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## HOW AN ISSUE BECOMES A BALLOT PROPOSAL

## Background

Historically, the phenomenon of "direct democracy" - voters casting ballots to amend statutes or the state constitution - has its roots in the populist movement of the turn of the twentieth century. Since 1898, when South Dakota adopted a statewide initiative and referendum capability, many states have incorporated mechanisms for direct citizen participation in lawmaking. Michigan provides more access to the ballot for its citizens than most states. Only 15 states, including Michigan, provide for all three of the tools for citizens to place proposals on the ballot: the initiative to propose changes to the state constitution, the initiative to propose legislation, and the power of citizens to invoke the referendum.

The mechanisms of the referendum and initiative, through which many proposals reach the ballot, have been part of Michigan law for many years. The Michigan Constitution of 1908 contained the right of initiative and the right of referendum (as a result of a 1913 amendment). The referendum used by the Legislature to submit any bill to a vote of the people and the right of the people to propose amendments to the constitution are also found in the 1908 constitution. The right of initiative is defined in the Constitution of the State of Michigan of 1963, as amended, as ". . . the power to propose laws and to enact and reject laws . . .", and the people's right of referendum is defined as ". . . the power to approve or reject laws enacted by the legislature . . .".

An issue can become a statewide ballot proposal as a result of any of the following actions:

- A citizen petition invoking the initiative relative to Michigan's statutes.
- A citizen petition invoking the referendum relative to Michigan's statutes.
- A citizen petition seeking to amend Michigan's constitution.
- Legislation enacted by the legislature which includes a provision that says the legislation cannot become law unless approved by a majority of voters.
- A measure adopted by the legislature seeking to amend the constitution.
- A constitutionally mandated provision which automatically places on the ballot each sixteenth year the question of a general revision of the constitution. This question appeared on the ballot in 1978, 1994, and 2010.
With the exception of the constitutionally mandated provision that automatically places the question of a general revision of the constitution before the electorate every 16 years, every ballot proposal is the result of either citizen or legislative action.


## Initiative

In order to exercise the right to initiate legislation, a citizen or group must secure, on petitions, the signatures of registered electors in an amount not less than eight percent of the total vote cast for all candidates for governor at the last gubernatorial election.

The Michigan Election Law, 1954 PA 116, as amended, establishes requirements and provisions that must be followed in order for a proposed piece of legislation to reach the ballot. These requirements include page and print size specifications, the full text of the proposed law to be printed on the petitions, and the manner in which they are to be circulated. Before they are circulated for signatures, all petitions to initiate legislation or amend the constitution must be filed with the Secretary of State to be made available to the public. Not less than ten days before the beginning of a session of the legislature, completed petitions to initiate legislation are filed with the Secretary of State and the Board of State Canvassers, which then must check validity and sufficiency of the signatures and make an official declaration of approval or disapproval at least two months before the election. The Elections Division of the Secretary of State recommends that petitions be filed at least 160 days prior to the general election to assure placement on the ballot, if required. The legislature has 40 days from the time it receives the petition to enact or reject the proposed law or to propose a different measure on the same question. If not enacted, the original initiative proposal and any different measure passed by the legislature must go before the voters as ballot proposals. A substitute passed by the legislature would be a separate proposal. Regarding situations where legislative and citizen-originated measures, or any proposals, are approved and conflict, the constitution provides:

If two or more measures approved by the electors at the same election conflict, that receiving the highest affirmative vote shall prevail.

If an initiated proposal is passed by a majority of those voting, the new law takes effect ten days after the date of the official declaration of the vote. A new initiated law thus passed cannot be vetoed by the governor. It can only be amended or repealed by a subsequent vote of the electors or by a three-fourths vote of the members in each chamber of the legislature. (Article 2, Section 9, Constitution of the State of Michigan of 1963, as amended.)

The method of initiative used in Michigan is sometimes called the indirect initiative because the measure is first submitted to the legislature rather than directly to the voters.

## Referendum

A referendum is also exercised through the gathering of signatures. The number of registered voters needed to invoke the referendum is five percent of the total vote cast for all candidates for governor at the last gubernatorial election. A referendum cannot be proposed to approve or reject a law that appropriates money for state institutions or to meet deficiencies in state funds. A referendum petition must be filed with the Secretary of State within 90 days of the final adjournment of the legislative session during which the law in question was enacted. As with the initiative, these petitions are filed with the Secretary of State and the Board of State Canvassers is responsible for ascertaining the validity and sufficiency of the signatures.

After the referendum is properly invoked, the law in question must be suspended until the next general election, at which time the law will appear before voters as a ballot proposal. A law approved through the referendum by a majority of the voters takes effect ten days after the date of the official declaration of the vote. Unlike laws approved as a result of the initiative, which require a three-fourths majority of each legislative chamber to be amended, a law approved under referendum may be amended using the normal legislative process. If the law is rejected, of course, it does not go into effect. (Article 2, Section 9, Constitution of the State of Michigan of 1963, as amended.)

## Constitutional Amendments

Citizen action, through the petition, can also be used to amend the constitution. In the case of proposed constitutional amendments, signatures of registered voters must equal at least 10 percent of the number of votes cast for all candidates in the last gubernatorial election in order for the matter to go before the electorate. As in the case of initiative and referendum, petitions seeking amendments to the state's constitution are filed with the Secretary of State, and the Board of State Canvassers is responsible for ascertaining the validity and sufficiency of the signatures. Petitions must be filed at least 120 days prior to the election. After the correct number of valid signatures are ascertained, the proposed amendment to the constitution is placed on the ballot at least 60 days prior to the election. Any proposal that is approved by a majority of those voting becomes part of the constitution and takes effect 45 days after the date of the election at which it was approved. (Article 12, Section 2, Constitution of the State of Michigan of 1963, as amended.)

## Legislative Action

Ballot proposals placed before the electorate as the result of legislative action are of three types: proposed amendments to the constitution (traditionally proposed as joint resolutions of the two legislative chambers), bills passed by the legislature and approved by the governor that stipulate that voter approval is necessary for the bill to become law, and questions pertaining to the state borrowing money for specific purposes.

Nothing in the constitution may be altered without the approval of the voters. Thus, any measure by the legislature to amend the constitution must be placed on the ballot. An amendment proposed by the legislature in the form of a joint resolution can be introduced into either the Senate or the House of Representatives. In order to become a ballot proposal, such a measure must be agreed to by a two-thirds majority of the members in each chamber. If passed by the legislature at least 60 days before the election, the measure is placed on the ballot at the next general or special election. If approved by a majority of those voting on the ballot proposal, the measure becomes part of the constitution 45 days after the date of the election at which it was approved. (Article 12, Section 1, Constitution of the State of Michigan of 1963, as amended.)

The legislature may, in effect, ask for voter approval of a bill. This may be done for any bill that has passed the legislature and has been approved by the governor, except one appropriating money. In order for a ballot proposal to go before the voters in this manner, the bill must contain a provision that the bill cannot become law unless it receives approval from a majority of those voting. (Article 4, Section 34, Constitution of the State of Michigan of 1963, as amended.)

Another manner in which a proposal goes before the people involves the state borrowing money for specific purposes. Through an act (or acts) by the legislature which is adopted by a two-thirds majority of the members in each chamber, the question of borrowing money may go before the electorate. The proposal must state the amount to be borrowed, the specific purpose to which the funds are to be devoted, and the method of repayment. (Article 9, Section 15, Constitution of the State of Michigan of 1963, as amended.)

## Ballot Proposal Language

A great deal of attention, and occasional controversy, is often focused on the actual ballot language of the proposals. The language that is printed on the ballots as "Proposal 14-1," "Proposal 14-2," etc. is often different than the wording of the actual amendment or law that is being considered. Obviously, the length of some measures and the technical language used to gain legal clarity prevent an entire measure from being reproduced on the ballot. The important task of summarizing each proposal into a yes or no question in less than 100 words (excluding the title) is the responsibility of the Board of State Canvassers. The wording that is finalized as the ballot proposal is often the result of many hours of discussion.

## Recent Ballot Proposals

Since the ratification by Michigan voters of the current constitution, the Constitution of 1963, there have been many significant changes in our state that have come about because of ballot proposals. Many elements of our everyday lives have resulted from this method of direct citizen impact. Things such as daylight savings time, the legal drinking age, the removal of sales tax on food and prescription drugs, the prohibition of nonreturnable beverage containers, the Vietnam era veterans bonus, tax limitations, school financing, and setting term limits for state elected officials. In all, there have been $\mathbf{7 8}$ proposed amendments to the Constitution of $\mathbf{1 9 6 3}$. Thirty-one of these have resulted from initiatory petitions, while 44 have been placed on the ballot by the legislature. Also included are three questions of calling a constitutional convention: in 1978, 1994, and 2010, which were all defeated. Of the 78 total proposed amendments to the constitution (including the question of a constitutional convention), 32 have been approved by the voters of Michigan.

There have been 13 occasions in which the initiative has brought a proposed law before the people for a vote under our present constitution. Seven of these proposals have been passed by the voters. Successful initiatives that have passed and become law have included daylight savings time in 1972, the prohibition of nonreturnable beverage containers in 1976, casino provisions in 1996, and the legalization of medical marihuana in 2010.

