

# Bill as Introduced

HB 148 - AS INTRODUCED

2013 SESSION

13-0354  
03/05

HOUSE BILL

**148**

AN ACT

relative to electoral college electors.

SPONSORS:

Rep. Weed, Ches 16

COMMITTEE:

Election Law

---

ANALYSIS

This bill adopts the interstate agreement to elect the president by national popular vote.

-----

Explanation:

Matter added to current law appears in ***bold italics***.

Matter removed from current law appears [~~in brackets and struck through~~].

Matter which is either (a) all new or (b) repealed and reenacted appears in regular type.

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

*In the Year of Our Lord Two Thousand Thirteen*

AN ACT relative to electoral college electors.

*Be it Enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives in General Court convened:*

1 1 New Chapter; Agreement Among the States to Elect the President by National Popular Vote.  
2 Amend RSA by inserting after chapter 659 the following new chapter:

3 CHAPTER 659-A

4 AGREEMENT AMONG THE STATES TO ELECT THE PRESIDENT BY NATIONAL POPULAR  
5 VOTE

6 659-A:1 Agreement Among the States to Elect the President by National Popular Vote. The  
7 agreement among the states to elect the president by national popular vote is hereby adopted as  
8 follows:

9 Agreement Among the States to Elect the President by National Popular Vote.

10 Article I

11 Membership

12 Any State of the United States and the District of Columbia may become a member of this  
13 agreement by enacting this agreement.

14 Article II

15 Right of the People in Member States to Vote for President and Vice President

16 Each member state shall conduct a statewide popular election for President and Vice President  
17 of the United States.

18 Article III

19 Manner of Appointing Presidential Electors in Member States

20 Prior to the time set by law for the meeting and voting by the presidential electors, the chief  
21 election official of each member state shall determine the number of votes for each presidential slate  
22 in each State of the United States and in the District of Columbia in which votes have been cast in a  
23 statewide popular election and shall add such votes together to produce a "national popular vote  
24 total" for each presidential slate.

25 The chief election official of each member state shall designate the presidential slate with the  
26 largest national popular vote total as the "national popular vote winner."

27 The presidential elector certifying official of each member state shall certify the appointment in  
28 that official's own state of the elector slate nominated in that state in association with the national  
29 popular vote winner.

30 At least six days before the day fixed by law for the meeting and voting by the presidential  
31 electors, each member state shall make a final determination of the number of popular votes cast in

1 the state for each presidential slate and shall communicate an official statement of such  
2 determination within 24 hours to the chief election official of each other member state.

3 The chief election official of each member state shall treat as conclusive an official statement  
4 containing the number of popular votes in a state for each presidential slate made by the day  
5 established by federal law for making a state's final determination conclusive as to the counting of  
6 electoral votes by Congress.

7 In event of a tie for the national popular vote winner, the presidential elector certifying official of  
8 each member state shall certify the appointment of the elector slate nominated in association with  
9 the presidential slate receiving the largest number of popular votes within that official's own state.

10 If, for any reason, the number of presidential electors nominated in a member state in association  
11 with the national popular vote winner is less than or greater than that state's number of electoral votes,  
12 the presidential candidate on the presidential slate that has been designated as the national popular vote  
13 winner shall have the power to nominate the presidential electors for that state and that state's  
14 presidential elector certifying official shall certify the appointment of such nominees.

15 The chief election official of each member state shall immediately release to the public all vote  
16 counts or statements of votes as they are determined or obtained.

17 This article shall govern the appointment of presidential electors in each member state in any  
18 year in which this agreement is, on July 20, in effect in states cumulatively possessing a majority of  
19 the electoral votes.

20 Article IV

21 Other Provisions

22 This agreement shall take effect when states cumulatively possessing a majority of the electoral  
23 votes have enacted this agreement in substantially the same form and the enactments by such states  
24 have taken effect in each state.

