

**DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE
COMMISSION ON PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION TIMING AND SCHEDULING
July 16th, 2005**

Page 1 of 42

**DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE
COMMISSION ON PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION
TIMING AND SCHEDULING**

Chinese Room
Mayflower Hotel
Washington, D.C.
Saturday, July 16, 2005

CO-CHAIRS: HON. ALEXIS M. HERMAN,
Former U.S. Secretary of Labor
- and -
HON. DAVID E. PRICE,
U.S. Representative, North Carolina

MEMBERS PRESENT:

HON. ALEXIS HERMAN and HON. DAVID PRICE, Co-Chairs

DONNA BRAZILE
ROXANNE CONLIN
JERRY CRAWFORD
DEBBIE DINGELL
MARIA ECHAVESTE
CUAUHTEMO "TEMO" FIGUE ROA
HARTINA FLOURNOY
DONALD L. FOWLER
JEHMU GREENE
LINDA HONOLD
HAROLD ICKES

CAROL KHARE
HON. CARL LEVIN
STEVE MURPHY
JAMES ROOSEVELT, JR.
TERRY SHUMAKER
MIKE STRATTON
HON. HILDA SOLIS
SUSAN SWECKER
JOHN SWEENEY
ED TURLINGTON
HON. JENNIFER VEIGA

ALSO PRESENT:

JOSEPH SANDLER, General Counsel, DNC
PHIL McNAMARA, Staff, DNC

**DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE
COMMISSION ON PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION TIMING AND SCHEDULING
July 16th, 2005**

Page 2 of 42

CALL TO ORDER AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

CO-CHAIR PRICE: This third meeting of the Commission on Presidential Nomination Timing and Scheduling will come to order. I'm Co-Chair David Price, Congressman from North Carolina, and along with former Secretary of Labor Alexis Herman we're pleased to co-chair this effort and work with you as we move to the third of five meetings that we'll be holding.

This is good attendance. We added this meeting, as you know, to our original schedule, so we weren't sure what kind of attendance we could have. But on a Saturday in midsummer, I think we've done very, very well.

We have an important responsibility here today, a morning full of testimony. So we appreciate your being here and we thank you in advance for your cooperation.

There's something I need to say first, though. This is a special day in more respects than one. It is the birthday of our Co-Chair.

(Applause)

CO-CHAIR PRICE: We'll have a little more to say about that at lunch; with I think maybe even, maybe even some refreshments. But we especially appreciate Alexis being here, given that special, this special day.

All right. Let me now turn the meeting over to Secretary Herman for her remarks and for the Pledge of Allegiance.

CO-CHAIR HERMAN: Good morning. My thanks to all of you for being here for this special call meeting, as Congressman Price has already said. I also want to thank you, Congressman Price, for your birthday wish. I think it's important for the record to note that I have never worked on my birthday, and the last time that I was pressed into

official duty on July 16th it was 1992 when I served as the Chief Executive Officer of the Democratic National Convention in New York City. That was, of course, the day that we all nominated Bill Clinton for President. So I take it as a very good omen that I am pressed into service again today.

I would now like to call the roll for a quorum, and before we do that we would like you to stand for the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Attendees rose and recited the Pledge of Allegiance.)

CALL OF THE ROLL AND DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

CO-CHAIR HERMAN: I know from looking around the room, Congressman Price, that we do have a quorum. We need 20 members to constitute a quorum of the Commission. But let us begin to call the roll.

Roxanne Conlin.

MS. CONLIN: Here.

Jerry Crawford.

MR. CRAWFORD: Here.

CO-CHAIR HERMAN: Debbie Dingell.

MS. DINGELL: Here.

CO-CHAIR HERMAN: Maria Echaveste.

MS. ECHAVESTE: Here.

CO-CHAIR HERMAN: Temo Figueroa.

MR. FIGUEROA: Here.

CO-CHAIR HERMAN: Tina Flournoy.

MS. FLOURNOY: Here.

**DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE
COMMISSION ON PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION TIMING AND SCHEDULING
July 16th, 2005**

Page 3 of 42

CO-CHAIR HERMAN: Donna Brazile is coming into the room. We'll note you as present, Donna.

Don Fowler.

MR. FOWLER: Here.

CO-CHAIR HERMAN: Linda Honold.

MS. HONOLD: Here.

CO-CHAIR HERMAN: Harold Ickes.

MR. ICKES: Here.

CO-CHAIR HERMAN: The Honorable Carl Levin.

SENATOR LEVIN: Here.

CO-CHAIR HERMAN: Steven Murphy.

MR. MURPHY: Here.

CO-CHAIR HERMAN: James Roosevelt.

MR. ROOSEVELT: Here.

Terry Shumaker.

MR. SHUMAKER: Here.

CO-CHAIR HERMAN: Mike Stratton.

MR. STRATTON: Here.

CO-CHAIR HERMAN: The Honorable Hilda Solis.

MS. SOLIS: Here.

CO-CHAIR HERMAN: Susan Swecker.

MS. SWECKER: Here.

CO-CHAIR HERMAN: John Sweeney.

MR. SWEENEY: Here.

CO-CHAIR HERMAN: Ed Turlington.

MR. TURLINGTON: Here.

CO-CHAIR HERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I believe that we do have a quorum.

Jennifer, I didn't call your name, Jennifer Veiga.

MS. VEIGA: Here.

OPENING REMARKS OF HON. DAVID PRICE

COMMISSION CO-CHAIR CO-CHAIR PRICE: Thank you. Well, this is our pivotal meeting, you might say. This is the third of the five meetings. We're going to pivot, I would hope, from receiving information and ideas to beginning our decision process. We still have some important party constituencies to hear from and our meeting this morning will be devoted to that. We'll have an opportunity then this afternoon for discussion among ourselves as we look toward the decisions we must make in the fall. We're doing this work in a challenging but hopeful political environment.

Americans want our country to succeed, to grow our economy, to get our fiscal house in order, to open wide the doors of opportunity, to secure our homeland, to repair and rebuild our relations around the world.

Republican rule is not succeeding on any of these fronts. Quite the contrary and Americans know it.

Public assessments of the President's and Congress's leadership are sinking and voters are increasingly drawn to the Democratic alternative.

So a season of opportunity is opening up for our party and for our country. The challenge of this Commission is to devise a nomination process that helps translate these favorable stirrings into vigorous debate and broaden participation and the nomination of the strongest possible candidate who can unify our party and galvanize our country.

That's what's really at stake in these sometimes tedious deliberations over rules and process. Let's not forget that today.

**DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE
COMMISSION ON PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION TIMING AND SCHEDULING
July 16th, 2005**

Page 4 of 42

Let's have a meeting that moves us significantly toward our goal.

Thank you for being here and thank you for your dedication to this task. I now turn to Secretary Herman for an explanation of how we're going to proceed and in particular our agenda for the morning.

OPENING REMARKS OF HON. ALEXIS HERMAN

COMMISSION CO-CHAIR HERMAN:
Thank you very much, Congressman Price.

Let me remind Commission members that when we met in May in Chicago we determined at that time, given the interest in the subject matter and the need we believe to hear from additional allies in the party, from organizations, from our friends and allies in organized labor, on Capitol Hill, that it was important to have this special call meeting, to make the time not only to hear those presentations, but also to give ourselves additional time to deliberate the various proposals that have come before this body and other proposals that Commission members have been involved in terms of direct discussion with the Co-Chairs and with other members.