Twenty-four instances of the referendum bringing legislation to the electorate for approval or rejection have occurred since the Constitution of 1963 became effective on January 1, 1964. Eleven of these referenda were approved by the voters.

There have been seven instances of the legislature approving initiatives proposed by the citizens, which eliminated the need for the measures to go before voters. These citizen-initiated and legislature-approved acts were 1964 PA 2, 1987 PA 59, 1990 PA 211, 2004 PA 135, 2006 PA 325, 2013 PA 182, and 2014 PA 281.

## LAWS PROPOSED BY INITIATIVE PETITION AND SUBMITTED TO THE PEOPLE, 1964-2014

| Subject of Petition | Date of Election | Action | Vote |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | For | Against |
| New legislation to allow licensed physicians to perform abortions upon demand if period of gestation has not exceeded 20 weeks. | Nov. 1972 | Rejected | 1,270,416 | 1,958,265 |
| Repeal Act 6 of 1967, to permit the establishment of daylight saving time in Michigan. | Nov. 1972 | Adopted | 1,754,887 | 1,460,724 |
| New legislation to prohibit use of nonreturnable beverage containers; to require refundable cash deposits for returnable containers; and to provide penalties for violation of the law. | Nov. 1976 | Adopted ${ }^{1}$ | 2,160,398 | 1,227,254 |
| Amend section 33 of, and add section 33a to, Act 232 of 1953, to revise standards for grant of parole and to prohibit grant of parole for certain defined crimes until court-imposed minimum sentence is served. | Nov. 1978 | Adopted ${ }^{2}$ | 2,075,599 | 711,262 |
| Amend sections 3105, 3140, and 3204 of Act 236 of 1961, to prohibit a lender from using a "due on sale" clause in foreclosure proceedings on a mortgage or land contract unless security is impaired. | Nov. 1982 | Rejected | 1,344,463 | 1,445,897 |
| Amend title and sections 6 a and 6 b of Act 3 of 1939, to prohibit utility increases without full notice or hearing and to amend rate adjustment provisions. | Nov. 1982 | Adopted ${ }^{3}$ | 1,472,442 | 1,431,884 |
| New legislation calling for mutual, verifiable nuclear weapons freeze between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and requiring transmission of communication to United States government officials. | Nov. 1982 | Adopted ${ }^{4}$ | 1,585,809 | 1,216,172 |
| Amendments to auto insurance statutes. | Nov. 1992 | Rejected | 1,482,577 | 2,480,032 |
| Amend the Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Act to limit bear hunting season and prohibit the use of bait and dogs to hunt bear. | Nov. 1996 | Rejected | 1,379,340 | 2,225,675 |
| New legislation to permit casino gaming in qualified cities. | Nov. 1996 | Adopted ${ }^{5}$ | 1,878,542 | 1,768,156 |
| Amendatory legislation to legalize the prescription of a legal dose of medication to terminally ill, competent, informed adults in order to commit suicide. | Nov. 1998 | Rejected | 859,381 | 2,116,154 |
| Amend School Aid Act to set mandatory funding levels. | Nov. 2006 | Rejected | 1,366,355 | 2,259,247 |
| New legislation, the Medical Marihuana Act. | Nov. 2008 | Adopted ${ }^{6}$ | 3,006,820 | 1,790,889 |

[^0]|  | Date |  | Vote |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Subject of Referendum | Election | Action | For | Against |

Act 240 of 1964, to amend sections 685, 696, 706, $737,775,782,786,803$, and 804 of Act 116 of 1954, to institute use of Massachusetts ballot in Michigan to prevent straight party ticket voting. ${ }^{1}$ (Referendum Petition)

Act 6 of 1967, to permit establishment of daylight saving time in Michigan. ${ }^{1}$ (Referendum Petition) . .
Act 76 of 1968 , to authorize issuance of bonds for planning, acquisition, and construction of facilities for prevention and abatement of water pollution and for loans and grants to municipalities. ${ }^{2}$ (Legislative Action)

Act 257 of 1968 , to authorize issuance of bonds to provide funding for public recreational facilities and programs and for loans and grants to municipalities. ${ }^{2}$ (Legislative Action)
Act 304 of 1969 , to authorize issuance of bonds for urban redevelopment to increase the supply of lowincome housing and for loans and grants to municipalities and redevelopment corporations. ${ }^{2}$ (Legislative Action)
Act 231 of 1972, to authorize issuance of bonds to provide funding for bonus payments and educational benefits to Vietnam and other veterans. ${ }^{2}$ (Legislative Action)

Act 106 of 1974 , to authorize issuance of bonds to provide funding for bonus payments to Vietnam and other veterans. ${ }^{2}$ (Legislative Action).

Act 245 of 1974 , to authorize issuance of bonds to provide funding to plan, acquire, construct, and equip transportation systems and to make loans and grants for that purpose. ${ }^{2}$ (Legislative Action)
Act 250 of 1980, to amend sections 51 and 475 of Act 281 of 1976, to increase the state income tax $0.1 \%$ for 5 years to fund the construction of regional correctional facilities, the demolition of the Michigan Reformatory, and other state and local correctional projects. ${ }^{6}$ (Legislative Action)
Act 212 of 1982, to amend sections 6 a and 6 b of Act 3 of 1939, to prohibit certain utility rate adjustment clauses, utility rate increases without notice and hearing, and acceptance of employment with any utility for 2 years by member of 81st Legislature. ${ }^{6}$ (Legislative Action)
Act 59 of 1987 , to prohibit use of public funds for the abortion of a recipient of welfare benefits unless the abortion is necessary to save the life of the mother. ${ }^{1}$ (Referendum Petition)
Act 326 of 1988 , to authorize issuance of bonds to finance environmental protection programs that would clean up environmental contamination sites and address related problems. ${ }^{2}$ (Legislative Action)
Act 327 of 1988 to authorize issuance of bonds to finance state and local public recreation projects. ${ }^{2}$ (Legislative Action)
Act 143 of 1993, to reduce auto insurance rates; place limits on personal injury benefits, fees paid to health care providers, and right to sue; and allow rate reduction for accident-free driving. (Referendum Petition)

Act 118 of 1994, to amend certain sections of Michigan Bingo Act. (Referendum Petition)
Nov. 1964 Rejected 795,546 1,515,875

Nov. 1968 Adopted ${ }^{3}$ 1,906,385 796,079
Nov. $1968 \quad$ Adopted $^{4} \quad 1,384,254 \quad 1,235,681$
Nov. 1970 Rejected 921,482 1,388,737
Nov. 1972 Rejected 1,490,968 1,603,203
Nov. 1974 Adopted ${ }^{5} \quad 1,668,641 \quad$ 700,041
Nov. 1974 Rejected 963,576 1,319,586
Nov. 1980 Rejected 1,288,999 2,202,042

Nov. $1982 \quad$ Adopted $^{7} \quad 1,670,381 \quad 1,131,990$

Nov. $1988 \quad$ Adopted $^{8} \quad 1,959,727 \quad 1,486,371$

Nov. $1988 \quad$ Adopted $^{9} \quad 2,528,109 \quad 774,451$

Nov. 1988 Adopted ${ }^{10} \quad 2,055,290 \quad 1,206,465$

Nov. 1994 Rejected 1,165,732 1,812,526
Nov. 1996 Rejected 1,511,063 1,936,198

REFERENDA ON LEGISLATION ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE, 1964-2014 (Cont.)

| Subject of Referendum | Date of Election | Action | Vote |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | For | Against |
| Act 377 of 1996, an amendment regarding the management of Michigan's wildlife populations. (Legislative Action) | Nov. 1996 | Adopted ${ }^{11}$ | 2,413,730 | 1,099,262 |
| Act 284 of 1998, to authorize bonds for environmental and natural resources protection programs. (Legislative Action) | Nov. 1998 | Adopted ${ }^{12}$ | 1,821,006 | 1,081,988 |
| Act 269 of 2001, to amend certain sections of Michigan election law. (Referendum Petition) | Nov. 2002 | Rejected | 1,199,236 | 1,775,043 |
| Act 396 of 2002, to authorize bonds for sewage treatment works projects, storm water projects and water pollution projects. ${ }^{2}$ (Legislative Action) | Nov. 2002 | Adopted ${ }^{13}$ | 1,774,053 | 1,172,612 |
| Act 160 of 2004, to allow hunting season for mourning doves. | Nov. 2006 | Rejected | 1,137,379 | 2,534,680 |
| Act 4 of 2011, to authorize the governor to appoint an emergency manager to act in place of local government officials. | Nov. 2012 | Rejected | 2,130,354 | 2,370,601 |
| Act 80 of 2014 , to allocate use tax revenue for various local purposes. | Aug. 2014 | Adopted ${ }^{14}$ | 863,459 | 382,770 |
| Act 520 of 2012, to designate wolf as game for hunting purposes and authorize the first wolf hunting season. | Nov. 2014 | Rejected | 1,318,080 | 1,606,328 |
| Act 21 of 2013, to allow the Natural Resources Commission to designate certain animals as game for hunting purposes and establish the first hunting season for game animals without legislative action. | Nov. 2014 | Rejected | 1,051,426 | 1,856,603 |

[^1]
## REFERENDA ON LEGISLATION ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE, 1964-2014 (Cont.)