25 Any member state may withdraw from this agreement, except that a withdrawal occurring six  
26 months or less before the end of a President's term shall not become effective until a President or  
27 Vice President shall have been qualified to serve the next term.

28 The chief executive of each member state shall promptly notify the chief executive of all other  
29 states of when this agreement has been enacted and has taken effect in that official's state, when the  
30 state has withdrawn from this agreement, and when this agreement takes effect generally.

31 This agreement shall terminate if the electoral college is abolished.

32 If any provision of this agreement is held invalid, the remaining provisions shall not be affected.

33 Article V

34 Definitions

35 For purposes of this agreement,

36 "chief executive" shall mean the Governor of a State of the United States or the Mayor of the  
37 District of Columbia;

**HB 148 - AS INTRODUCED**

**- Page 3 -**

1 "elector slate" shall mean a slate of candidates who have been nominated in a state for the  
2 position of presidential elector in association with a presidential slate;

3 "chief election official" shall mean the state official or body that is authorized to certify the total  
4 number of popular votes for each presidential slate;

5 "presidential elector" shall mean an elector for President and Vice President of the  
6 United States;

7 "presidential elector certifying official" shall mean the state official or body that is authorized to  
8 certify the appointment of the state's presidential electors;

9 "presidential slate" shall mean a slate of two persons, the first of whom has been nominated as a  
10 candidate for President of the United States and the second of whom has been nominated as a  
11 candidate for Vice President of the United States, or any legal successors to such persons, regardless  
12 of whether both names appear on the ballot presented to the voter in a particular state;

13 "state" shall mean a State of the United States and the District of Columbia; and

14 "statewide popular election" shall mean a general election in which votes are cast for presidential  
15 slates by individual voters and counted on a statewide basis.

16 2 Effective Date. This act shall take effect 60 days after its passage.

# Speakers



# Hearing Minutes



HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ELECTION LAW

PUBLIC HEARING ON HB 148

**BILL TITLE:** relative to electoral college electors.

**DATE:** 1/15/13

**LOB ROOM:** 308      **Time Public Hearing Called to Order:** 11:30 am

**Time Adjourned:** 12:01 pm

(please circle if present)

**Committee Members:** Reps. Cote, Knowles, Perry, Moody, Levesque, Ward, Connor, Gage, Till, G. Richardson, Jasper, Marston, Souza, Gray, Comerford, Sweeney, Birdsell and Hoelzel.

**Bill Sponsors:** Rep. Weed, Ches 16

TESTIMONY

\* Use asterisk if written testimony and/or amendments are submitted.

**Rep. Charles Weed, Ches 16, Keene** – Sponsor – Supports having. This would be part of an interstate compact and therefore is not amendable. This compact would do away with the electoral college. Rep. Weed explained how and the history of the electoral college. The electoral college makes insignificant the 2/3rds of the voters in the country. Nine states have approved the interstate agreement. The agreement would take effect when a majority of the states approve.

**\*Hon. Greg Sorg** – former state rep – against the bill. Written testimony submitted entitled “A Defense of the Electoral College System by Gregory M. Sorg” which he compiled twelve years ago. He explained how the number of voters influences/or would influence the results. We need to arise above what “sounds good” to address the whole issue. The founding fathers were “smart”. History of electoral college was explained. Matter of electoral college. Deferred matters.

**Rep. Pam Tucker** – Opposed bill – Unintended consequences – end of first in nation primary

**Rep. Timothy Horrigan, Straford** – Opposes bill – We should keep the electoral college. Electoral college serves as a “firewall” to states that don’t run elections well. Small states vs. large states.

Respectfully submitted,



Rep. Kathleen M. Hoelzel, Clerk

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ELECTION LAW

PUBLIC HEARING ON HB 148

BILL TITLE: relative to electoral college electors.

DATE: 1/15/13

LOB ROOM: 308

Time Public Hearing Called to Order: 11:30 am

Time Adjourned: 12:01 pm

(please circle if present)

Committee Members: Reps. Cote, Knowles, Perry, Moody, Levesque, Ward, Connor, Gage, Gill, G. Richardson, Jasper, Marston, Souza, Gray, Somerford, Sweeney, Birdsall and Hoelzel.

