

know what the practical effect of all of this is. As I said earlier, Maine has had this system since the 1960s. And I have to admit to you, candidly, I can't remember whether it was 1963 or 1968, but in that time, in all of that time Maine has never, never divided its electoral votes. If you look at Nebraska's electoral history, in the last fifty some years you will also see that at least under the kind of system that we have now, Nebraska would have only had three different occasions on which that electoral vote may have divided. And I suggest to you that those were times that were unusual and that it was appropriate that the vote be divided. The two times starting in the 1940s, the two times back in the forties in which a vote would have been divided, if you will look at the figures on page 2, or no, sorry, page 4 of the packet that I handed out, clear at the end, page 4 of the figures, the last page in the packet, you'll see that in 1940 it was a Roosevelt-Willkie race, and Willkie won 57 percent of the state; Roosevelt, 42 percent. In the first, third, fourth and fifth district, Willkie won. In the second congressional district, at that time, Roosevelt got 55 percent of the vote, and Willkie got 44 percent, a fairly substantial margin. If you will look at 1944, you will see that again Roosevelt came in second, and Dewey won with 58 percent of the vote statewide. In the first district and third district, Dewey won by substantial margins, but in the second congressional district Roosevelt won with like a 3 percent margin. The only other race that would have been affected if this kind of system had been in effect would have been in 1964, and that's on page 2. And if you look, that was the Johnson-Goldwater race. Johnson won 52 percent statewide; Goldwater, 47. In the first district, Johnson won; in the second district, Johnson won, but in the third district Barry Goldwater won with 51 percent of the vote, again about a 3 percent margin. And I submit to you that if the electoral system that we have now had been in place then, those people in the third district in 1964, and in the second district in 1940 and 1944, would have had their voices heard. And I think that's what this is all about, letting people feel that they really are casting a vote for president and that their vote is going to count. And, frankly, that's what the argument was on the floor back in 1991, that it would be closer to the one person-one vote, it would make people feel that they made a difference and, secondly, it would encourage grassroots...

PRESIDENT ROBAK: One minute.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: ...activity. And I think if you'll look at