[^2]
## Please see page 96 for proposed consitutional amendments placed on the ballot.

# State Election Results for Selected Positions 

U.S. Congress<br>2014<br>U.S. Senate<br>2014<br>Governor<br>2014

Secretary of State
2014
Attorney General
2014
State Senate
2014
State House
2014

## U.S. CONGRESS GENERAL ELECTION RESULTS 2014

Status of incumbents seeking re-election in the primary and general elections is noted.
$\left.\begin{array}{clll}\hline \begin{array}{c}\text { Congressional } \\ \text { District } \\ \text { Number }\end{array} & \text { Democratic Candidate } & \text { Republican Candidate } & \text { Other General Election Candidates }\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c}\text { Primary Candidates Currently or } \\ \text { Formerly Holding State Elected office }\end{array}\right]$

## U.S. CONGRESS GENERAL ELECTION RESULTS 2014 (Cont.)

Bold - winner of general election

- former member of the State Legislature
$\pi$ former U.S. Congress member
$\ddagger$ - current member of State Legislature
$\dagger$ incumbent
GRN - Green Party
- Lib - Libertarian Party

U UST - U.S. Tax Payers Party
NPA - no party affiliation
Number in parenthesis total votes cast for candidate in November election. Source: http://miboecfr.nictusa.com/election/results/14GEN/

## U.S. SENATE GENERAL ELECTION RESULTS 2014

Status of incumbent seeking re-election in the primary and general elections is noted.

| Democratic Candidate | Republican Candidate | Other General Election Candidates |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Gary C. Peters* (1,704,936) | Terri Lynn Land (1,290,199) | Jim Fulner - Lib (62,897), <br> Richard Matkin - UST (37,529), <br> Chris Wahmhoff - GRN (26,137) |

Bold - winner of general election

*     - former member of the State Legislature

GRN - Green Party
Lib - Libertarian Party
UST - U.S. Tax Payers Party
Number in parenthesis total votes cast for candidate in November election. Source: http://miboecfr.nictusa.com/election/results/14GEN/

GENERAL ELECTION RESULTS FOR GOVERNOR 2014

| Democratic Candidate | Republican Candidate | Other General Election Candidates |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Mark Schauer* | Rick Snyder $\dagger$ | Mary Buzuma - Lib (35,723), |
| $(1,479,057)$ | $(1,607,399)$ | Mark McFarlin - UST (19,368), |
|  |  | Paul Homeniuk - GRN (14,934) |

GENERAL ELECTION RESULTS FOR SECRETARY OF STATE 2014

| Democratic Candidate | Republican Candidate | Other General Election Candidates |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Godfrey Dillard | Ruth Johnson $\dagger$ <br> $(1,323,004)$ | Jason Lewis - Lib (61,112), <br> Robert Gale - UST (34,447), |
|  |  | Jason Gatties - NLP (13,185) |

GENERAL ELECTION RESULTS FOR ATTORNEY GENERAL 2014

| Democratic Candidate | Republican Candidate | Other General Election Candidates |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Mark Totten | Bill Schuette $\dagger$ | Justin Altman - Lib $(57,345)$, |
| $(1,359,839)$ | $(1,603,471)$ | Gerald VanSickle - UST $(30,762)$, |
|  |  | John LaPietra - GRN $(25,747)$ |

*     - former member of the State Legislature
$\dagger$ incumbent
GRN - Green Party
Lib - Libertarian Party
UST - U.S. Tax Payers Party
NPA - no party affiliation
NLP - Natural Law Party
Number in parenthesis total votes cast for candidate in November election. Source: http://miboecfr.nictusa.com/election/results/14GEN/

STATE SENATE GENERAL ELECTION RESULTS 2014
Status of incumbents seeking re-election in the primary and general elections is noted.

| Senate District Number | Democratic Candidate | Republican Candidate | Other General Election Candidates | Primary Candidates Currently or Formerly Holding State Elected Office |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Coleman Young, II $\dagger(48,510)$ | Barry Berk ( 19,021 ) |  |  |
| 2 | Bert Johnson $\dagger(41,452)$ | Mark Price ( 14,354 ) | Jeffrey Hall - NPA ( 2,088 ) | John Olumba $\ddagger$ |
| 3 | Morris W. Hood, III $\dagger(45,546)$ | Matthew Keller (11,086) |  |  |
| 4 | Virgil Smith $\dagger(49,970)$ | Keith Franklin ( 11,047 ) |  | Rashida Tlaib $\ddagger$ |
| 5 | David Knezek $\ddagger(59,680)$ | Jennifer Rynicki (13,286) |  | Shanelle Jackson* <br> David Nathan $\ddagger$ <br> Thomas Stallworth $\ddagger$ |
| 6 | Hoon-Yung Hopgood $\dagger(42,835)$ | Darrell McNeill ( 25,919 ) |  |  |
| 7 | Dian Slavens $\ddagger(47,110)$ | Patrick Colbeck $\dagger(52,567)$ |  |  |
| 8 | Christine Bell $(34,279)$ | Jack Brandenburg $\dagger(55,304)$ |  |  |
| 9 | Steven M. Bieda $\dagger(48,146)$ | Hawke Francassa (22,699) |  |  |
| 10 | Kenneth Jenkins ( 30,657 ) | Tory Rocca $\dagger(51,465)$ |  |  |
| 11 | Vincent Gregory $\dagger(70,862)$ | Boris Tuman ( 22,846 ) | James Young - Lib ( 2,994 ) | Vicki Barnett $\ddagger$ Ellen Lipton $\ddagger$ |
| 12 | Paul Secrest $(37,067)$ | $\boldsymbol{J i m}$ Marleau $\dagger(50,117)$ |  |  |
| 13 | Cyndi Peltonen (42,892) | Marty Knollenberg* (59,570) |  | Chuck Moss* Rocky Raczkowski* |
| 14 | Bobbie Walton $(34,502)$ | David Robertson $\dagger(46,826)$ |  |  |
| 15 | Michael Smith ( 37,489 ) | Mike Kowall $\dagger(52,797)$ |  |  |
| 16 | Kevin Commet ( 26,823 ) | Mike Shirkey $\ddagger(41,667)$ |  |  |
| 17 | Doug Spade* ( 34,706 ) | Dale Zorn $\ddagger(38,442)$ | Jeff Andring - UST ( 2,039 ) |  |
| 18 | Rebekah Warren $\dagger(61,421)$ | Terry Linden ( 23,745 ) |  |  |
| 19 | Greg Grieves ( 27,951 ) | Mike Nofs $\dagger(44,798)$ |  |  |
| 20 | Sean McCann $\ddagger(36,584)$ | Margaret 0'Brien $\ddagger(36,645)$ | Lorence Wenke* - Lib (7,171) |  |

STATE SENATE GENERAL ELECTION RESULTS 2014 (Cont.)

| Senate <br> District <br> Number | Democratic Candidate | Republican Candidate | Other General Election Candidates | Primary Candidates Currently or Formerly Holding State Elected Office |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 21 | Bette Pierman $(25,090)$ | John Proos $\dagger(45,586)$ |  |  |
| 22 | Shari Pollesch ( 37,709 ) | Joe Hune $\dagger(58,380)$ | Jeff Wood - Lib (3,108) |  |
| 23 | Curtis Hertel Jr. $(50,824)$ | Craig Whitehead ( 26,076 ) |  |  |
| 24 | Dawn Levey ( 42,776 ) | Rick Jones $\dagger(55,332)$ |  |  |
| 25 | Terry Brown $\ddagger(36,832)$ | Phillip Pavlov $\dagger(46,553)$ |  |  |
| 26 | Jim Walters ( 26,782 ) | Tonya Schuitmaker $\dagger(47,244)$ | William Wenzel - Lib (2,944) |  |
| 27 | $\boldsymbol{J i m}$ Ananich $\dagger(51,291)$ | Brandt Gerics $(15,062)$ |  |  |
| 28 | Deb Havens ( 25,131 ) | Peter MacGregor $\ddagger(53,221)$ | Ted Gerrard - UST ( 2,115 ) | Kevin Green* |
| 29 | Lance Penny ( 34,278 ) | Dave Hildenbrand $\dagger(47,200)$ |  |  |
| 30 | Sarah Howard ( 24,940 ) | Arlan Meekhof $\dagger(62,338)$ |  |  |
| 31 | Ron Mindykowski $(38,086)$ | Mike Green $\dagger(45,699)$ |  | Kevin Daley $\ddagger$ |
| 32 | Stacy Erwin Oakes $\ddagger(41,539)$ | Ken Horn* (49,452) |  |  |
| 33 | Fred Sprague ( 27,235 ) | Judy Emmons $\dagger(36,420)$ |  |  |
| 34 | Cathy Forbes $(31,246)$ | Goeff Hansen $\dagger(39,129)$ |  |  |
| 35 | Glenn Lottie ( 34,872 ) | Darwin Booher $\dagger(51,299)$ |  |  |
| 36 | Joe Lukasiewicz ( 32,788 ) | Jim Stamas $\ddagger(51,849)$ |  |  |
| 37 | Phil Bellfy ( 35,031 ) | Wayne Schmidt $\ddagger(54,981)$ |  | Greg MacMaster $\ddagger$ |
| 38 | Christopher Germain (31,277) | Tom Casperson $\dagger(50,690)$ |  |  |
| Bold - winner of * - former mem $\ddagger$ - current mem $\dagger$ incumbent GRN - Green Pa Lib - Libertarian UST - U.S. Tax NPA - no party Number in pare | general election <br> er of the State Legislature <br> er of State House of Representatives <br> ty <br> Party <br> ayers Party <br> ffiliation <br> thesis total votes cast for candidate in No | lection. Source: http://miboecfr.nictusa | /election/results/14GEN/ |  |