Bill Sponsors: Rep. Weed, Ches 16

TESTIMONY

\* Use asterisk if written testimony and/or amendments are submitted.

Rep. Charles Weed - sponsor, <sup>Keene</sup>Cheshire 16<sup>th</sup> - supported having  
This would be part of an interstate compact and therefore is not amendable. This compact would do away with the electoral college. Rep Weed explained how and the history of the electoral college. The electoral college makes insignificant ~~2/3~~ 2/3rds of the voters in the country. 9 states have approved the interstate agreement. The agreement would take effect when a majority of the electoral <sup>the</sup> voters states approve.

\* Hon. Greg Sorg - former state rep. - against bill.  
written testimony submitted entitled "A Defense of the Electoral College System by Gregory M. Sorg" which he compiled twelve years ago. He explained how the number of voters influences for would influence the results. We need to ~~prior~~ <sup>address</sup> address the whole issue. The funding for this own

were "smart." History of electoral college was explained. Matter of electoral college. Deferred Matters.

Rep. Pam Tucker: opposes bill - unintended consequences - End of first in nation primary (2)

Rep. Timothy Harrigan - opposes bill - Strafford - We should keep the electoral college - Electoral college serves as a "firewall" to States that don't run elections well. Small States vs large states.

12<sup>01</sup> pm

Rep Kathleen M. Ahearn

# Testimony

A DEFENSE OF THE  
ELECTORAL COLLEGE SYSTEM

BY

GREGORY M. SORG

*file copy  
1-15-2013  
"compiled twelve  
years ago"  
submitted during  
hearing on HB 148  
2013*

The office of President of the United States, because it is exercised by only one person, and because it is the only one filled with the participation of the entire nation, is unique in its susceptibility to the corrupting effects of democratic influences. The primary avenue for this lies in the sheer size of the President's constituency, so large as greatly to hinder his being well acquainted with all the local circumstances and lesser interests of his constituents.

The Electoral College system of electing the President anticipates this potential for ineffective contact between the President and his national constituency by the ingenious device of changing what would otherwise be one national into numerous state elections. By awarding votes in groups by states, votes which are distributed among the states so as to benefit in disproportionate progression the less populous, the Electoral College system assures that the executive function of the federal government cannot be conducted in a politically responsible manner without due regard for the concerns of residents of small states, sparsely populated states, sparsely populated regions, or regions with unique interests. Because under the prevailing operation of the Electoral College system, the loss by a presidential candidate of a given state by a popular margin as small as a single vote results in the loss of that state's entire block of electoral votes, political considerations require a presidential candidate to devote attention to issues peculiar to, or of particular interest to the people of that or any other state in which he has a reasonable possibility of prevailing in the election. Once having dispensed with the Electoral College system in favor of a simple national plebiscite, the necessity for articulating positions of national concern in any but the broadest terms, and the incentive even to identify issues of regional, state, or local concern, will be greatly reduced.

A still more vital purpose served by the Electoral College system than that of encouraging a more wide-ranging discussion of issues, is that of preventing, to the maximum extent yet shown to be feasible, the very evil which its detractors insist it invites, and out of fear of which they have advocated its replacement: the election of a minority President.

The Electoral College system, by requiring (under state law) the awarding of a state's entire block of electoral votes to the candidate capturing a plurality of

that state's popular vote, while additionally requiring (under the Constitution) the winning of a majority of all the electoral votes cast in order to be elected, discourages the candidacy of presidential aspirants whose support is merely regional, or if widespread, is merely superficial; and it minimizes the impact upon the election of such candidates of that type as do run for the office. Under this system, minor party candidates can, by their candidacy, serve the valuable function of directing attention to the concerns they represent, but without at the same time crippling the integrity of the elective process either by causing a reversal of the outcome between the major party candidates, or by forcing the election into the House of Representatives for a decision, with its consequent debilitating effects upon the authority of the President finally chosen.