So therefore we have organized today's meeting on two levels. The first part of the day will be a day dedicated to hearing from members of Capitol Hill, from organized labor, from other organizations. This afternoon --

(Cell phone ring tone)

That must be birthday music for me.

(Laughter)

This afternoon we will then go into closed session, into executive session, and we will have the opportunity to review the various scenarios that have been presented to the Commission members. We will have working tools, working documents, for you to use as a part of those discussions, including

we're going to give you a scorecard sheet so that as Commission members we will be able to have some sense of how we are feeling about the various proposals. I will have the opportunity this afternoon to say more about that process.

I should also point out, since this is a special call meeting and it was not a part of the original calendar that we sent to members, that there will be no official votes taken at this meeting. This is simply an opportunity to get a sense of the whole as we move to October. As we have indicated in the past, October will of course be a very significant and important meeting for the Commission members, as we will attempt at that time to converge on what we believe to be the top scenarios or the top proposals that Commission members believe are worthy of consideration and or final recommendation at the December meeting. So that is the proposed work schedule for today. I would ask before we proceed if there are any questions that individual Commission members would have regarding today's agenda.

(No response.)

CO-CHAIR HERMAN: All right. Then, seeing no hands, we shall proceed with the presentations for the morning. Congressman Price, I will turn it back to you introduce our first presenter.

CO-CHAIR PRICE: Thank you. I'm especially delighted to introduce our first presenter because she's a colleague in the House of Representatives. We're going out of order just a bit here, but Hilda Solis will be our first presenter. She's a member of the Commission. She's a member of Congress from California. She's active in both the Women's and the Hispanic Caucuses and will tell you a little bit more about those affiliations. She has some guests with her who will elaborate on her statement. So let me at this time recognize my colleague and our fellow Commission member Congresswoman Hilda Solis, and she'll be reading a statement on behalf of the Latino members of Congress.

**DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE
COMMISSION ON PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION TIMING AND SCHEDULING
July 16th, 2005**

Page 5 of 42

PRESENTATIONS AND Q & A

STATEMENT BY COMMISSION MEMBER
HONORABLE HILDA SOLIS ON BEHALF
OF HISPANIC MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

MS. SOLIS: Thank you very much to our Commissioners and our Co-Chairs for allowing us the opportunity to present a perspective that I believe is a long time overdue. I'm very delighted to be representing members of the Hispanic Democratic Caucus of the U.S. House of Representatives.

While this is not an official letter that I'll be submitting that has been signed by our chair, because of legal issues regarding the use of their particular title, I do want to nevertheless submit for the record the entire letter that they submitted on behalf of our Democratic members. If I could just read

"On behalf of the Hispanic Democratic members of the U.S. House of Representatives, we thank you for seeking our input on the scheduling of future Democratic presidential primaries and caucuses. As the Commission on Presidential Nomination Timing and Scheduling considers developing recommendations, we ask that you consider the impact that any proposed changes to the nominating process will have on the opportunity for Latino voters to have an influential role in determining the ultimate Democratic nominee. We also ask that you share with us the criteria that will ultimately be used to determine the timing and sequence of nominating contests for the 2008 presidential election.

"The Latino electorate is growing substantially, as we all know. It grew 23 percent between 2000 and 2004 elections, casting 6 percent of the ballots in November 2004. This seemingly modest number will only continue to grow according to two important population trends: the continued growth of the Hispanic population from immigration and the population's relative youthfulness. Latinos now represent 12 percent of the voters under the age of 24.

As these voters age, their turnout rate will increase, further expanding the size of the Latino electorate. "However, Latino voters have not played a significant role in the nominating contests. This is partially attributable to the fact that the Hispanic electorate was smaller in 2000 and previous election years than it was in 2004. But it's also attributable to the demographic composition of the states that play an early and decisive role in the nominating process.

The Hispanic electorate in New Hampshire and Iowa is proportionally far smaller than the national average. Whether or not these states remain at the front of the nominating calendar, consideration should be given to ensure that timing of primaries and caucuses does not erode the significance of the early nominating contents in which Latinos can play a pivotal role.

"The year 2004 general election demonstrated that the Latino vote is now a swing vote. A more prominent role for Latino voters in our presidential nominating process and a greater investment of resources by the Democratic National Committee into the Latino electorate will strengthen our ability to win that growing swing vote. As population trends suggest, the size of the Latino electorate will continue to increase and our party cannot afford to neglect this population."

I am submitting this letter on behalf of Grace F. Napolitano, member of Congress, and Charlie Gonzalez, member of Congress, and the remaining members also that are supporting this letter. I also want to mention that I have invited a speaker to come from California to make a presentation. He will be introduced next. But on my own time, I would just like to say that, given this last electoral process, presidential process, many of my colleagues in the House, particularly Hispanic members, felt that we were not utilized appropriately. That is in terms of key states where there's a sizable number of Latinos, whether it's percent or 6 percent, where we could have made a difference in earlier voter turnout.

**DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE
COMMISSION ON PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION TIMING AND SCHEDULING
July 16th, 2005**

Page 6 of 42

I myself spent some time out in different parts of the country and noticed that the messages have to be tailored to different groups of Latinos. You can't just lump Latinos all into one pot and say that the message that you give to Southwest Latinos in California will work for you in Florida and will work for you in New York.

So there are variations. There are different potential opportunities, I think, for us. I know that my members of Congress, the Democratic Congressional Hispanic Caucus, would very much like to be involved and engaged and utilized, and especially looking forward to trying to put more investment into resources that will address and target strategically the Latino vote, because it is not homogeneous. It is very diverse, depending. If you are a newer immigrant and you've just become naturalized, you have a higher tendency of voting than you do if you are a second or third generation Latino.

Co-Chairs. Thank you very much.

CO-CHAIR HERMAN: Thank you very, very much for those remarks, Congresswoman Solis. We certainly agree with your perspective. We appreciate your remarks for the record. I think that we all recognize the importance of the Latino vote to our nation and certainly to the Democratic Party, and it is continuing to grow in significance and importance. You alluded to the fact that we have Andre Pineda with us today, who is going to actually give us more context for what Congresswoman Solis has already shared. I would like to invite Mr. Pineda to the speaker's table. He is a researcher and pollster who has spent a great deal of time studying these issues, looking at these issues. We appreciate you being with us today and we look forward now to your remarks.

PRESENTATION OF ANDRE PINEDA

MR. PINEDA: It's a pleasure to be here. Thank you very much, Chairwoman Herman and Chairman Price, and thank you, Congresswoman Solis.

CO-CHAIR HERMAN: Andre, could I ask you to speak directly into the microphone so that we could hear you.

MR. PINEDA: Of course.

CO-CHAIR HERMAN: Thank you.

MR. PINEDA: Much of what I'm going to say simply going to reinforce what Congresswoman Solis has been saying. The demographics are undeniable with regard to Latinos and one way to look at it is when you look at the population growth in the United States, what the census predicts is going to happen between 2000 and 2020. The census is projecting that there are going to be 55 million more people in the U.S. and 28 million of those are going to be Latinos. That is going to be a lot of voters. That is much higher than any other group. This is one of the problems that we're facing. Of course, only 6 percent of the electorate today is Latino, but NDN, for example, predicted that in the next 30 or 40 years that a quarter of the electorate is going to be Latino.