## STATE REPRESENTATIVE GENERAL ELECTION RESULTS 2014

Status of incumbents seeking re-election in the primary and general elections is noted.
$\left.\begin{array}{clll}\hline \begin{array}{c}\text { House } \\ \text { District } \\ \text { Number }\end{array} & \text { Democratic Candidate } & \text { Republican Candidate } & \text { other General Election Candidates }\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c}\text { Primary Candidates Currently or } \\ \text { Formerly Holding State Elected office }\end{array}\right]$


| House District Number | Democratic Candidate | Republican Candidate | Other General Election Candidates | Primary Candidates Currently or Formerly Holding State Elected Office |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 24 | Philip Kurczewski $(10,893)$ | Anthony G. Forlini $\dagger(16,358)$ | Daryl Smith - UST (690) |  |
| 25 | Henry Yanez $\dagger(14,974)$ | Nick Hawatmeh ( 13,026 ) |  |  |
| 26 | $\boldsymbol{J i m}$ Townsend $\dagger(17,755)$ | Greg Dildilian ( 11,377 ) |  |  |
| 27 | Robert Wittenberg (23,756) | Michael Ryan (7,671) |  |  |
| 28 | Derek Miller ( 13,363 ) | Beth Foster ( 7,425 ) |  |  |
| 29 | Tim Greimel $\dagger(15,042)$ | David Lonier ( 5,380 ) |  |  |
| 30 | Bo Karpinsky ( 10,455 ) | Jeff Farrington $\dagger(12,654)$ |  |  |
| 31 | Marilyn Lane $\dagger(15,769)$ | Phil Rode ( 10,054 ) |  |  |
| 32 | Pamela Kraft ( 9,915 ) | Andrea LaFontaine $\dagger(16,218)$ |  |  |
| 33 | Joe Ruffin ( 9,398 ) | Ken Goike $\dagger(18,148)$ |  |  |
| 34 | Sheldon Neeley (17,124) | Bruce Rogers (1,670) |  |  |
| 35 | Jeremy Moss (31,655) | Robert Brim $(6,473)$ |  |  |
| 36 | Robert Murphy $(8,966)$ | Peter Lucido (20,847) |  |  |
| 37 | Christine Greig (19,148) | Richard Lerner $(14,359)$ |  |  |
| 38 | Jasper Catanzaro (11,508) | Kathy Crawford (19,234) |  |  |
| 39 | Sandy Colvin ( 15,300 ) | Klint Kesto $\dagger$ ( 16,740 ) |  |  |
| 40 | Mary Belden $(17,408)$ | Mike McCready $\dagger(23,680)$ |  |  |
| 41 | Mary Kerwin $(14,589)$ | Martin Howrylak $\dagger(18,371)$ |  |  |
| 42 | Timothy Johnson (12,547) | Lana Theis ( 23,477$)$ |  |  |
| 43 | Dennis Ritter ( 13,379 ) | Jim Tedder $(18,662)$ |  |  |
| 44 | Mark Venie ( 10,362 ) | Jim Runestad ( 21,838 ) |  |  |
| 45 | Joanna VanRaaphorst (14,336) | Michael Webber (18,369) |  |  |
| 46 | David Lillis (9,597) | Bradford C. Jacobsen $\dagger(21,513)$ |  |  |
| 47 | Jordan Genso (8,086) | Henry Vaupel (20,998) | Rodger Young - Lib (1,300) |  |


| House District Number | Democratic Candidate | Republican Candidate | Other General Election Candidates | Primary Candidates Currently or Formerly Holding State Elected Office |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 48 | Pam Faris $\dagger(17,631)$ | Stephanie Stikovich ( 10,656 ) |  |  |
| 49 | Phil Phelps $\dagger(18,211)$ | Lu Penton (6,524) |  |  |
| 50 | Charles Smiley $\dagger(17,018)$ | Craig Withers (11,949) |  |  |
| 51 | Ken Thomas ( 14,111 ) | Joseph Graves $\dagger(19,429)$ |  |  |
| 52 | Gretchen Driskell $\dagger(20,849)$ | John Hochstetler ( 16,265 ) |  |  |
| 53 | Jeff Irwin $\dagger(21,004)$ | John Spisak (4,504) |  |  |
| 54 | David Rutledge $\dagger(18,610)$ | Ed Moore ( 6,092 ) |  |  |
| 55 | Adam F. Zemke $\dagger(19,090)$ | Leonard Burk (9,028) |  |  |
| 56 | Tom Redmond (12,726) | Jason Sheppard (13,596) | Al Bain - UST (697) |  |
| 57 | Sharon Wimple ( 10,933 ) | Nancy E. Jenkins $\dagger(15,422)$ |  |  |
| 58 | Amaryllis Thomas (6,786) | Eric Leutheuser ( 17,017 ) |  |  |
| 59 | Mike Moroz (8,572) | Aaron Miller (14,140) |  |  |
| 60 | Jon Hoadley ( 15,513 ) | Mike Perrin $(6,611)$ |  |  |
| 61 | John Fisher ( 14,148 ) | Brandt Iden $(16,016)$ | Michael Stampfler - Lib (2,941) |  |
| 62 | Andy Helmboldt (11,336) | John Bizon (11,875) |  |  |
| 63 | Bill Farmer $(13,023)$ | David Maturen ( 16,718 ) |  |  |
| 64 | Brenda Pilgrim ( 9,167 ) | Earl Poleski $\dagger(14,439)$ |  |  |
| 65 | Bonnie Johnson $(11,077)$ | Brett Roberts ( 15,955 ) | Ronald Muszynski - Lib (971) |  |
| 66 | Annie Brown (11,646) | Aric Nesbitt $\dagger(15,753)$ |  |  |
| 67 | Tom Cochran $\dagger$ ( 16,976 ) | John Hayhoe ( 14,281 ) |  |  |
| 68 | Andy Schor $\dagger(19,602)$ | Rob Secaur ( 5,884 ) |  |  |
| 69 | Samir Singh $\dagger(18,476)$ | Frank Lambert (8,759) |  |  |
| 70 | James Hoisington (8,283) | Rick Outman $\dagger(13,376)$ |  |  |
| 71 | Theresa Abed $\dagger(17,612)$ | Tom Barrett (17,760) |  |  |

$\left.\begin{array}{clll}\hline \begin{array}{c}\text { House } \\ \text { District } \\ \text { Number }\end{array} & \text { Democratic Candidate } & \text { Republican Candidate } & \text { Other General Election Candidates }\end{array} \begin{array}{c}\text { Primary Candidates Currently or } \\ \text { Formerly Holding State Elected Office }\end{array}\right]$

PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS

| Year | Number Voting ${ }^{1}$ | Number Registered ${ }^{2}$ | Voting Age Population (VAP) ${ }^{3}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Turnout } \\ & \text { (\% of VAP) } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1948 | 2,109,609 | Not Available | 4,041,000 | 52.2 |
| 1952 | 2,798,592 | Not Available | 4,193,000 | 66.7 |
| 1956 | 3,080,468 | 3,128,573 | 4,538,000 | 67.9 |
| 1960 | 3,318,097 | 3,454,804 | 4,564,000 | 72.7 |
| 1964 | 3,203,102 | 3,351,730 | 4,658,000 | 68.8 |
| 1968 | 3,306,250 | 4,022,378 | 4,953,000 | 66.8 |
| 1972 | 3,490,325 | 4,762,764 ${ }^{4}$ | 5,874,000 ${ }^{5}$ | 59.4 |
| 1976 | 3,722,384 | 5,202,379 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 6,268,000 | 59.4 |
| 1980 | 3,978,647 | 5,725,713 | 6,510,000 | 61.1 |
| 1984 | 3,884,854 | 5,888,808 | 6,551,000 | 59.3 |
| 1988 | 3,745,751 | 5,952,513 | 6,774,000 | 55.3 |
| 1992 | 4,341,909 | 6,147,083 | 6,947,000 | 62.5 |
| 1996 | 3,912,261 | 6,677,079 ${ }^{\text {6 }}$ | 7,177,000 | 54.5 |
| 2000 | 4,279,299 | 6,859,332 | 7,358,000 | 58.2 |
| 2004 | 4,875,692 | 7,164,047 | 7,541,000 | 64.7 |
| 2008 | 5,039,080 | 7,470,764 | 7,613,000 | 66.2 |
| 2012 | 4,780,701 | 7,454,553 | 7,616,490 | 63.0 |

