

Mark Conrad
41 Mountain View Ave
New Milford CT 06776
markdotcon@gmail.com

The Government Administration and Elections Committee

Testimony in regard to HB 5421 - AN ACT ADOPTING THE INTERSTATE COMPACT TO ELECT THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES BY NATIONAL POPULAR VOTE.

Honored committee members,

I am writing to ask this committee to reject the proposal to join the National Popular vote. This campaign is based on falsehoods.

For example the following are used to garner support:

“The candidate with the most votes should win. This is the way we fill other offices.”

“The electoral College, as it stands now, is an outdated system. There is absolutely no reason we shouldn't be electing our Presidents by a nationwide popular vote.”

The Presidential election is the only National election therefore it cannot be fairly compared to any other election. In fact in a presidential election there are 51 separate elections with the winner being the candidate who receives the majority of the popular vote. The United States are just that; a union of independent states. Each State and the District of Columbia have a popular vote, that vote determines how their electors will vote. The number of electors is determined by size and population to give equal weight to voters from all States. The States then vote for the President of the Union.

Other misconceptions include:

“Candidates never campaign in Connecticut because everyone knows the outcome in advance.”

Candidates never campaign in Connecticut. If every vote in Connecticut mattered, they would have to pay attention to us”

“Connecticut doesn't matter now in presidential elections. Only a handful of so-called key states, like Ohio and Colorado, seem to matter.

“Under the current Electoral College system, Connecticut doesn't seem to ever matter.”

“The candidate who gets the most votes should become President. This is not only fairer than the current way, but it would make candidates come to Connecticut.”

Through the Electoral College Connecticut has a vote despite our small number of electoral votes. If a NPV were used to elect the President of the United States, Connecticut would be completely ignored as the focus would be on those states with a large number of electoral votes with the fore knowledge that other State's electoral votes would automatically go to the candidate with the most of the popular vote. Don't

allow yourself to be deceived, this bill does not provide a more fair method of electing a President; it silences the voices of the people from the majority of the States while enforcing the will of large populations of a few States.

While CT may never be a "swing State" due to our size, therefore it's number of electoral votes, it is not ignored. It is considered safe based on our voting history, once there is a sense of change or opportunity it will receive more attention. It is also true that swing states change because of this, Virginia is a recent example.

From Tara Ross, Electoral College Myth #1: Only swing states matter. Other states are ignored .[August 30, 2016](#)

"Remember that Texas used to vote Democratic. California used to vote Republican. George W. Bush won his victory in 2000 with the help of one state that was *supposed* to be a safe blue state: West Virginia."

From Allen West:

"Electoral College vs Popular Vote:

There are 3,141 counties in the United States.

Trump won 3,084 of them. Clinton won 57.

There are 62 counties in New York State.

Trump won 46 of them. Clinton won 16.

Clinton won the popular vote by approximately 2 million votes.

In the 5 counties that encompass NYC, (Bronx, Brooklyn, Manhattan, Richmond & Queens) Clinton received well over 2 million more votes than Trump. (Clinton only won 4 of these counties; Trump won Richmond.)

These 5 counties alone, more than accounted for Clinton winning the popular vote of the entire country.

These 5 counties comprise 319 square miles. The United States is comprised of 3,797,000 square miles.

When you have a country that encompasses almost 4 million square miles of territory, do you think that vote of those who inhabit a mere 319 square miles should dictate the outcome of a national election? "

In conclusion, I do not wish to surrender my vote, or the vote of my State to outside forces. I support the Electoral College as it is now operated. I ask for your support in opposing the deceptive and unfair change to our State's Federal election process.

Regards,
Mark Conrad