We need to be doing much better with Latinos than we're doing because right now what's happening is that we are losing Latinos. President Clinton got 72 percent of Latinos in 1996. Senator Kerry only got 58 percent of Latinos in 2004. This is the direction that they're going. In my mind, I don't exactly see it as a swing vote yet, because if we're getting 58 percent they're still in our camp. But it's heading in completely the wrong direction, and there's more, there's lots of trends working against us. The most prominent is the fact that the more educated, the more affluent Latinos get, the less likely they are to identify with the Democratic Party. In other words, the longer they stay here and the better they do, the less likely they are to identify with the Democratic Party. This is the direction in which we're going. If they do become the swing, that's actually a disaster. They have been traditionally the second most loyal constituency to the Democratic Party there is, more loyal than women, more loyal than union members, more loyal than anybody

**DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE
COMMISSION ON PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION TIMING AND SCHEDULING
July 16th, 2005**

Page 7 of 42

except for African Americans. So for what was once such a huge part of our base to get bigger but become a swing vote is a problem.

Part of why we're losing Latinos is just our Democratic Party approach to Latinos. As Congresswoman Solis was saying, we tend to view Latinos as just one group and that's just not true at all. One of my favorite examples of that is from my own personal history, is my mom and my dad moved here to the U.S. from Nicaragua and Costa Rica respectively. My wife's parents moved here from Mexico. They're both immigrants, both sets of parents are immigrants. Both are native Spanish speakers. But they share no political identity whatsoever. They would never ever say "we" in a political context whatsoever.

One example of that would be the recent election of Antonio Villaraigosa. With my parents, Antonio Villaraigosa is not one of them. It's nice that he was elected and all, he's very progressive and so are they, but he's not one of them. They feel no ethnic pride in his election. With my parents-in-law it's different. They do feel that sort of ethnic pride.

It just points that it's not just enough to sit there and say that people came from a country that once spoke Spanish, therefore they identify together and we can use the same political strategy with them. It doesn't work. The other thing that we can't do is just speak Spanish to them, and that's so much of what the party has been doing recently and that doesn't work. Speaking Spanish to -- speaking Spanish is very good for selling soap. There's no question that the Latino population -- when you're trying to reach the Latino population speaking Spanish is terrific. But when you're trying to reach Latino voters it's a whole different story. Latino voters do not look like the Latino population at large.

For starters, only one out of every five members of the Latino population are voters. So there's this little proxy group of Latinos that is in effect voting for all the rest

of the Latinos and that proxy group doesn't look like the rest. The majority of Latinos in the U.S. were not born here. The majority of voters were. The voters are much more affluent. The voters are much more educated and the voters are much more likely to speak English.

A recent poll by my old firm, Greenberg Research, that was conducted just last month showed that only 5 percent of Latinos come from -- watch TV exclusively in Spanish. Another 7 percent watch more Spanish language TV than they do English, so a total of 12 percent watching more Spanish than English. On the other hand, 67 percent watch more English TV than Spanish, including 37 percent which only watch English language TV.

Again, if we're sitting there and doing commercials in Spanish and thinking that we're reaching voters, we're not doing the right thing. So this just points to the sorts of things that we're not doing right in terms of making sure that Latinos come back to us. It's there that I think that there's some potential with the primary process. One of the things that Latinos say is that 51 percent of Latinos who are registered to vote say that they do not believe that the political leaders in the U.S. care about what they think. A majority think that. On the other hand, only 39 percent think that political leaders are interested in what they think. I think that with the primary process we have the chance to change that.

My second campaign ever was the Paul Tsongas for President Campaign. So I was in New Hampshire all the time. I was actually responsible for getting all of our Massachusetts volunteers up to New Hampshire, which we did with great success. It was very -- it was very interesting for me so early in my political career to see this perspective of voters on primaries. In New Hampshire it's just amazing; you have these everyday voters who wouldn't even think about voting for a candidate unless they had sat in their house and had coffee with them. It's no big deal for them to have three U.S. senators in their

**DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE
COMMISSION ON PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION TIMING AND SCHEDULING
July 16th, 2005**

Page 8 of 42

house at one time. There's no place else that's like that. Another race that I did more recently was I did the GOTV for Governor Janet Napolitano in 2002 when she got elected. So much of how she got elected was by pulling in the Latino vote. But it's a completely different feeling that they have there. I spent a lot of time there in 2004. We did see a dramatic improvement in participation on the part of Latinos and with the population at large because the primary got moved up. But did it feel anything like New Hampshire? It's not even close. Even though we got three times as many people to go to the polls as before, it wasn't the same. So, to put it another way, did this make Latinos feel like the political leaders were more interested in what it is that they have to say? No, I don't think it did.

So that's the opportunity here, to work out a primary schedule, especially with a state like Arizona, where it could be at some point first. I recognize the political consequences of doing that right away. But if we could have a state like Arizona going first, where percent of the population is Latino, where 17 percent of the primary electorate last time is Latino, then what we will have is candidates going there and really putting their money where their mouth is in terms of speaking to the issues that matter to the Latinos.

But one of the byproducts of this is that this doesn't mean that these candidates are going to be speaking in a way that's going to get in the way of their general election success, because Latinos on the whole are more conservative than the rest of the Democratic constituencies. So when candidates are speaking to Latino concerns on values and so forth, they're speaking in such a way that's going to be successful for them in the red states and as a result we're going to be more likely to have the sort of candidate that can win in the general.

The other thing of course that will happen is that know, for example, that Antonio Villaraigosa, Mayor Villaraigosa, is as good at counting votes as anyone, and if a state like Arizona is first then we have more chance of Latinos, serious Latinos, jumping

into the race and again getting Latinos more engaged.

Given the way that the demographics are going, given the huge importance that Latinos are going to play in the electorate, much, much greater than they are today, and given the way that we're losing them, to do something like this to reel them back in just makes strategic sense to me in terms of getting us a Democratic president.

CO-CHAIR HERMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Pineda. I know that Commission members have questions. I'll go first to Harold Ickes.

MR. ICKES: Yes. Thanks for your statement. You know, when you look at the '04 calendar, both Arizona and New Mexico, which I understand have very large Latino populations, came very early on. You had Iowa, which was on the 19th of January; you had New Hampshire on the 27th of January; and then you had on the 3rd of February, you had both Arizona and New Mexico. I was curious as to -- you think that's not early enough for big Latino states?

MR. PINEDA: Right, because I say it's completely different to be first than to be early; that the level of energy that I saw and that I know that you've seen as well, that the level of energy in New Hampshire that comes from being the first state, that comes from the level of organization that is there, is much, much higher than anything that was in Arizona.

It's that sort of organization. Again, it's not just Spanish language TV buys and so forth, which is so much of what happened in Arizona. It's the organization, the presence of the candidates, the feeling of Latinos actually being involved in the process as opposed to being targeted for political marketing, that I think makes the difference.

MS. BRAZILE: Can I follow up?

CO-CHAIR HERMAN: Donna Brazile.

**DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE
COMMISSION ON PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION TIMING AND SCHEDULING
July 16th, 2005**

Page 9 of 42

MS. BRAZILE: I think what you're saying, Andre, if I'm listening right is that it's not just the date, it's the level of engagement and how we engage that community in the process. If we go by the old methodology of just having specially TV buys and some Spanish language radio advertisement, that's old school. That's not going to grab the larger population. It's about making sure, if these states are early in the process, that candidates can engage them in such a way that involves them in the process, as opposed to just, as I always say, drive-by campaigning, so to speak.