Under a system in which only raw popular vote totals would bear upon the outcome of presidential elections, minor party candidates would greatly proliferate since it would be obvious that all but the most frivolous could exert a direct impact upon them. The inevitable consequence of thus encouraging multi-candidate presidential contests would be to increase substantially resort to what would be, regardless of their form, divisive and enervating post-election procedures for narrowing the field to a single candidate, and would do so to the extent where resort to such extraordinary, undesirable, and heretofore rarely invoked procedures would become the prevailing practice rather than the very infrequently occurring exception it has been under the current system.

The genius of the Electoral College system, as it has evolved, lies in its tendency to confine the presidential contest, as a practical matter, to two candidates of generally moderate views and demeanor. Moderation results, first, because success under the Electoral College system depends upon having the depth and scope of support that a candidate of immoderate views or deportment cannot hope to achieve in a nation with the diversity of interests, opinions, and mores of the United States; and second, because the difficulty of capturing significant numbers of electoral votes, together with the fact that a majority of those votes is required for election, compels interests of different but not incompatible types to coalesce; to unite behind a single candidate in order to enhance the possibility of success. Such a coalition of competing and potentially antagonistic interests requires moderation in the positions adopted and espoused by the candidate in order that he neither alienate any of the member interests, nor antagonize more voters than needed to enable the capture of a majority of the electoral votes.

The number of candidates is effectively limited to two by operation of the same factors. The extreme difficulty of winning a substantial portion of the electoral vote all but eliminates any realistic expectation on the part of potential minor party presidential candidates not only of victory in the election, but, excepting a very few isolated instances in the nation's history, even of influencing the outcome between the candidates of the two largest coalitions. As a result, most often they will not undertake the arduous task of contesting for the office,

unless it is done for the purpose simply of directing attention to the particular issues with which they are specifically concerned. This consequence of the Electoral College system is and has been a factor of inestimable stabilizing value since it enhances the likelihood that the person elected to the office of President of the United States will receive not only a plurality, but a majority of the popular vote, and further that, regardless of his popular vote total, he will be a consensus choice for the office, behind whom the entire nation could rally, and would not merely be the champion of the largest narrowly focused faction.

The nature of the Electoral College system also serves to discourage the myriad factions and interests at work at any given time from coalescing into any more than two major parties in their attempt to overcome the institutional disadvantage the system places upon narrowly confined political movements. In a theoretical setting in which no major political party as yet existed, political factions contemplating union with other factions for the purpose of presenting a single, mutually acceptable candidate for the office of President, would recognize the futility of pursuing such a course if the ultimate result were to be three or more major coalitions and candidates. The predictable consequence under such a configuration of an indecisive election would hardly serve to justify the difficult problems of reconciliation and accommodation necessary to have produced it. In the practical setting of current political reality, in which two major parties already exist, the same considerations apply even more forcefully, for in such a situation, each faction contemplating the formation of a third major party finds itself confronted not only with the almost prohibitively difficult but necessary preliminary task of recruiting and accommodating other non-aligned interests, but also of attracting other interests already affiliated with either one or the other of the two existing major parties. Again, even could these labors be accomplished to the optimum, this enormous expense of effort very likely would result in nothing more advantageous to the third party than an indecisive election which denied victory to the candidate of any party, at least until the House of Representatives chose the winner pursuant to the Twelfth Amendment, a procedure likely to be of small comfort and no profit to the third party.

As a practical matter, foreknowledge of indecisiveness as the most favorable result a third major party could realistically expect in a presidential election conducted under the Electoral College system, prevents the formative process from ever progressing beyond the enlistment of more than a very few homogeneous interests. Other interests, unless they are such as can, standing alone, inspire a significant defection of voters from the major parties, are, or become, reconciled by this consequence of the Electoral College system to not attempting to challenge the prevalence of the two-party system, preferring instead to work within that system to promote their objectives by means of influencing a consensus party, and through it, a consensus administration.