GUBERNATORIAL ELECTIONS

| Year | Number <br> Voting $^{\mathbf{1}}$ | Number <br> Registered $^{2}$ | Voting Age Population <br> $(\text { VAP })^{\mathbf{3}}$ | Turnout <br> $(\%$ of VAP) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1950 | $1,879,382$ | Not Available | $4,137,000$ | 45.4 |
| 1954 | $2,187,027$ | Not Available | $4,342,000$ | 50.4 |
| 1958 | $2,312,184$ | $3,489,626$ | $4,623,000$ | 50.0 |
| 1962 | $2,764,839$ | $3,710,798$ | $4,605,000$ | 60.0 |
| 1966 | $2,461,909$ | $3,613,463$ | $4,718,000$ | 52.2 |
| 1970 | $2,656,162$ | $3,969,807$ | $5,148,000$ | 51.6 |
| 1974 | $2,657,017$ | $4,785,689$ | $6,037,000$ | 44.0 |
| 1978 | $2,984,829$ | $5,230,345$ | $6,405,000$ | 46.6 |
| 1982 | $3,135,978$ | $5,624,573$ | $6,554,000$ | 47.8 |
| 1986 | $2,468,009$ | $5,790,753$ | $6,675,000$ | 37.0 |
| 1990 | $2,641,649$ | $5,892,001^{8}$ | $6,851,000$ | 38.6 |
| 1994 | $3,177,740$ | $6,207,662$ | $6,983,000$ | 45.5 |
| 1998 | $3,143,432$ | $6,300,000^{9}$ | $7,227,000$ | 43.5 |
| 2002 | $3,219,864$ | $6,797,293$ | $7,400,000$ | 43.5 |
| 2006 | $3,852,008$ | $7,180,778$ | $7,597,000$ | 50.7 |
| 2010 | $3,268,217$ | $7,276,237$ | $7,620,000$ | 42.9 |
| 2014 | $3,188,956$ | $7,446,280$ | $7,660,000$ |  |

[^3]SUMMARY OF VOTE FOR GOVERNOR, 1835-2014

| Year | Name | Vote | Year | Name | Vote |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1835 | Mason, Democrat | 7,558 | 1860 | Blair, Republican | 87,806 |
|  | Biddle, Whig | 814 |  | Barry, Democrat | 67,221 |
|  | Scattering . | 94 |  | Scattering. | 27 |
|  | Mason's majority . | 6,744 |  | Blair's majority | 20,585 |
| 1837 | Mason, Democrat | 15,314 | 1862 | Blair, Republican | 68,716 |
|  | Trowbridge, Whig | 14,800 |  | Stout, Union | 62,102 |
|  | Scattering. . . . . | 544 |  | Scattering. | 40 |
|  | Mason's majority | 514 |  | Blair's majority | 6,614 |
| 1839 | Woodbridge, Whig | 18,195 | $1864{ }^{2}$ | Crapo, Republican | 81,744 |
|  | Farnsworth, Democrat | 17,037 |  | Fenton, Democrat | 71,301 |
|  | Scattering. | 55 |  | Scattering. | 18 |
|  | Woodbridge's majority. | 1,158 |  | Crapo's majority | 10,443 |
| 1841 | Barry, Democrat | 20,993 | 1866 | Crapo, Republican | 96,746 |
|  | Fuller, Whig. . | 15,439 |  | Williams, Democrat | 67,708 |
|  | Fitch, Liberty Party | 1,223 |  | Scattering. . . . . . . | 146 |
|  | Scattering. | 68 |  | Crapo's majority | 29,038 |
|  | Barry's plurality | 5,554 | 1868 | Baldwin, Republica |  |
| 1843 | Barry, Democrat | 21,392 |  | Moore, Democrat . . | 97,290 |
|  | Pitcher, Whig | 14,899 |  | Scattering. | 705 |
|  | Birney, Liberty Party . | 2,776 |  | Baldwin's majority | 30,761 |
|  | Scattering. | 74 |  |  |  |
|  | Barry's plurality | 6,493 | 1870 | Baldwin, Republican | 100,176 |
|  |  |  |  | Comstock, Democrat | 83,391 |
| 1845 | Felch, Democrat |  |  | Fish, Prohibition | 2,710 |
|  | Vickery, Whig | $16,316$ |  | Scattering. | 230 |
|  | Birney, Liberty Party | 3,023 |  | Baldwin's plurality | 16,785 |
|  | Scattering. | 127 |  |  |  |
|  | Felch's plurality | 3,807 | 1872 | Bagley, Republican. Blair, Liberal | $137,602$ |
| 1847 | Ransom, Democrat | 24,639 |  | Ferry, Straight Democrat | 2,720 |
|  | Edmunds, Whig | 18,990 |  | Fish, Prohibition. . . . | 1,231 |
|  | Gurney, Liberty Party | 2,585 |  | Scattering. | 39 |
|  | Scattering | 145 |  | Bagley's plurality | 56,644 |
|  | Ransom's plurality | 5,649 | 1874 | Bagley, Republican |  |
| 1849 | Barry, Democrat | 27,837 |  | Chamberlain, Democrat | 105,550 |
|  | Littlejohn, Whig and Free Soil . | 23,540 |  | Carpenter, Prohibition | 3,937 |
|  | Scattering. . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 192 |  | Scattering. . . . . . . . | 417 |
|  | Barry's majority | 4,297 |  | Bagley's plurality | 5,969 |
| $1851^{1}$ |  | 23,827 | 1876 |  | 165,926 |
|  | Gidley, Whig | 16,901 |  | Webber, Democrat | 142,492 |
|  | Scattering. . | 156 |  | Sparks, Greenback | 8,297 |
|  | McClelland's majority | 6,926 |  | Croswell's plurality | 23,434 |
| $1852^{1}$ | McClelland, Democrat |  | 1878 | Croswell, Republican | 126,280 |
|  | Chandler, Whig .... | 34,660 |  | Barnes, Democrat. | 78,503 |
|  | Christiancy, Free Soil | 5,850 |  | Smith, Greenback . | 73,313 |
|  | Scattering. . . . . . . . | -68 |  | Snyder, Prohibition Scattering. . . . | 3,469 1,200 |
|  | McClelland's plurality | 8,138 |  | Croswell's plurality | 47,777 |
| 1854 | Bingham, Republican | 43,652 | 1880 | Jerome, Republican | 178,944 |
|  | Barry, Democrat. . | 38,675 |  | Holloway, Democrat | 137,671 |
|  | Scattering. | 39 |  | Woodman, Greenback | 31,085 |
|  | Bingham's majority | 4,977 |  | McKeever, Prohibition | 1,114 |
| 1856 |  |  |  | Quick, Am. Labor. | 220 |
|  | Bingham, Republican | 71,402 |  | Scattering. . . . . . | 134 |
|  | Felch, Democrat | 54,085 |  | Jerome's plurality | 41,273 |
|  | Scattering . . . . | 71 |  |  |  |
|  | Bingham's majority | 17,317 | 1882 | Begole, Fusionist | 154,269 |
|  | Wisner, Republican | 65,202 |  | Jerome, Republican ... Sagendorph, Prohibition | 149,697 5,854 |
| 1858 | Stuart, Democrat . | 56,067 |  | May, National . . . . . . | 2,006 |
|  | Scattering. . | 146 |  | Foote. | 343 |
|  | Wisner's majority . | 9,135 |  | Begole's plurality | 4,572 |