MR. PINEDA: Right, exactly. That's exactly it. Again comparing to New Hampshire, the candidates are there, these huge organizations are there. There's constant engagement all the time. With Arizona this past time around, the candidates would fly in on their way to California to raising money and so forth and stop by for a weekend and have a rally. There wasn't that same kind of engagement. There wasn't the same kind of organization.

Also, to step back a bit, too, not to beat up my own profession, but so much of what we do with Latinos is we do these national polls in which we can't really have the sort of sample size that we'd like for the individual groups, especially because there's so many other variables that matter more than just being Latino. What matters more is the country of origin. What matters more is whether you're a native here. What matters more is religion. There's a huge difference, for example. Not all Latinos are Catholic and there's a huge difference between Catholic Latinos and Protestant Latinos.

So there's all sorts of other variables that we need to look at, that we can't really do in these national polls. Instead, what I think we need to be doing is going out to Latinos wherever they happen to be, whether it's the first generation in Miami, first generation Cubans, or the generation one and a half, who will be completely different.

Generation one and a half couldn't care less if they ever hear the name "Fidel Castro"

again, whereas for generation one it's still of the highest importance. The difference between sixth generation New Mexican, Mexican American business owners, who don't even really think of themselves as Mexican Americans, they think of themselves as Spanish, as opposed to the new immigrants in California.

We need to go listen to them and listen to why it is that they're not voting for us the way that they should. Because if you look at the national polls, we're right on all the issues. Latinos care about education way more than anybody else and nonetheless, even though they say that we're better on the issues, 40 percent of them are voting for George Bush and Karl Rove is getting all sorts of credit for properly segmenting the audience. I mean, it's ridiculous that this is happening to us.

MS. BRAZILE: So just to follow up, what you're saying is that it's important, a strategic imperative, that we take into consideration when looking at the calendar states with diverse populations, especially those emerging populations that will help us enhance our electoral ability in the future?

MR. PINEDA: Yes, no question. And watching those demographics and just seeing the way they grow; it's not just about 2008. It's about the future.

MS. BRAZILE: Thank you, sir.

CO-CHAIR HERMAN: I want to recognize first Ed Turlington and then Don Fowler, and after Don Jim Roosevelt in that order.

MR. TURLINGTON: Congresswoman and Andre, I thank you for your comments. I want to ask slightly different questions, and I'd say amen to Donna's question about diversity, which we all are very committed to in improving our process. Congressman Price and I come from a state where in the last census 5 percent of the population in North Carolina was self-identified as Hispanic and we've both been pleased as activists in the Democratic Party that not only are we beginning to see activity within

**DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE
COMMISSION ON PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION TIMING AND SCHEDULING
July 16th, 2005**

Page 10 of 42

the party, we're beginning to see elected officials, which leads to my question to both the Congresswoman and to you, two questions: Do you have any thoughts -- and all of us have some experience in this -- how we can use our presidential nominating process to grow leaders like yourself, people who are Latino and Hispanic, in all of our states as we seek to strengthen the party at all levels? Then second of all, I thought I heard you say in Arizona that there was three times as much participation from Latino voters. Was that correct?

MR. PINEDA: Right, it's three times -- I mean basically, not quite three. It was just a little short of three for the electorate as a whole as well as Latinos, participation. I think there was about 75,000 voters in the 2000 Democratic primaries and it worked out to be about 200,000 in the 2004 because of having been moved up, and Latinos alongside everyone else went up by that ratio.

MR. TURLINGTON: Which I think I hear you saying that's a good thing, but we can do better.

MR. PINEDA: Right, exactly.

MR. TURLINGTON: Let me state a theory and then have you both react. That to me sounds like a positive thing, especially since these states, New Mexico, Arizona, were early as I understand it for the first time, whereas some of our other states historically have been early and those of us who've been in Iowa and New Hampshire, you've built it up over decades. And I hope we can grow that in some of these other states. I'd be interested in your comments on not only the early issue, but an issue that I've thought about lately, how throughout the process do we not only have representation and strength geographically, women participating in our presidential process, but people of color. In other words, I hope, as all of us deliberate -- and we're going to do some of that this afternoon -- we not only think about early, but we also think about February, March, April, when Latino voters,

African American voters, women, young voters, can be significant in the process.

So really two things: How do we use this to build leaders and parties; and then second of all, do you have any comment on how our process can engage Latino and Hispanic voters all the way through?

MS. SOLIS: Thank you very much for your question. This is something that I know many of our colleagues in the House have been talking about, particularly the Black Caucus, the Asian Caucus, as well as the Hispanic Caucus, because some would feel as though we are not as engaged or should be involved in the intricacies that go on in terms of planning that outreach.

I'll be honest with you. I think a lot more has to be done in terms of identifying young leadership early on in those key states. I know North Carolina because I've been there, and it was hosted by my colleague Mr. Price, two years ago, I believe it was. I met with 600 Latino leaders, leaders in their own right, and I was amazed to see that half of the room was under the age of 30.

These are individuals who I believe can be -- just as a sample size right there, that you could begin to work with and identify and bring them into the kind of work, whether it's -- not just doing field campaigning, precinct walking, but getting people registered to vote, having activities that center around, not just culturally but more on the issues. 600 people don't just show up on a Saturday in North Carolina to shake hands and eat tacos. They sit down because they want to hear from leaders, they want to hear substantively what programs that are being offered and where they can get assistance, whether it was someone who was looking to get information on furthering their education or someone who was looking for a job or someone who was looking for opportunities at governments, both local, municipal, and state and federal could do collectively.

Those kinds of opportunities should be happening with our party in conjunction with some of our friends and allies that are out

**DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE
COMMISSION ON PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION TIMING AND SCHEDULING
July 16th, 2005**

Page 11 of 42

there. LULAC, National Council of La Raza for example. There are many different organizations. In fact, there's a group of Latino publishers nationally that's available and they gather every year here in Washington, but many of them represent rural areas. They make their living off of selling small advertisements from the small businesses that are Latino-owned. That's a captive audience right there, free press in many occasions, that you could be using as a recruitment tool, and they will do the bilingual and the English. They'll do the Spanish and the English translations for you.

But it's a way of beginning that discussion, because if you're not seen and you're not heard then you're not going to be easily, how could I say it, admitted into the community. I think the more that we can do to hire staff that's reflective of that community, I think the better off we're going to be. I know that our Chairman, Howard Dean, has talked very much about trying to empower our state parties. Those state parties in key states should also be reflective of the changing demographics, whether they are bringing on staff in mentoring internships or paid positions. It has to happen. The sooner that happens, then it's more reflective of the kind of party that we really should be and really are, and I think are going to be helpful in this process.

There are many people I think in Washington that have done enough research on how to reach our community, that it's worth almost just having that kind of a discussion on that topic as well. Thank you.

MR. PINEDA: One thing that I would add is just, I would bring them in and, instead of making these kids sort of representatives of their communities, I would make them, especially thinking about sort of my own background, I would make them the technicians. You have the little Nicaraguan kid that's good at math; let's make him a pollster. You have the really charming Argentinian; well, let's get her raising money. But let's make them technicians as opposed to doing things necessarily

specifically for their community, because that's when they're going to grow up to have the positions of authority, to manage, to strategize, to be sitting at the table, not by virtue of their ethnicity, but because of their experience, and to be examples for others in the community.