It is bewildering that any Constitutional revision would be proposed and supported by apparently sober and intelligent people in the name of vindicating

the majority, whose tendency would plainly and inevitably be to the contrary. Presidential elections conducted under any of the replacements for the Electoral College system that at one time or another have been proposed neither would require nor likely would ever result in the capture of a popular vote majority by any candidate.

Even if it were confinable to two candidates, which it most assuredly would not be, a presidential election conducted by means of a national plebiscite would still, despite its democratic adornments, be perceived by large numbers of voters as unfair, particularly by those politically active holders of unpopular opinions, or spokesmen for regional interests, who would be among the first to comprehend that their means of influencing the executive branch of the federal government had been effectively suppressed. As for the balance of the electorate, certainly once having been confronted with the far more probable election-day scenario of a multi-candidate circus, the utter absurdity of that mode of election as a model for fairness or as an arbiter of legitimacy would no longer be a subject for dispute. In the aftermath of such an election, the electorate would find itself pondering how merely finishing first in the popular vote legitimizes the ascent to the highest office in the land of a person whose views, demeanor, or parochialism would have prevented perhaps as many as seven voters in ten from ever casting ballots for in a contest confined, were it confinable, to two candidates. Nor would such a degree of opposition to a President-elect be an improbability under a system which could not help but attract numerous candidates representing the full spectrum of narrow interests, each fervently supported by some voters, but each fundamentally opposed by the rest.

The present system, by contrast, renders almost impossible the election of a candidate detestable to a significant proportion of the electorate, for as has been shown, the need to win electoral votes has fostered the development of the two-party system, which in turn has resulted in the nomination and election of temperate, consensus candidates. The disintegration of party discipline, and eventually of the two-party system itself, that would inevitably follow the adoption of such a proposal, combined with the need it would create to resort frequently to post-election procedures to choose a President from a crowded field, would eliminate this institutional impediment to control of the executive branch of the government by a person who is extreme or provincial in his views, unintelligent, inexperienced, or otherwise unfit for the office of President of the United States.

In political affairs, no standard of judgment as to which is best is more reliable than that of the test of time. The Electoral College system, precisely because of those virtues which its detractors illogically and insistently characterize as its defects, has contributed substantially over a period of more than 200 years to that continuing miracle of the American system of government: the orderly and peaceful transfer of the executive power. It must not be tampered with.





**HOUSE COMMITTEE RESEARCH OFFICE**

**New Hampshire House of Representatives**

**4<sup>th</sup> Floor, Legislative Office Building**

**Concord, NH 03301**

**Tel: (603) 271-3600**

**Fax: (603) 271-6689**

*Pam Smarling, Committee Researcher*  
*(603) 271-3387; Pam.Smarling@leg.state.nh.us*

To: Rep. David E. Cote, Chairman, House Election Law Committee

From: Pam Smarling, Committee Researcher  
House Committee Research

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "PS", written over the name "Pam Smarling" in the "From:" field.

Date: January 15, 2013

RE: HB 148, relative to electoral college electors.  
Background

---

**SUMMARY**

HB 148 adopts the interstate agreement to elect the president by popular vote. States adopting the agreement pledge to award all of their electoral votes to the presidential candidate who receives the greatest number of popular votes in the country.

Currently, between 2007 and 2011, eight states and the District of Columbia have adopted the interstate agreement. The states that have adopted it represent 132 electoral votes. Since states representing a majority of electoral votes (i.e. 270 votes) are needed in order for the agreement to take effect, states representing at least 138 more electoral votes are needed.

Legislation proposing that New Hampshire adopt the National Popular Vote interstate agreement was introduced in the House in 2008 and 2009. Neither of these proposals passed the House.