## SUMMARY OF VOTE FOR GOVERNOR (Cont.)

| Year | Name | Vote | Year | Name | Vote |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1884 | Alger, Republican | 190,840 | 1902 | Bliss, Republican | 211,261 |
|  | Begole, Fusionist | 186,887 |  | Durand, Democrat | 174,077 |
|  | Preston, Prohibition | 22,207 |  | Westerman, Prohibition | 11,326 |
|  | Miller, Butler Greenback | 364 |  | Walter, Socialist | 4,271 |
|  | Scattering . . . . . . . . . . | 50 |  | Cowles, Socialist Labor | 1,282 |
|  | Alger's plurality | 3,953 |  | Scattering | 9 |
|  |  |  |  | Bliss' plurality | 37,184 |
| 1886 | Luce, Republican | 181,474 | 1904 |  |  |
|  | Yaple, Fusionist . | 174,042 |  | Warner, Republican | 283,799 |
|  | Dickie, Prohibition | 25,179 |  | Ferris, Democrat . . . . | 223,571 |
|  | Scattering . . . . . . | 190 |  | Shackleton, Prohibition | 10,395 |
|  | Luce's plurality | 7,432 |  | Lamb, Socialist . . . . . | $\begin{array}{r} 6,170 \\ 782 \end{array}$ |
|  |  |  |  | Meyer, Socialist Labor | 782 |
| 1888 | Luce, Republican | 233,595 |  | Warner's plurality | 60,228 |
|  | Burt, Fusionist . . | 216,450 |  |  | 60,228 |
|  | Cheney, Prohibition | 20,342 | 1906 | Warner, Republican | 227,567 |
|  | Mills, Union Labor | 4,388 |  | Kimmerle, Democrat | 130,018 |
|  | Scattering . | 17 |  | Reed, Prohibition . . | 9,139 |
|  | Luce's plurality | 17,145 |  | Walker, Socialist . | 5,925 |
|  |  |  |  | Richter, Socialist Labor | 1,153 |
| 1890 | Winans, Democrat | 183,725 |  | Scattering | 4 |
|  | Turner, Republican | 172,205 |  | Warner's plurality | 97,549 |
|  | Patridge, Prohibition | 28,681 |  |  |  |
|  | Belden, Industrial | 13,198 | 1908 | Warner, Republican | 262,141 |
|  | Scattering | 47 |  | Hemans, Democrat | 252,611 |
|  | Winans' plurality | 11,520 |  | Gray, Prohibition | 16,092 |
|  |  |  |  | Stirton, Socialist | 9,447 |
| 1892 | Rich, Republican | 221,228 |  | McInnis, Socialist Labor | 845 |
|  | Morse, Democrat | 205,138 |  | Nichols, Independence | 612 |
|  | Ewing, People's | 21,417 |  | Scattering. | 19 |
|  | Russell, Prohibition | 20,777 |  | Warner's plurality | 9,530 |
|  | Scattering | 77 |  |  |  |
|  | Rich's plurality | 16,090 | 1910 | Osborn, Republican | 202,803 |
|  |  |  |  | Hemans, Democrat | 159,770 |
| 1894 | Rich, Republican | 237,215 |  | Warnock, Socialist . | 9,992 |
|  | Fisher, Democrat | 130,823 |  | Corbett, Prohibition ... | 9,989 |
|  | Nichols, People's | 30,012 |  | Richter, Socialist Labor | 1,204 |
|  | Todd, Prohibition | 18,788 |  | Scattering. | 4 |
|  | Scattering . . . . . | 150 |  | Osborn's plurality | 43,033 |
|  | Rich's plurality | 106,392 | 1912 | Ferris, Democrat | 194,017 |
|  |  |  |  | Musselman, Republican | 169,963 |
| 1896 | Pingree, Republican | 304,431 |  | Watkins, National Progressive | 152,909 |
|  | Sligh, D.P.U.S. ${ }^{3}$. | 221,022 |  | Hoogerhyde, Socialist . . . . . | 21,398 |
|  | Sprague, Democrat | 9,738 |  | Leland, Prohibition . . | 7,811 |
|  | Safford, Prohibition | 5,499 |  | Richter, Socialist Labor | 359 |
|  | Giberson, National | 1,944 |  | Scattering | 2,464 ${ }^{4}$ |
|  | Scattering . | 5,168 |  | Ferris' plurality | 24,054 |
|  | Pingree's plurality | 83,409 |  |  |  |
| 1898 |  |  | 1914 | Ferris, Democrat | 212,063 |
|  | Pingree, Republican | 243,239 |  | Osborn, Republican | 176,254 |
|  | Whiting, D.P.U.S. . . | 168,142 |  | Pattengill, Progressive . | 36,747 |
|  | Cheever, Prohibition | 7,006 |  | Hoogerhyde, Socialist | 11,056 |
|  | Cook, People's | 1,656 |  | Eayrs, Prohibition . . . | 3,830 |
|  | Hasseler, Socialist | 1,101 |  | Richter, Socialist Labor | 497 |
|  | Scattering. | 20 |  | Harris | 1 |
|  | Pingree's plurality | 75,097 |  | Ferris' plurality . . . | 35,809 |
| 1900 | Bliss, Republican | 305,612 | 1916 | Sleeper, Republican | 363,724 |
|  | Maybury, Democrat | 226,228 |  | Sweet, Democrat | 264,440 |
|  | Goodrich, Prohibition | 11,834 |  | Moore, Socialist | 15,040 |
|  | Ramsay, Social Democrat | 2,709 |  | Woodruff, Prohibition | 7,255 |
|  | Ulbricht, Social Labor | 958 |  | Murray, Socialist Labor | 963 |
|  | Thompson, People's. | 871 |  | Pattengill, Progressive. | 95 |
|  | Pingree, Social Democrat | 2 |  | Durfee . . | 1 |
|  | Bliss' plurality . | 79,384 |  | Sleeper's plurality | 99,284 |

SUMMARY OF VOTE FOR GOVERNOR (Cont.)

| Year | Name | Vote | Year | Name | Vote |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1918 | Sleeper, Republican | 266,738 | 1934 | Fitzgerald, Republican | 659,743 |
|  | Bailey, Democrat | 158,142 |  | Lacy, Democrat | 577,044 |
|  | Moore, Socialist | 7,068 |  | Larsen, Socialist | 12,002 |
|  | McColl, Prohibition | 1,637 |  | Anderson, Communist | 5,734 |
|  | Hinds, Socialist Labor | 790 |  | Alderdyce, Farmer-Labor | 2,105 |
|  | Scattering | 1 |  | Fraser, Socialist Labor | 1,040 |
|  | Sleeper's plurality | 108,596 |  | Buell, Commonwealth | 800 |
|  |  |  |  | Pointer, People's Prog. | 198 |
| 1920 | Groesbeck, Republican | 703,180 |  | Meadow, National | 164 |
|  | Ferris, Democrat . . . . | 310,566 |  | Lee, American | 95 |
|  | Blumenberg, Socialist | 23,542 |  | Fitzgerald's plurality | 82,699 |
|  | Jeffries, Farmer-Labor | 11,817 | 1936 | Murphy, Democrat | 892,774 |
|  | Johnston, Prohibition . . | 6,990 |  | Fitzgerald, Republican | $843,855$ |
|  | Markley, Socialist Labor | 2,097 |  | Monarch, Socialist | 6,631 |
|  | Scattering . . . . . . . . | $347{ }^{5}$ |  | Martin, Farmer-Labor | 3,289 |
|  | Groesbeck's plurality. | 392,614 |  | Raymond, Communist | 2,071 |
|  |  |  |  | O'Donohue, Socialist Labor | 524 |
| 1922 | Groesbeck, Republican | 356,933 |  | Fuller, Commonwealth | 433 |
|  | Cummins, Democrat. | 218,252 |  | Mann, American | 170 |
|  | Blumenberg, Socialist | 4,452 |  | Scattering. | 22 |
|  | Hoyt, Prohibition . | 2,744 |  | Murphy's plurality | 48,919 |
|  | Markley, Socialist Labor | 1,279 | 1938 |  |  |
|  | Scattering. | 1 138,681 |  | Fitzgerald, Republican Murphy, Democrat . . | $\begin{aligned} & 847,245 \\ & 753,752 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Groesbeck's plurality. | 138,681 |  | Burnett, Socialist . | 2,896 |
|  |  |  |  | O'Donohue, Socialist Labor | 446 |
| 1924 | Groesbeck, Republican | 799,225 |  | Hammond, American . . . . . | 257 |
|  | Frensdorf, Democrat. | 343,577 |  | Beshgetoor, Commonwealth | 242 |
|  | Johnston, Prohibition . | 11,118 |  | Holmes, Square Deal . . . . | 205 |
|  | Dinger, Socialist Labor | 4,079 |  | Gover, Protestants United | 177 |
|  | Krieghoff, Socialist | 2,725 |  | Scattering . | 21 |
|  | Scattering . . . . . . . . . | 194 455,648 |  | Fitzgerald's plurality | 93,493 |
|  | Groesbeck's plurality. | 455,648 | 1940 |  |  |
| 1926 |  | 399,564 | 1940 | Dickinson, Republican | $945,784$ |
|  | Comstock, Democrat | 227,155 |  | Whitmore, Socialist. | 4,124 |
|  | Titus, Prohibition . . | 2,507 |  | Raymond, Communist | 2,387 |
|  | Reynolds, Workers | 1,512 |  | Naylor, Socialist Labor | 702 |
|  | Scattering . . . . . . | 14 |  | Scattering. | 7 |
|  | Green's plurality | 172,409 |  | VanWagoner's plurality | 131,281 |
|  |  |  | 1942 | Kelly, Republican | 645,335 |
| 1928 | Green, Republican | 961,179 |  | VanWagoner, Democrat | 573,314 |
|  | Comstock, Democrat | 404,546 |  | Goodrich, Prohibition | 8,065 |
|  | Lockwood, Socialist | 2,850 |  | Scattering | 60 |
|  | Brooks, Prohibition | 2,575 |  | Kelly's plurality | 72,021 |
|  | Reynolds, Workers . . . | 2,537 | 1944 |  |  |
|  | Dinger, Socialist Labor | 654 556,633 |  | Fry, Democrat | $989,307$ |
|  | Green's plurality | 556,633 |  | Davey, Prohibition | 5,744 |
|  |  |  |  | Odell, Socialist | 2,851 |
| 1930 | Brucker, Republican | 483,990 |  | Marion, America First Party | 2,121 |
|  | Comstock, Democrat | 357,664 |  | Grove, Socialist Labor . . . . | 1,364 |
|  | Billups, Workers . . | 3,988 |  | Kelly's plurality | 219,552 |
|  | Campbell, Socialist . | 3,903 |  |  |  |
|  | McCone, Prohibition. | 1,336 | 1946 | Sigler, Republican | 1,003,878 |
|  | Scattering . . . . . . | 11 |  | VanWagoner, Democrat | 644,540 |
|  | Brucker's plurality | 126,326 |  | Phillips, Prohibition | $11,974$ |
|  |  |  |  | Sim, Socialist Labor | $5,071$ |
| 1932 | Comstock, Democrat. | 887,672 |  | Scattering . . . . . . | 12 359 |
|  | Brucker, Republican . | 696,935 |  | Sigler's plurality | 359,338 |
|  | Panzner, Socialist | 20,108 | 1948 | Williams, Democrat | 1,128,664 |
|  | Reynolds, Communist | 7,906 |  | Sigler, Republican | 964,810 |
|  | Holmes, Prohibition | 2,031 |  | Phillips, Prohibition | 15,249 |
|  | Fraser, Socialist Labor | 1,107 |  | Seidler, Socialist | 2,115 |
|  | Renner, Proletarian | 318 |  | Chenoweth, Socialist Labor | 1,405 |
|  | Bergman, Liberty | 182 |  | Lerner, Socialist Workers . . | 870 |
|  | Scattering . . | 3 |  | Scattering. | 9 |
|  | Comstock's plurality | 190,737 |  | William's plurality | 163,854 |