MR. TURLINGTON: Did you have any comment on my theory about that it's good for all of us, including Latino and Hispanic voters, to have their active participation and leadership later in the process and not only right at the first?

MS. SOLIS: Absolutely. Absolutely. It has to be a continuum, absolutely. Otherwise you'll see excitement early on in states like Arizona and where pockets of Latinos are and then it'll just dissipate. It'll stop if, for example -- which happened in Arizona, quite frankly, with this last presidential election. After they pulled a lot of resources, you could see the tide of the opinion of Hispanics out there that changed dramatically, and there wasn't that same enthusiasm that kept, I think in my opinion, kept up to speed. That was a big loss for us and that shouldn't have happened.

CO-CHAIR HERMAN: Don Fowler.

MR. FOWLER: I think we all recognize the growing importance of the Latino-Hispanic vote in the United States. Even in South Carolina, which is not normally identified as a state that has a substantial Latino population, Latinos broadly defined are the fastest growing population group there.

But I have a specific question. You responded to Harold's question that having New Mexico and Arizona early on the process, February the 3rd this past year, was not a sufficient inducement in the ordering of the calendar of the presidential nominating process, was not sufficient to stimulate appropriate enthusiasm and involvement by the Latino population. Now, if I asked Terry Shumaker from New Hampshire and Jerry Crawford from Iowa what constitutes a good, effective nominating calendar, they have a specific

**DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE
COMMISSION ON PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION TIMING AND SCHEDULING
July 16th, 2005**

Page 12 of 42

answer. So I ask you, specifically with respect to the nominating process per se, what would you suggest as an alteration from what we now do that would provide that kind of inducement and enthusiasm and encouragement to the Latino population?

MR. PINEDA: I would look to over time have it in such a way that we could have a state like Arizona be first. I would not look to make that happen right away. I recognize that there are political consequences. But there's no question that if it was up to me then I would sit there and I would say -- and it doesn't necessarily have to be Arizona. It can be -- but the idea is to get a state there that is going to make that kind of strong statement to a constituency that's going to have incredible importance and make it first, because in effect it's sort of market-driven in my mind. You know, New Hampshire and Iowa get that kind of organization because they're first and because there's that tremendous importance to them, and they know how to do it and the people there all know how to do it, and because of the importance people put their money where their mouth is. Well, I would want to see that happen in a state with a significant Latino population so that we could get the population engaged and also get the sort of candidates there that sit there and say: I can talk to them and that's going to help me win the general election.

CO-CHAIR PRICE: I need to say that we're overdue now on this segment, so we have two more questions and then we'll move on, and we'll ask the questioners and responders to both be very brief if you will. Jim and Temo to wrap it up.

MR. ROOSEVELT: Thank you, Congressman. Thank you, Congresswoman, for your presentation. Andre, I'd just like to ask you as a former student of Dennis Newman myself --

MR. PINEDA: Ah, yes.

MR. ROOSEVELT: -- and a fan of Sam Coppersmith -- very different political styles and different places, New Hampshire and

Arizona. Putting aside mega-states like California and Florida, could an Arizona or a New Mexico provide the same kind of retail political experience that a New Hampshire provides, or does the geography prevent that?

MR. PINEDA: I think the geography of Arizona actually lends itself pretty well to it, because it is a big state, but the majority of the population is in the Phoenix-Tucson corridor, and it would allow itself a certain measure of retail politics. It's not all urban. A lot of it is this new trend in demographics, the exurb. The exurb, you can do the retail politics there. Is it going to be the same as New Hampshire? No. But can it be done? Yes, the retail can be done.

CO-CHAIR PRICE: Temo.

MR. FIGUEROA: I think one of issues that always comes up in the presidential races, as you mentioned, is the lack of money or resources spent in the Latino community. But if you look at the process and you look at the schedule and you look at where the majority of Hispanics and Latinos live -- California, Illinois, New York, Texas, Florida -- four of the five big states are already done. If you look at where they're at in the schedule, they're nowhere early, and then when it comes to the general election -- California, Illinois, New York -- who's going to campaign there? Who's going to spend any money there, not just on Latinos, but in general? I mean, that's a Democratic state. Texas, well, who's going to spend any money there? You're going to go there to raise money. If you're a Democrat, it's a red state. Florida is the one state that people are going to spend money on, and in 2004 I saw there was money spent there. For the amount of Latinos that were going to vote, there seemed to be some money that was spent there on radio, on television, on field work and what-not. So my question is, we can play around the edge. We can talk about Arizona or New Mexico. But if we're talking about reaching Latinos and we're talking about the Latinos that vote, where do they live? In these five states. They're an urban population. The majority of them

**DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE
COMMISSION ON PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION TIMING AND SCHEDULING
July 16th, 2005**

Page 13 of 42

live in Los Angeles, they live in Miami, they live in New York, they live in Chicago, they live in Texas in Dallas or Houston.

So how do you go about, like as a party, if we want to grow and reach this community? What do we do, other than maybe have one of these states move up in the primary or move -- am I not thinking about this right? -- other than playing in Arizona or New Mexico or Colorado, and we'll still be frustrated as a Latino: well, we didn't spend that much money. Well, there's not that many. I mean, in regards to Colorado, there are pockets. There's a good amount of it. But if one in five Hispanics are eligible to vote, what is that percentage? Have you done a percentage of like the actual votes that are coming out and how much money is being spent on television, outreach, or what-not in money for that one in five?

MR. PINEDA: I haven't quantified it. It was dramatically higher, and especially because of one of the states that we were mentioning, Florida, than in Arizona. The thing that I would just say to that is that we're always going to have the sort of retail-big state split, but what happens from having a state like Arizona go first, then you have candidates recognizing that Latinos are someone that they have to start speaking -- are people that they have to start speaking to right away, and they start recognizing that this is a group that needs to be included. I think that that will translate into the big states. It will translate into the message that they take there, the mediums that they use.

MR. FIGUEROA: I don't want to speak for him, but I think Senator Art Torres would have a different opinion about that, and I think my family would as well, being from Los Angeles originally. They watch it from a distance. My mom calls me up, it's like she's as yellow dog Democrat as you can be. She was always first in line to vote. She doesn't feel at all engaged with what's going on in the presidential, being from California. And you look at it, that's where we're all at as Latinos. I don't know. I may be speaking out of turn here, but in regards to this whole, they can't do retail politics in California or

Illinois or New York or Texas or Florida, everyone can do retail politics. They can do media too. They do it very well in California and they do it very well in Texas and Illinois, New York, and California. But I think Antonio Villaraigosa would differ and I think he does very good retail politics.

MR. PINEDA: Again I would just say, it's part of the process of just being in a state like California. I'm from there too and that's where I grew up, and I recognize that we don't get to play because we're so Democratic. If we were a swing state we would get to play more, like the experience of Florida. But I think nonetheless moving a state up will make us look at what's happening and say, yeah, I still don't get to play, I still don't have an effect on who the primary choice is going to be, but at least I'm hearing candidates speak in a way that's more relevant to me than I ever had before because a state like Arizona's first.

CO-CHAIR HERMAN: Thank you very, very much, Andre Pineda. This was very informative and I'm sure, just looking at the faces of Commission members, we could probably spend more time in this one area of really getting additional clarity. But thank you so much for bringing your perspectives and enlightening us, and it's my hope that we'll have the opportunity to spend more time in future meetings to continue to talk about the significance of the vote, but more importantly, how we approach it and the impact on the calendar of what we need to do to make sure that we're going to energize the Latino vote as we go forward. Thank you very much.