***Electoral College; US Constitution***

The electoral college was established by the United States Constitution and is used to indirectly elect the President of the United States. It consists of a total of 538 members – the number of senators and representative sent to Congress by each of the 50 states and three electors representing the District of Columbia.

Article II, section 1, clause 2 of the United States Constitution requires each state “to appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors” equal to the number of senators and representatives sent to Congress by the state.

Amendment XII requires the electors to meet in their respective states and specifies the procedure to be used to vote for the President and Vice-President by ballot and to send the results of the vote to the President of the United States Senate for counting.

Amendment XXIII allocates three electors to the District of Columbia.

Currently, all states select electors through a popular vote. In the early years, however, the state legislature selected electors in many states.

All 50 states and the District of Columbia use one of two methods for awarding their electoral votes:

#### *Winner-Take-All System*

In 48 states and the District of Columbia, all electoral votes are awarded to the candidate that receives the most popular votes in the state.

#### *District System*

Maine (4 electoral votes, 2 congressional districts) and Nebraska (5 electoral votes, 3 congressional districts) are currently the only states that use the district system to award electoral votes. One electoral vote is awarded to the presidential candidate who wins the popular in each congressional district, and the remaining two electoral votes are awarded to the candidates receiving the most votes statewide.

#### *National Popular Vote*

Since the 2000 presidential election, bills have been introduced in all 50 states to change the process for selecting electors. Initially, most Electoral College reform bills proposed switching to the district system. None of these bills passed. More recently efforts have focused on the National Popular Vote interstate agreement.

National Popular Vote is a nonprofit organization established in 2006. The organization was formed to promote the adoption of National Popular Vote legislation such as HB 148. Proponents of this legislation note that the winner take all system has allowed some candidates who did not win the greatest number of popular votes to be elected president of the United States. They also note that this system causes candidates to generally ignore states in which they have either a large lead or are behind by a large margin to concentrate on campaigning in a relative few battleground states.

### *Electoral College Legislation in New Hampshire*

Legislation to adopt the national popular vote interstate agreement was introduced in New Hampshire in 2008 and 2009. Both bills were introduced in the House, voted Inexpedient to Legislate by the House Election Law Committee and defeated in the House.

*HB 1454 (2008), relative to electoral college electors.*

House Election Law Committee report: Majority, Inexpedient to Legislate, vote 11-4  
Minority, Ought to Pass

*Rep. Janet F. Allen for the Majority of Election Law:* During the public hearing regarding this bill, the committee was given an example of what could happen if this bill became law. If all of the voters in New Hampshire voted for one particular candidate and a different candidate won in all of the other states, then all 4 of the New Hampshire electoral college votes would go to the other candidate. This example alone tells the voters in New Hampshire that their vote does not count and they may as well have not voted at all. This would be incredibly unfair to the voters of New Hampshire.

*Rep. James R. Splaine for the Minority of Election Law:* The minority believes that the electoral college is an anachronistic vestige which may have served the country well when we were without rapid transportation and immediate communication. It may have been a useful check on a population which had not proven itself responsible or resistant to spontaneous manipulation. But the existing system gives inordinate power to the smallest states which have vetoed attempts in the United States Senate to amend the Constitution more than 30 times. The status quo also disenfranchises voters in uncompetitive states which are ignored in the consultant driven 17-19 state strategies of the major parties. With the electoral college in place, we are guaranteed to end up with presidents who have received a minority of the popular vote. The minority agrees with top constitutional scholars whose research findings focus on the profoundly undemocratic nature of the electoral college. This bill would have been a good way to fix this undemocratic vestige.