## SUMMARY OF VOTE FOR GOVERNOR (Cont.)

| Year | Name | Vote | Year | Name | Vote |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1950 | Williams, Democrat | 935,152 | 1974 | Milliken, Republican | 1,356,865 |
|  | Kelly, Republican | 933,998 |  | Levin, Democrat | 1,242,247 |
|  | Hayden, Prohibition | 8,511 |  | Ferency, Human Rights | 28,675 |
|  | Groves, Socialist Labor | 1,077 |  | Davidson, Am. Indepen. | 20,278 |
|  | Lerner, Socialist Workers | 636 |  | Andrews, Conservative . | 4,117 |
|  | Scattering . . . . . . . . . . . | 8 |  | Maisel, Socialist Workers | 1,505 |
|  | Williams' plurality | 1,154 |  | Horvath, Socialist Labor | 1,296 |
| 1952 | Williams, Democrat | 1,431,893 |  | Dennis, Communist | 1,119 |
|  | Alger, Republican . | 1,423,275 |  | Signorelli, U.S. Labor | 898 |
|  | Munn, Prohibition | $8,990$ |  | Milliken's plurality | 114,618 |
|  | Grove, Socialist Labor . . | 1,192 | 1978 | Milliken, Republican | 1,628,485 |
|  | Lerner, Socialist Workers . | 628 |  | Fitzgerald, Democrat | $1,237,256$ |
|  | Scattering | 2 |  | Scattering . | 1,237,256 |
|  | Williams' plurality | 8,618 |  | Milliken's plurality | 391,229 |
| 1954 | Williams, Democrat | 1,216,308 | 1982 | Blanchard, Democrat |  |
|  | Leonard, Republican Munn, Prohibition | 963,300 5,824 |  | Headlee, Republican | $1,369,582$ |
|  | Grove, Socialist Labor | 5,824 980 |  | Tisch, Tisch Independent Citizens | 80,288 |
|  | Lovell, Socialist Workers | 615 |  | Jacobs, Libertarian . . . . . . . . | 15,603 |
|  | Williams' plurality . . | 253,008 |  | Phillips, Am. Indepen. | 7,356 |
|  |  | 253,008 |  | Craine, Socialist Workers | 3,682 |
| 1956 | Williams, Democrat | 1,666,689 |  | McLaughlin, Worker's League | 1,980 |
|  | Cobo, Republican. | 1,376,376 |  | Scattering . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 226 |
|  | Halsted, Prohibition | 6,538 |  | Blanchard's plurality | 191,709 |
|  | Scattering. | 48 |  |  |  |
|  | Williams' plurality | 290,313 | 1986 | Blanchard, Democrat | 1,632,138 |
|  | Williams, Democrat |  |  | Lucas, Republican | 753,647 |
| 1958 | Bagwell, Republican | 1,078,089 |  | McLaughlin, Worker's League | 9,477 |
|  | Muncy, Socialist Labor | 1,078,983 |  | Write-In . . . | 1,302 |
|  | Severance, Prohibition | 3,622 |  | Blanchard's plurality | 878,491 |
|  | Lovell, Socialist Workers | 957 | 1990 | Engler, Republican | 1,276,134 |
|  | Williams' plurality | 147,444 |  | Blanchard, Democrat | 1,258,539 |
| 1960 | Swainson, Democrat | 1,643,634 |  | Roundtree, Worker's World | 28,091 |
|  | Bagwell, Republican . | 1,602,022 |  | Write-In | 1,799 |
|  | Himmel, Socialist Workers | 3,387 |  | Engler's plurality | 17,595 |
|  | Gibbons, Prohibition | 2,183 | 1994 | Engler, Republican | 1,899,101 |
|  | Toohey, Tax Cut | 1,899 |  | Wolpe, Democrat . | $1,188,438$ |
|  | Grove, Socialist Labor . . . | 1,479 1,354 |  | Write-In . . . . . . | 1,538 |
|  | Pursell, Independent Amer. Scattering | 1,354 33 |  | Engler's plurality | 710,663 |
|  | Swainson's plurality | 41,612 | 1998 | Engler, Republican | 1,883,005 |
| 1962 | Romney, Republican | 1,420,086 |  | Fieger, Democrat | 1,143,574 |
|  | Swainson, Democrat | 1,339,513 |  | Write-In . | 525 |
|  | Sim, Socialist Labor | 5,219 |  | Engler's plurality | 739,431 |
|  | Scattering. | 21 | 2002 |  |  |
|  | Romney's plurality | 80,573 |  | Granholm, Democrat Posthumus, Republican | $\begin{aligned} & 1,633,796 \\ & 1,506,104 \end{aligned}$ |
| 1964 | Romney, Republican | 1,764,355 |  | Campbell, Green . . | 25,236 |
|  | Staebler, Democrat | 1,381,442 |  | Pilchak, U.S. Taxpayer | 12,411 |
|  | Lovell, Socialist Workers | 5,649 |  | Write-In | 18 |
|  | Cleage, Freedom Now . | 4,767 |  | Granholm's plurality | 127,692 |
|  | Horvath, Socialist Labor | 1,777 |  | Granhorm's plurality | 127,6)2 |
|  | Scattering | 112 | 2006 | Granholm, Democrat | 2,142,513 |
|  | Romney's plurality | 382,913 |  | DeVos, Republican | 1,608,086 |
| 1966 | Romney, Republican ${ }^{6}$ | 1,490,430 |  | Cresswell, Libertarian | 23,524 |
|  | Ferency, Democrat . . | 963,383 |  | Campbell, Green . . . . . . | 20,009 |
|  | Horvath, Socialist Labor | 8,017 |  | Dashairya, U.S. Taxpayer | 7,087 |
|  | Scattering . . . . . . . . . | 79 |  | Write-In | 37 |
|  | Romney's plurality | 527,047 |  | Granholm's plurality | 534,427 |
| 1970 | Milliken, Republican | 1,339,047 | 2010 | Snyder, Republican | 1,874,834 |
|  | Levin, Democrat . . . | 1,294,638 |  | Bernero, Democrat | 1,287,320 |
|  | McCormick, Am. Indepen. | 18,006 |  | Proctor, Libertarian . | 22,390 |
|  | Bouse, Socialist Workers . | 2,220 |  | Mathia, U.S. Taxpayer | 20,818 |
|  | Horvath, Socialist Labor | 2,144 |  | Mikkelson, Green | 20,699 |
|  | Scattering . . | 107 |  | Write-In | 27 |
|  | Milliken's plurality. | 44,409 |  | Snyder's plurality. | 587,514 |

# SUMMARY OF VOTE FOR GOVERNOR (Cont.) 

| Year | Name | Vote | Year | Name | Vote |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2014 | Snyder, Republican. | 1,607,399 |  |  |  |
|  | Schauer, Democrat | 1,479,057 |  |  |  |
|  | Buzuma, Libertarian | 35,723 |  |  |  |
|  | McFarlin, U.S. Taxpayer | 19,368 |  |  |  |
|  | Homeniuk, Green. . . . . | 14,934 |  |  |  |
|  | Write-In . . . . | 50 |  |  |  |
|  | Snyder's plurality. | 128,342 |  |  |  |

[^4]
[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Compiled as $\$ 445.571$ et seq. of the Michigan Compiled Laws.
    ${ }^{2}$ Compiled as $\$ \S 791.233$ and 791.233 b of the Michigan Compiled Laws.
    ${ }^{3}$ Following the enactment of Act 212 of 1982, which amended Act 3 of 1939 and was made subject to referendum, the legislature received an initiative petition to amend the 1939 statute, upon which it failed to act. Under the provisions of Const 1963, art 2, §9, the petition was placed on the ballot as Proposal D. Act 212 was placed on the ballot as Proposal H, following a court challenge to its submission to the voters (Michigan State Chamber of Commerce v Secretary of State, Court of Appeals No 65841 (1982)).