It's now my pleasure to introduce my colleague from the Clinton-Gore years, Ginger Lew, who served as the General Counsel at the Commerce Department. She was also Deputy Administrator at SBA. Ginger is now the Chief Executive Officer of the Telecommunications Development Fund. A lawyer by training from the University of California at Berkeley, Ginger is here representing today the Asian Pacific American Caucus. Ginger is going to speak

**DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE
COMMISSION ON PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION TIMING AND SCHEDULING
July 16th, 2005**

Page 14 of 42

on their behalf at the request of the chair of that caucus. So, Ginger, welcome.

PRESENTATION OF GINGER EHN LEW

MS. LEW: Secretary Herman, it's a pleasure to see you again. It's been too long. Congressman Price, a pleasure to see you as well. Good morning. As Secretary Herman mentioned, I am here on behalf of the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus, and I thank you for the invitation to present to you today. I'd like to acknowledge that Congressman Faleomavaega from American Samoa was here earlier and regrettably was called away, unfortunately. He sends his regrets not to be able to stay. I also would like to welcome and acknowledge Mona Mohib, who is Vice Chair of the DNC APA Caucus.

I am here today not to advocate on behalf of any specific proposal or recommended calendar for the 2008 presidential primaries or caucus schedules. Instead, I am here to share with you, the Commission, a set of principles that we as the Asian Pacific American Island communities hope you will take into your consideration during your deliberations.

A copy of my formal statement has been provided for the record. I am also pleased to submit for the record three reports: a comprehensive report put together by then DNC Deputy Chair and now DNC Vice Chair Congressman Mike Honda, summarizing voter contact, outreach and fundraising successes of the AAPI community of 2004. The results of exit polls collected by DNC pollsters Cornell Belcher. The poll details the performances of AAPI's in the 2004 presidential election and provides information about our community's attitudes about issues and messages.

Finally, a spreadsheet of state by state data compiled by the U.S. Census and media exit polls, showing where 7.5 million AAPI voters lived during the 2004 election. I am honored to have been actively involved in the work of the DNC starting in 1986 and through every presidential campaign. This party is my

home because it shares the AAPI community's values of protecting families, rewarding hard work, increasing opportunities, and ensuring a level playing field for all residents of the United States.

Back in 1960 when I was a near-child, I volunteered to hand out pamphlets in my neighborhood to elect John F. Kennedy as President. I knew most of the folks in my neighborhood because I walked that same route to my school every day. Back then there wasn't any concern about an 11-year-old going door to door.

As I grew older and continued with my volunteer work, the radius or the scope of my neighborhood or sphere of influence grew from my elementary school to junior high school and then to high school. Back then, we saw folks from our neighborhoods. We talked neighbor to neighbor. We interacted with each other in the daily rhythm of life, at church, at school, at the grocery store, at the gas station. We were of the community. While we didn't always agree with each other, especially politically, when it came to elections we knew we were acting out of a collective concern and a commitment to improving our communities.

While the core values that I spoke about earlier remain constant, today's political environment and process has changed. Some of these changes have been good, but I submit some of these changes have been counterproductive. To put it in the terms of the business world, where I have been involved in investments for the past 8 years -- and by the way, we are in the business of politics -- for more than a decade we have seen a decline in our customer base. Our customers are no longer buying from us. They're buying from our competitor or they've decided to stop buying.

Regardless of the reasons, if the Democratic Party was a pure corporate business we'd be forced into restructuring because this erosion of our customer base cannot be withstood. The move away from neighborhood grassroots politics of the

**DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE
COMMISSION ON PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION TIMING AND SCHEDULING
July 16th, 2005**

Page 15 of 42

1960s has moved us away from our customers. Despite the downward trends with many constituencies, with respect to the AAPI community we have made impressive strides in gaining market share and loyalty. In 1992 Bill Clinton and Al Gore received 31 percent of the AAPI vote. By 1996 they had received 43 percent of the AAPI vote. In 2000, Al Gore and Joe Lieberman received 54 percent of the AAPI vote. And by 2004 John Kerry and John Edwards received 61 percent of the AAPI vote.

In an election cycle when Democrats lost ground with many of our most vital base communities, AAPI's turned out and voted in record numbers. 83 percent of all registered AAPI voters turned out and voted.

Additionally, the AAPI communities raised more than \$5 million for the 2004 presidential election, not to mention additional funds raised for critical local, state, and federal candidates. We are community that is on the move that has demonstrated continued, sustained, and impressive growth, growth which has the potential to shift the political landscape in the years to come. The key is whether we translate our continued growth into a Democratic voting base.

Our strong Democratic performance last year was due in large part to the aggressive grassroots, field, surrogate, and media programs run by the party, by the Kerry campaign, and by our own community leaders and activists. A key step to rebuilding the Democratic Party's grassroots base is the timing and calendar for the 2008 presidential primaries and caucuses. In that respect there are five key principles we ask the Commission to consider.

The first key principle is inclusion. It is essential that some states rich in AAPI populations be front-loaded into the process. Some of our most popular states include Washington, Florida, Virginia, Maryland, Illinois, Texas, New Jersey, Massachusetts, and of course California and New York. Other key 2004 battleground states include Minnesota, Ohio, Wisconsin, Oregon,

Nevada, and Michigan. All of them have significant AAPI populations.

The second core principle is outreach. It is vital to the Democratic performance of the AAPI communities that candidates reach out to our communities early, often, and intelligently throughout the primary process. Field political and media programs must have an AAPI component. By starting this kind of outreach in the primary campaigns, we can ensure potential retention of our AAPI vote base. This is a critical component that enables us to organize locally to win nationally.

Third, we need dedicated resources to building an AAPI base vote. The schedule should be designed such that presidential candidates will put resources, be they money, candidates' time, staff hires, literature and translated materials, into the constituency programs and specifically into the AAPI communities. Despite having raised more than \$5 million in the presidential 2004 campaign, less than 10 percent was used to support AAPI outreach.

Our community has more than pulled its weight financially. Yet we continue to be starved for resources. In the business world, companies who ignore or take for granted their core customers have learned the hard lesson of how easy it is to lose those customers to competitors. We know retention of, if not growth of, the AAPI community can be made better if we have early and adequate resources.

Fourth, we need to increase the participation of AAPI delegates in the nomination process. In 1984 there were only 74 AAPI delegates to the Democratic convention. By 2004 that number rose to 170. Building on the accomplishments of the 2004 effort to ensure diversity in the delegate pool, we need a primary process structured in a way that will inherently produce a rich and diverse pool of delegates.

Let me be clear. This should not be a last-minute token effort before the quadrennial conventions. A good primary calendar can

**DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE
COMMISSION ON PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION TIMING AND SCHEDULING
July 16th, 2005**

Page 16 of 42

ensure that AAPI delegates are cultivated by the campaigns early and throughout the process.

Finally, we ask the Commission to recommend a process that empowers the grassroots organizers in our party. If there is a phrase to describe the 2004 election, it should be called the year of the volunteer. We saw a dramatic rise in the interest and participation from people who had never been active in politics before. Thanks to candidates like Howard Dean, a belief grew in our communities that we could organize locally and win nationally. It is vital for our party to cultivate and empower grassroots activists to organize and take part in the primary process, thereby getting their participation and buy-in early in the election cycle.