House vote: Inexpedient to Legislate, voice vote

*HB 417(2009), relative to electoral college electors.*

House Election Law Committee report: Inexpedient to Legislate, vote 16-2

*Rep. Shawn N. Jasper for Election Law:* This bill would have New Hampshire enter into an interstate agreement, which would go into effect when states whose combined electoral college votes equal 270 adopt this agreement. At that time those states would cast their electoral college votes based on the national

popular vote. Under our federal system of government we are a sovereign state. It should not matter to us how other states vote. It is unlikely that the Union would have been formed if small states had been forced to have all decisions made by their proportional population. This is a slippery slope, what would be next? Would we be asked that the membership of U.S. Senate be based on population? Would we then be asked to have amendments to the U.S. Constitution adopted based on population? The theory is the same in all three cases; it is not fair that our say in national affairs is disproportional to our population. The majority of the committee believes that we should preserve the principles upon which the Union was created.

House vote: Inexpedient to Legislate, voice vote  
Motion to reconsider defeated, division vote 160-186

In addition, two resolutions introduced in 1993 and 2012 calling for an amendment to the US Constitution to abolish the electoral college were both introduced and defeated in the House [HCR 2 (1993) and HJR 20 (2012)] And two resolutions supporting the electoral college were adopted by wide margins in both the House and the Senate in 2001 and 2012. [HCR 10 (2001) and HCR 42 (2012)]

If I can provide further information on this, please let me know.

# Voting Sheets

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ELECTION LAW

EXECUTIVE SESSION on HB 148

**BILL TITLE:** relative to electoral college electors.

**DATE:** 2/14/13

**LOB ROOM:** 308

**Amendments:**

Sponsor: Rep. OLS Document #:

Sponsor: Rep. OLS Document #:

Sponsor: Rep. OLS Document #:

**Motions:** OTP, OTP/A, ITL, Retained (Please circle one.)

Moved by Rep. Knowles

Seconded by Rep. Jasper

Vote: 17-0 (Please attach record of roll call vote.)

**Motions:** OTP, OTP/A, ITL, Retained (Please circle one.)

Moved by Rep.

Seconded by Rep.

Vote: (Please attach record of roll call vote.)

**CONSENT CALENDAR VOTE: Yes**

(Vote to place on Consent Calendar must be unanimous.)

**Statement of Intent:** Refer to Committee Report

Respectfully submitted,

Rep. Kathleen Hoelzel, Clerk

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ELECTION LAW

EXECUTIVE SESSION on HB 148

BILL TITLE: relative to electoral college electors.

DATE:

2/14/13

LOB ROOM: 308

Amendments:

Sponsor: Rep.

OLS Document #:

Sponsor: Rep.

OLS Document #:

Sponsor: Rep.

OLS Document #:

Motions: OTP, OTP/A, ITL, Retained (Please circle one.)

Moved by Rep.

*Knowles*

Seconded by Rep.

*Jasper*

Vote:

(Please attach record of roll call vote.) 17-0

Motions: OTP, OTP/A, ITL, Retained (Please circle one.)

Moved by Rep.

Seconded by Rep.

Vote:

(Please attach record of roll call vote.)

CONSENT CALENDAR VOTE: {Type VOTE} *Yes*

(Vote to place on Consent Calendar must be unanimous.)

Statement of Intent: Refer to Committee Report

Respectfully submitted,

*Rep. Kathleen M. Hoelzel*

Rep. Kathleen Hoelzel, Clerk



STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE  
OFFICE OF THE HOUSE CLERK

1/10/2013 9:19:02 AM  
Roll Call Committee Registers  
Report

2013 SESSION

ELECTION LAW

Bill #: HB 148 Title: relative to electoral college electors

PH Date: 01/15/2013 Exec Session Date: 02/14/2013

Motion: Prepedient to Legislate Amendment #: \_\_\_\_\_

MEMBER	YEAS	NAYS
Cote, David E, Chairman	✓	
Knowles, Mary Ann , V Chairman	✓	
Perry, Robert J	✓	
Levesque, Melanie A	✓	
Gage, Ruth E	✓	
Moody, Marcia G	✓	
Richardson, Gary B	✓	
Connor, Evelyn M	✓	
Till, Mary L	✓	
Ward, Gerald W.R.	✓	
Jasper, Shawn N	✓	
Hoelzel, Kathleen M, Clerk	✓	
Comerford, Timothy P	✓	
Birdsell, Regina M	✓	
Souza, Kathleen F	✓	
Gray, James P	✓	
Marston, Dick	✓	
Sweeney, Joe	✓	
<b>TOTAL VOTE:</b>	<u>17</u>	<u>0</u>



