative Fox, distinguished Vice Chairmen and Ranking Members, and honorable members of the Government Administration and Elections Committee, my name is James Albis, State Representative for the 99<sup>th</sup> district in East Haven. I'm here to express my support for HB 5421.

Simply put, AN ACT ADOPTING THE INTERSTATE COMPACT TO ELECT THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES BY NATIONAL POPULAR VOTE, will guarantee the Presidency to the candidate who receives the most popular votes in the entire United States. This bill ensures that *every* vote, in *every* state, will matter in every presidential election.

Under the U.S. Constitution, the states have exclusive power to allocate their electoral votes within the Electoral College, and may change their state laws concerning how they are awarded at any time. Under the National Popular Vote bill, Connecticut's seven electoral votes would be awarded to the presidential candidate who receives the most popular votes in all 50 states and the District of Columbia. The bill would not take effect until enacted, in identical form,

by states possessing a majority of the electoral votes-that is, enough electoral votes to elect a President (270 of 538).

To date, the bill has been enacted by 11 jurisdictions possessing 165 electoral votes- over 50% of the 270 necessary to activate it. Rhode Island has already enacted the legislation, as well as fellow New England states Vermont and Massachusetts.

This bill would exercise Connecticut's rights to determine how our electoral votes should be awarded, replacing our own winner-take-all statute. State winner-take-all statutes have permitted candidates to win the Presidency without winning the most popular votes nationwide in 4 of our 57 elections – 1 in 14 times. A shift of 59,93 votes in Ohio in 2004 would have elected John Kerry despite President Bush's nationwide lead of over 3,000,000 votes. A shift of 214,390 votes in 2012 would have elected Mitt Romney despite President Obama's nationwide lead of almost 5,000,000 votes.

The most important consequence of winner-take-all statutes is that presidential candidates have no reason to pay attention to the concerns of voters in states where they are comfortably ahead or hopelessly behind. Four out of five Americans were ignored in the 2012 presidential election. After being nominated, President Obama conducted campaign events in just eight closely divided battleground states, and Romney did so in only 10. These 10 states received 98% of the \$940 million spent on campaign advertising. Forty states were mere spectators.

But this bill is about much more than Presidential campaign stops.

Attention paid to swing states at the expense of "safe" states like Connecticut does not end on Election Day. Using a database that includes all federal project grants from 1996-2008 to examine the distribution of grant money across the 50 states, recent research (Hudak) cited in my written testimony clearly demonstrates that through the strategic use of discretion, presidents influence the distribution of federal funds, essentially using them as a campaign resource.

Notably, since our state's efforts to pass this important election reform began in 2009, our UConn Health Center lost a \$100 million grant for renovation to Ohio State University (Altamari). The cited research (Hudak) suggests that's not an accident. It suggests over all, swing states see a benefit of 5.7% more grant dollars than other states. In fact, in the two years leading up to a presidential election, swing states will see an 11.5% increase in the number of federal grants and an 8.2% increase in the number of grant dollars compared to the two years after an election.

The prevalence of winner-take-all rules means that presidential candidates don't face a national electorate, but instead a small number of state-level electorates. "The small size of the truly competitive presidential electorate makes an electoral strategy that uses distribution of government funds a feasible and appealing tactic."

National Popular Vote is also a protection against voter fraud schemes. Consider the 2000 election and the state of Florida. No matter the cause for the close vote count, the problem in Florida

wasn't that the count was so close: the problem was that so much hung in the balance – 29 electoral votes – because of their winner-take-all rule.

Incentives for fraud in the current system are greater because it is easier to impact the overall outcome through fraud or illegal behavior in one state, county or city, than by an organized effort around the country trying to influence the outcome of the total national popular vote.

National Popular Vote preserves states' administration of elections.

Opponents may argue that this will somehow incur a national election or federal ballot, and that is simply unfounded. States are currently entrusted to administer their elections. They decide what documentation is needed to vote, determine where the votes happen, what their ballots look like, and they are responsible for counting their votes. States determine the thresholds for recounts, and the procedures for those recounts. This bill doesn't seek to change that.

Fundamentally, this bill is about equality. I was initially attracted to the bill's overriding goal of counting everyone's vote equally, regardless of where they happen to live. However, the more I have learned about the unintended consequences of winner-take-all statutes, the more I have recognized the need for reform. And to realize that the tool for reform is not only available, but constitutionally granted to our state gives me great hope that we can address these problems.

2018 is the time for National Popular Vote in Connecticut. The work began right here in this committee in 2009, went through the House and ran out of time in the Senate. As other states see the introduction of reforms that would even further game the Electoral College system, Connecticut can continue the momentum toward fairness in that institution which our neighbors in Massachusetts and New Jersey have already adopted.

Thank you for your time and consideration of this important matter. I look forward to your questions about the bill before us.

Sincerely,



James M. Albis  
State Representative

Altimari, Daniela. "UConn Loses Out on Critical Grant for Health Center." *Hartford Courant*. December 29, 2010.

Hudak, John Joseph. 2011. *The Politics of Federal Grants: Presidential Influence over the Distribution of Federal Funds*. Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions. Working Paper # 01-2011. [www.vanderbilt.edu/csdlresearch/CSDI-WP-01-2011.pdf](http://www.vanderbilt.edu/csdlresearch/CSDI-WP-01-2011.pdf)