ELECTION SYSTEM REVIEWED

In our last editorial we expressed dissatisfaction with the Election Study Committee's attempts to rectify the evils of our present system. We believed that the proposed methods would not be better if the present preferential election methods were explained.

When voting under the regular preferential system, the voter places as many names as he would like on his ballot. The man in order of his preference, that is, he rates the candidates 1, 2, 3, and so on. The counting of the ballots consists of the separation of all the ballots according to the first place choices. The number of first place votes that each candidate has received is noted, and any candidate with a majority of the total ballots cast is elected.

If there is no candidate with a majority, the one with the lowest number of first place ballots has his ballots redistributed according to the second place choices listed. This procedure is repeated until a man has received a majority of the ballots cast. If this is not the case, the whole process is repeated until a candidate is elected.

There is more than one person to be elected, as in some of the committee elections, the complete preferential count is repeated for each man elected.

This system has shown two real disadvantages. One, the counting is complicated and entails a considerable length of time. Second, an organized majority of 51% can successfully elect all the candidates to office, with the remaining 49% of the voters being deprived of any representation.

The proposed amendment of the Elections Study Committee attempts to rectify the second of the disadvantages mentioned above. Under the proposed method, the regular preferential count would be carried out until a majority of the electees have been chosen in any one election. Then all the ballots which have been used in electing this majority are discarded, and the rest of the men to be elected are chosen from the remaining ballots. The stipulation is made, however, that the man elected in this manner must be chosen with at least 25% of the votes cast. If this cannot be done, all the ballots cast are used to select the remaining men.

This "preferential-proportional system" does not completely cure the "51% disadvantage," and it has been shown that under this procedure, a 51% minority would be able to exert almost as much control as a 75% majority. In fact the "preferential-proportional" system would seem to count certain ballots much more than others. How this would actually affect the elections is not a much more desirable situation than the "51" rule.

With enough restrictive clauses and amendments, the "preferential-proportional system" could be made into a democratic and representative system, however the added burden of these amendments would make the whole thing too complicated, too long and too slow.

The stumbles of the present system are due to the fact that the student body can not be made up of the whole student body. The system should be made to allow for this and the method should not be too complicated or confusing, because the students may not be able to vote a second time.

We cast our vote for John Little's system.

Professor Townsend's Secretary

By Marvin C. Grossman

...one of the most gorgeous secretaries roaming around the place. If you are in the basement looking for something, you will find the entrance to the building through the street, just ask her what time she will be there. She will actually open the door for you. She always greets you with a smile and never fails to get you what you need in a timely fashion.

She will also change the time on her watch for you if you need it. She is very helpful and always willing to help others.

She has a wonderful sense of humor and is never afraid to laugh at herself. She is a great asset to the group and we are all grateful for her presence.

We cast our vote for her.