The DNC under the leadership of Governor Dean has made it clear that Democrats plan to fight in all 50 states, the four territories, the District of Columbia, and the votes of more than 4 million Americans living abroad. A 50-state strategy is rooted in the principle that every Democratic vote matters to us. Accordingly, we need a national commitment to every community and constituency within the Democratic family.

I appreciate the comments of Congresswoman Solis and Andre Pineda who spoke before me today and I echo those sentiments. I look forward to hearing from our next speakers. The truth is the fortunes of our communities, black and brown, labor and blue dog, GLBT, women, and people with disabilities, are directly linked to the success of Democrats. In order for us to take back the White House in 2008, the DNC must begin implementing a program today that reaches out to and truly values the many diverse communities that are the base of this party.

Again I thank you for the opportunity to be here today, for taking part in this dialogue. I would be glad to take any questions and comments you may have.

CO-CHAIR HERMAN: Thank you very much, Ginger Lew. Are there questions from Commission members for Ms. Lew? Congresswoman Solis?

MS. SOLIS: Yes. Thank you, Ginger, for your fine presentation. I happen to represent a district in California that has a sizable number of Asian Pacific Islanders and I would just mention that one of the confounding things about trying to identify populations, ethnic populations, is sometimes their party registration. I find that depending on how the message is translated or how it is set in place can make a big difference, even in the Asian community, where there are a number of "decline to state." That is a growing number, I think, in a lot of the parts of the country that we need to pay attention to, particularly where we find I think a sizable number of Asians. Do you have any information about those particular voters?

MS. LEW: Congressman Solis, it was a pleasure to be in your district a couple of years ago and I saw first-hand the growing presence of AAPI constituency members that you have. The problem that you mentioned about the Latino community is similar in the Asian Pacific American community, and that is that, regrettably, the parties tend to look at us as an entire entity, whole entity, when in reality we have Japanese Americans, Korean Americans, Filipino Americans.

For example, getting materials from the Democratic National Party translated into Chinese and asking us to distribute it to Nevada, where most of the AAPI population, the 54,000 members of the AAPI population, are Filipino, have no relevancy. So oftentimes when we talk about targeting and reaching out I think we have to be sensitive to the different ethnic groups in that community, and I think we could be far more effective in that regard.

CO-CHAIR HERMAN: Other questions?

(No response.)

**DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE
COMMISSION ON PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION TIMING AND SCHEDULING
July 16th, 2005**

Page 17 of 42

CO-CHAIR HERMAN: Ginger, I'd like to ask you just a background question, as you looked at the 2004 race and as we look at states and this calendar. We know historically that as we looked at the Latino vote in the Democratic Party, it used to be that we only talked about Cubans, we talked about Mexican Americans, and we talked about Puerto Ricans. Now of course, with the increased diversity and, as Andre spoke about earlier, all of the global communities really of the Latino vote, particularly from all of Latin America, it really forces us to be very clear that we have to think about this in very different ways, and it is not a one size fits all, as Andre talked about earlier.

As you look at the different communities in the Asian Pacific Islanders and the electoral process, how would you characterize for us today the growth in terms of that community?

MS. LEW: I think we will continue to see a very high growth of Southeast Asians, whether they be Filipino, Indo-American, Koreans, Thai. As a result, again I go back to this issue of resources. When it comes time to both provide translation services, translated materials, staff hires, hiring one person to represent the entire AAPI community is, quite frankly, very near-sighted. It does not take into account the recognition of the diversity of our Asian American Pacific Islander community, and as a result -- our numbers during the 2004 were extraordinarily impressive because we had a great band of volunteers who we were able to pull together.

But as I mentioned earlier, I've been in the business community for more than 20 years. We've been running this like a startup business on a shoestring for way too long. We need to devote the types of resources which represent and recognize the diversity of our communities, and that means significant hires, diversity of hires, commitment of resources, commitment of staff time, commitment of candidates' time, in order to reach out to each and every one of those communities.

I would also like to suggest that, frankly, the media outreach be broadened. At one point during the 2004 campaign we had people volunteering to speak as surrogates on a number of ethnic radio programs. We couldn't get a response from the DNC media office to support that effort, and that's a very sad statement.

CO-CHAIR HERMAN: Thank you very, very much for being with us today and for your insightful words. I thank you very much, Ginger.

MS. LEW: Thank you.

CO-CHAIR PRICE: Ginger, I'll add my thanks. We appreciate your testimony. Now we're going to turn to our friend and fellow Commission member John Sweeney. Everyone here knows that one of our party's most stalwart allies over the years has been the labor movement in this country, representing America's working families. Labor's been a vital source of our ground game during the fall general election, has been active in our presidential nomination process helping us write the rules, and of course has been an important part of our convention working on behalf of our candidates. Since 1995 the AFL-CIO has been under the leadership of our friend John Sweeney. I'd like to ask Secretary Herman to also add her word of welcome. We are very glad to have you here and of course many colleagues on the Commission and in the audience as well.

CO-CHAIR HERMAN: Thank you very much, Congressman Price. It's certainly no secret to those of us who are in this room or in our party, indeed to our nation, that organized labor has really been a big part of electing progressive candidates to office who really support the interests and needs of working families in this country. So, I'm just delighted that President Sweeney is here to give us labor's point of view on the significance of our calendar and what else we need to do to improve our overall process.

**DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE
COMMISSION ON PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION TIMING AND SCHEDULING
July 16th, 2005**

Page 18 of 42

So we welcome your presence today on behalf of organized labor, all labor, and we thank you for your leadership.

PRESENTATION OF COMMISSION
MEMBER JOHN SWEENEY, PRESIDENT,
AFL-CIO

MR. SWEENEY: Thank you very much, Co-Chairs, David Price and Alexis Herman. Thank you for your leadership. To Alexis Herman I say, happy birthday. I often say as I travel around the country that, boy, do we miss Secretary of Labor Alexis Herman.

(Applause.)

I'm happy that Karen Ackerman, the Political Director of the AFL-CIO, is here with me as well. To the members of the Commission, I thank you for the opportunity to offer our perspective on the Democratic Party's presidential nomination calendar. In my testimony today I will focus my comments on how the process can be designed to advance the lives of 13 million union members and their families nationwide, as well as all working families, the Democratic nominee and the Democratic Party.

Designed right, the nomination process can provide our nominees with huge advantages in the general election while building an America that puts working families first. My comments contain four basic principles regarding the nomination process. First, the calendar should be designed to give time, opportunity, and exposure to all candidates so that the strongest and best candidate emerges as the eventual nominee.

Second, the calendar should be designed to expose candidates to a variety of voters and issues, thus requiring that a successful candidate demonstrate an ability to be responsive on a variety of subjects.

Third, no state should be allowed to hold its primary or caucus outside the official opening of the calendar unless it or another state afforded the same privilege has representative diversity and high union density.

Finally, while reflecting the previous points, the candidates should be designed with an eye toward financial constraints facing candidates and the party during the presidential election cycle.

Mindful of the Gore campaign, the 2004 primary schedule was front-loaded to ensure that the eventual nominee would accumulate delegates early and have a cash reserve to fight the inevitable Republican attacks after the nomination had been decided. The just concern was that the federal matching rules contained a spending limit that would leave the nominee vulnerable to Republican attacks once the spending limit had been reached.

The front-loading succeeded in speeding up the nomination process. By week 7, more than 50 percent of the delegates had already been allocated. Compare this result to 1976, a year in which 50 percent of the delegates were not allocated until week 16.