# Committee Report

**CONSENT CALENDAR**

**February 19, 2013**

**HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

**REPORT OF COMMITTEE**

**The Committee on ELECTION LAW to which was referred HB148,**

**AN ACT relative to electoral college electors. Having considered the same, report the same with the following**

**Resolution: RESOLVED, That it is INEXPEDIENT TO LEGISLATE.**

**Rep. Mary Ann Knowles**

**FOR THE COMMITTEE**

## COMMITTEE REPORT

Committee:	<b>ELECTION LAW</b>
Bill Number:	<b>HB148</b>
Title:	<b>relative to electoral college electors.</b>
Date:	<b>February 19, 2013</b>
Consent Calendar:	<b>YES</b>
Recommendation:	<b>INEXPEDIENT TO LEGISLATE</b>

### STATEMENT OF INTENT

This bill would adopt the interstate agreement to elect the President of the United States by popular vote. States adopting the agreement pledge to award all of their electoral votes to the presidential candidate who receives the greatest number of popular votes in the country. The committee agreed that, under our federal system of government, we are a sovereign state, and our voters value their independence and want each of their votes to count. Entering into this compact could also lessen the importance of New Hampshire's esteemed First in the Nation Primary.

Vote 17-0.

Rep. Mary Ann Knowles  
FOR THE COMMITTEE

Original: House Clerk  
Cc: Committee Bill File

**CONSENT CALENDAR**

**ELECTION LAW**

**HB148**, relative to electoral college electors. **INEXPEDIENT TO LEGISLATE.**

Rep. Mary Ann Knowles for **ELECTION LAW**. This bill would adopt the interstate agreement to elect the President of the United States by popular vote. States adopting the agreement pledge to award all of their electoral votes to the presidential candidate who receives the greatest number of popular votes in the country. The committee agreed that, under our federal system of government, we are a sovereign state, and our voters value their independence and want each of their votes to count. Entering into this compact could also lessen the importance of New Hampshire's esteemed First in the Nation Primary.

**Vote 17-0.**

COMMITTEE REPORT

COMMITTEE: Election Law

BILL NUMBER: HB 148

TITLE: relative to electoral college

DATE: 02-14-2013 CONSENT CALENDAR: YES  NO

- OUGHT TO PASS
- OUGHT TO PASS W/ AMENDMENT
- INEXPEDIENT TO LEGISLATE
- INTERIM STUDY (Available only 2<sup>nd</sup> year of biennium)

Amendment No. _____
------------------------

STATEMENT OF INTENT:

This bill would adopt the interstate agreement to elect the President of the United States by popular vote. States adopting the agreement pledge to award all of their electoral votes to the presidential candidate who receives the greatest number of popular votes in the country. The committee agreed that, under our federal system of government, we are a sovereign state, and our voters value their independence and want each of their votes to count. Entering into this compact could also lessen the importance of New Hampshire's esteemed First in the Nation Primary.

COMMITTEE VOTE: 17-0

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

- Copy to Committee Bill File
- Use Another Report for Minority Report

Rep. Mary Ann Knowles  
For the Committee

HB 148

ITL

This bill would adopt the interstate agreement to elect the President of the United States by popular vote. States adopting the agreement pledge to award all of their electoral votes to the presidential candidate who receives the greatest number of popular votes in the country. The committee agreed that, under our federal system of government, we are a sovereign state, and our voters value their independence and want each of their votes to count. Entering into this compact could also lessen the importance of New Hampshire's esteemed First in the National Primary.

Rep. Mary Ann Knowles for the Committee

Handwritten signature or initials, possibly "OK" or "JD", written in black ink.