    At the November 1982 general election, both Proposals D and H were approved, with Proposal H receiving 1,670,381 votes to Proposal D's $1,472,442$ votes. Subsequently, an action was commenced in Ingham County Circuit Court seeking a declaratory judgment as to which of the two conflicting proposals would become effective. At the request of the governor, the Michigan Supreme Court asked the lower court to certify the controlling questions directly to the supreme court. Addressing the issue of whether Proposal H was validly enacted, the supreme court ruled that the legislature had enacted Proposal H subject to voter approval consistent with its power to approve legislation subject to referendum under Const 1963, art 4, §34. The court rejected the argument that the legislature was bound to act on the initiative under Const 1963, art 2, §9, pointing out that when the legislature enacted Proposal H , it had not yet received the certified initiative petition which later became Proposal D. In re Proposals D and H, Michigan State Chamber of Commerce v State of Michigan, 417 Mich 409, 398 NW2d 848 (1983).
    To determine which proposal would become effective, the court "borrowed" the provision of Const 1963, art 2 , $\S 9$, which states that if 2 or more measures approved by voters conflict, that receiving the highest affirmative vote shall prevail. The court held that Proposal H would become the effective statute based on its higher affirmative vote in the election. In re Proposals $D$ and $H$, supra.
    ${ }^{4}$ Compiled as $\$ 3.851$ et seq. of the Michigan Compiled Laws.
    ${ }^{5}$ Compiled as $\$ 432.201$ et seq. of the Michigan Compiled Laws.
    ${ }^{6}$ Compiled as $\$ 333.26421$ et seq. of the Michigan Compiled Laws.

[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ Referendum invoked by petition pursuant to Const 1963, art 2, §9
    ${ }^{2}$ Referendum required to borrow money for specific purposes pursuant to Const 1963, art 9, $\$ 15$.
    ${ }^{3}$ Compiled as $\$ 323.371$ et seq. of the Michigan Compiled Laws.
    ${ }^{4}$ Compiled as $\$ 318.351$ et seq. of the Michigan Compiled Laws.
    ${ }^{5}$ Compiled as $\$ 35.1001$ et seq. of the Michigan Compiled Laws.
    ${ }^{6}$ Referendum required by statute pursuant to Const 1963 , art $4, \$ 34$.
    ${ }^{7}$ Following the enactment of Act 212 of 1982, which amended Act 3 of 1939 and was made subject to referendum, the legislature received an initiative petition to amend the 1939 statute, upon which it failed to act. Under the provisions of Const 1963, art 2, $\$ 9$, the petition was placed on the ballot as Proposal D. Act 212 was placed on the ballot as Proposal H, following a court challenge to its submission to the voters (Michigan State Chamber of Commerce v Secretary of State, Court of Appeals No 65841 (1982)).

    At the November 1982 general election, both Proposals D and H were approved, with Proposal H receiving 1,670,381 votes to Proposal D's 1,472,442 votes. Subsequently, an action was commenced in Ingham County Circuit Court seeking a declaratory judgment as to which of the two conflicting proposals would become effective. At the request of the governor, the Michigan Supreme Court asked the lower court to certify the controlling questions directly to the supreme court. Addressing the issue of whether Proposal H was validly enacted, the supreme court ruled that the legislature had enacted Proposal H subject to voter approval consistent with its power to approve legislation subject to referendum under Const 1963, art $4, \mathbb{3} 3$. The court rejected the argument that the legislature was bound to act on the initiative under Const 1963, art 2, §9, pointing out that when the legislature enacted Proposal H, it had not yet received the certified initiative petition which later became Proposal D. In re Proposals D and H, Michigan State Chamber of Commerce v State of Michigan, 417 Mich 409, 398 NW2d 848 (1983).

    To determine which proposal would become effective, the court "borrowed" the provision of Const 1963, art 2, §9, which states that if 2 or more measures approved by voters conflict, that receiving the highest affirmative vote shall prevail. The court held that Proposal H would become the effective statute based on its higher affirmative vote in the election. In re Proposals $D$ and $H$, supra.

    Compiled as $\$ \$ 460.6 \mathrm{a}$ and 460.6 b of the Michigan Compiled Laws.
    ${ }^{8}$ This added section was proposed by initiative petition pursuant to Const 1963, art 2, §9. On June 17, 1987, the initiative petition was approved by an affirmative vote of the majority of the senators-elect and filed with the secretary of state. On June 23, 1987, the initiative petition was approved by an affirmative vote of the majority of the members-elect of the house of representatives and filed with the secretary of state. The legislature did not vote pursuant to Const 1963 , art $4, \$ 27$ to give immediate effect to this enactment.

    In affirming the decision of the court of appeals in Frey v Director, Department of Social Services, the Michigan Supreme Court held that when a law is proposed by initiative and enacted by the legislature without change or amendment within forty days as required by Const 1963 , art $2, \$ 9$, it takes effect ninety days after the end of the session in which it was passed unless two-thirds of the members of each house of the legislature, as provided by Const 1963, art $4, \$ 27$, vote to give the law immediate effect. Act 59 of 1987, not having received votes in favor of immediate effect by two-thirds of the elected members of each house, may not take effect until ninety days after the end of the session in which it was enacted. Frey v Director, Department of Social Services, 429 Mich 315; 414 NW2d 873 (1987).

    On March 1, 1988, petitions to invoke the power of referendum with regard to Act 59 of 1987 were filed with the secretary of state. On April 13, 1988, the board of state canvassers certified the validity of a sufficient number of petition signatures to invoke the referendum.
    In a letter opinion to C. Patrick Babcock, Director, Department of Social Services, dated March 28, 1988, the attorney general addressed the following question: "II]f the filing of petitions, which include, if they are valid, a sufficient number of signatures to properly invoke a referendum, stays the effective date of Act 59 of 1987, which will otherwise become effective on March 30, 1988?" The attorney general concluded that "when a petition seeking referendum, which on its face meets legal requirements, is filed the signatures appearing on that petition are presumed valid and the statute at issue is stayed or suspended until either the petitions are found to be invalid or a vote of the people occurs."

[^2]:    Act 59 of 1987, as enacted by the legislature, was submitted to the people by referendum petition and approved by a majority of the votes cast at the general election held November 8, 1988. The board of state canvassers officially declared the vote to be 1,959,727 (for) and 1,486,371 (against) on December 2, 1988.
    ${ }^{9}$ Compiled as $\$ 299.651$ et seq. of the Michigan Compiled Laws.
    ${ }^{10}$ Compiled as $\$ 318.551$ et seq. of the Michigan Compiled Laws.
    ${ }^{11}$ Compiled as $\$ 324.40113$ a of the Michigan Compiled Laws.
    ${ }^{12}$ Compiled as $\$ 324.95101$ et seq. of the Michigan Compiled Laws.
    ${ }^{13}$ Compiled as $\$ 324.95201$ et seq. of the Michigan Compiled Laws.
    ${ }^{14}$ Compiled as $\$ 205.91$ et seq. of the Michigan Compiled Laws.

[^3]:    ${ }^{1}$ As a "poll book total" was not kept prior to 1976, the turnout figures for elections held between 1948 and 1974 are based on the greatest number of votes cast for an office in the election.
    ${ }^{2}$ A registration figure for the state was not compiled for elections held prior to 1956.
    ${ }^{3}$ Voting age population figures obtained from U.S. Bureau of the Census, P- 25 Series and Source Book of American Presidential Campaign and Election Statistics, 1948-1968, compiled and edited by John H. Runyon, Jennifer Verdini and Sally Runyon, c 1971 by Frederick Unger, New York.
    ${ }^{4}$ The large increase in the number of registered voters in the state from 1970 to 1972 was the result of a March 1972 Michigan Supreme Court ruling which declared that it was unconstitutional to purge the registration of a voter who had not voted over a period of two years as Michigan law then required. In effect, this compelled clerks to reinstate the registrations of "non-voters" who had been purged from the registration rolls since 1968. Michigan State UAW Community Action Program Council v Secretary of State, 387 Mich. 506, 198 NW2d 385 (1972).
    ${ }^{5}$ The large increase in the state's voting age population from 1970 to 1972 was the result of the 26th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution which lowered the minimum voting age from 21 to 18.
    ${ }^{6}$ Two events occurred in 1975 which affected the 1976 registration total: (1) the Secretary of State Branch Office Voter Registration program was put into effect in October and (2) provisions allowing for the creation of "inactive" voter registration files were put into effect. Registration totals listed for 1976 to 1984 reflect only those registrations held in 4 -year "active" files.
    ${ }^{7}$ The National Voter Registration Act, effective January 1, 1995, eliminated the initiation of any voter registration cancellations for inactivity and introduced several new voter registration programs in the state, including mail-in registration.
    ${ }^{8}$ Public Act 142 of 1989 authorized city and township clerks to establish a 5 -year voter registration file and eliminate their "inactive" files. Registration totals listed for 1990 to 1994 are based on the 5 -year voter registration files maintained by the clerks.
    ${ }^{9}$ In 1998, approximately 600,000 duplicate voter registration records were purged from the state's registration rolls through the implementation of the Qualified Voter File - a statewide voter registration database mandated under Public Act 441 of 1994.

[^4]:    ${ }^{1}$ See Constitution of 1850 , art. 5 , sec. 3, and art 4, sec. 34; Act 175 of the Extra Session of 1851, Laws of Michigan.
    ${ }^{2}$ Totals do not include soldiers' vote of 9,612 for Crapo and 2,992 for Fenton. See Constitution of 1850, art. 7, sec. 1, and Act 21 of the Extra Session of 1864, Laws of Michigan.
    ${ }^{3}$ Democratic People's Union Silver.
    ${ }^{4}$ Total includes 2,463 votes cast for L. Whitney Watkins.
    ${ }^{5}$ Total includes 206 votes cast for Benjamin J. Blumenberg.
    ${ }^{6}$ First governor elected to 4 -year term. See Constitution of 1963, art. 5, sec. 21, and sched. sec. 5.