However, the federal matching program is broken, as exemplified by the decision of two candidates, including the eventual nominee, to forego matching funds, allowing unlimited primary spending. It seems doubtful that candidates, having seen the outcome of 2004, will choose to accept matching funds. No longer bound by federal spending limitations, the financial imperative to conclude the nomination as possible seems less likely.

In fact, the AFL-CIO believes front-loading is a detriment to the process and ultimately hurts the quality of the eventual nominee. With a longer calendar, the candidates engage significant early time in both retail and broad-based campaigning, both crucial skills for the general election. Moreover, this process rewards consistency and candidates who wear well with the public.

However, as the past often shows, the impact of campaign finance consideration often differs dramatically from expectations. Although we would like to see a longer process, we are mindful of the need to carefully consider the financial impact.

**DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE
COMMISSION ON PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION TIMING AND SCHEDULING
July 16th, 2005**

Page 19 of 42

The ideal calendar should be designed so that the candidate must be responsive to a variety of voters and issues early in the nominating process. However the calendar is designed, this diversity must occur before any candidate could acquire the momentum to make his or her nomination a foregone conclusion.

The traditional schedule has merits, but one weakness is that the earliest states do not represent the electorate as a whole. They are even worse at representing the traditional Democratic vote. The current process lacks the diversity consistent with the ideals of the Democratic Party.

For example, in 2004 21 percent of John Kerry's general election vote came from African Americans. In the New Hampshire primary only 1 percent of the voters were African American. In the Iowa caucuses there were so few minority caucus-goers that the exit pollsters did not even bother to include race in their survey. The statistics are similar for the Latino vote. In the New Hampshire primary a mere 1 percent of voters were Latino, while 9 percent of Kerry's vote in the general election came from Latino voters.

With statistics like these, it is conceivable, even rational, that a candidate does not need to demonstrate any ability to connect with base communities to win the nomination. At a time in which Republicans are making incremental but serious inroads into traditional Democratic base constituencies, the nominating process cannot be allowed to produce a nominee that has not proven his or her ability to connect with and motivate base audiences.

As I stated earlier, no state should be allowed to hold its primary or caucus outside the official opening of the calendar unless another state or states with representative diversity and high union density is afforded the same privilege. As he did among African Americans and Latinos, John Kerry got a significantly greater percentage of his general election vote from union households than were present at Iowa caucuses or the

New Hampshire primary. A full 30 percent of Kerry's general election vote came from union households, while only 23 percent of Iowa and New Hampshire voters live in a union household. Union members are currently underrepresented early in the nomination process, giving candidates less incentive to talk about the issues that matter to workers. The labor political program proves that talking to workers about issues they care about works. By communicating with our members on these issues, the AFL-CIO convinced millions to vote for a Democrat based on their interests.

White men are one example. In 2004 white male AFL-CIO members voted for John Kerry by a margin of over 20 percentage points, 59 percent to 38 percent. White males who did not live in a union household voted for Bush 66 percent to 33 percent. Why such a difference? The AFL-CIO makes sure its members know the differences between the candidates on the issues. In 2004 our members were very clear on the economic and security differences and priorities between the two candidates.

It is up to the nominee to make this same case among non-union workers. Too often, as in 2004, the nominee fails to make the case in critical areas. Most frequently, economic issues are given short shrift and non-union workers, unlike their union counterparts, do not hear enough about the Democratic nominee's plans to create good jobs and strengthen the economy.

Currently the schedule forces candidates to devote a disproportionate amount of time to issues that, while important in their right, tend to eclipse many issues that are tremendously important to all workers. This is why it is so critical that any changes to the calendar include union-dense states early in the nomination process. This would require all candidates to both address and appreciate a wide range of issues that are critical to both union and non-union workers. Candidates that do so well in such states will have demonstrated their ability to appeal to

**DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE
COMMISSION ON PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION TIMING AND SCHEDULING
July 16th, 2005**

Page 20 of 42

workers, a necessary component to a general election victory.

We want a nominee who will inspire workers to vote their interests and this is how to make it happen. Importantly, there are a number of states that are both union-dense and battleground states. Having one of these states early gives the ultimate nominee a leg up in the general, having already established an organization and positive favorability well before the general election.

I want to thank you once again for the opportunity to express our views, and this was done after consulting with all of the unions of the AFL-CIO, and I look forward to an improved nomination process that helps our nominee. America's workers and their families. Thank you.

CO-CHAIR HERMAN: Thank you very much, President Sweeney.

I will now turn to Commission members for questions that they have of Commission member President Sweeney. Harold Ickes and then Michael Stratton.

MR. ICKES: Mr. Sweeney, this is somewhat tangential to your testimony, which I think assumed pretty much the calendar as we know it. But as we look back – and I understand that each one of these presidential processes are sui generis and they are unique. But as you look back at '04, our general election was 7 months. Our nominee was known by the end of, probably by the middle of March, but surely by the end of March, so we had April, May, June, July, August, September, and October.

Putting aside some of the practicalities and legal considerations which I know come to play, do you think that's sort of a goofy system and that we ought to think about moving the whole calendar, starting it much later and ending it much sooner before the general election than we do now?

MR. SWEENEY: I think that there are

considerations to move the calendar and to have a shorter campaign. But I do think that it is important that we consider the diversity and the density issues up front. Assuming that including in the primaries, in the early primaries and caucuses, that in addition to those states that are early that we should also have greater focus on the diversity.

As we've heard from some of the earlier panelists, focusing on the Latino and Asian and African American, I think that that's a major part of our supporters that is not involved in the early decision-making. I think that we have to find a better way to recognize the diversity issues. I would add to the ethnic diversity, of course, that union-dense states have also to play a strong role.

CO-CHAIR HERMAN: I'm going to turn to Michael Stratton and then I want to recognize Maria Echaveste and Terry Shumaker. Michael.

MR. STRATTON: Mr. Sweeney, I get the elongated process and you're very clear on that. But as you know, below the surface as we sort of dance with one another here is this whole issue of Iowa and New Hampshire in specific. Was it just inferential or do you have a belief that Iowa and New Hampshire need to go or be changed in terms of their prominence in the schedule?

MR. SWEENEY: No, I'm not suggesting that Iowa and New Hampshire should be changed. What I am saying is that I don't think -- that I think there should be other states as well early on that would focus on diversity, the diversity that we heard expressed earlier in the panel, but also that there be states with union density. I think that we need to have those constituencies expressing themselves and raising their issues with the candidates early on in the campaign.

CO-CHAIR HERMAN: Maria.

MS. ECHAVESTE: President Sweeney, you mentioned and spoke about the relationship with the primary calendar and campaign finance and the opting out of a couple of the

**DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE
COMMISSION ON PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION TIMING AND SCHEDULING
July 16th, 2005**

Page 21 of 42

candidates. Do you have some thoughts about what impacts a longer period of selection, so that you're not so front-loaded, say, over a three-month period, what kind of impact that would have on candidates' ability to raise money, to be able to husband their resources so they can use them more effectively? Have you some thoughts about that?

MR. SWEENEY: Well, there are many around this table who are more familiar with the financing than Sweeney is. But it's safe to say that we have to take, while we're going through this whole process, that we have to take a very close look at financing and its impact in terms of a long campaign versus a shorter campaign, in terms of a primary versus the general election. I raise some of these issues just to make sure that it's a part of our discussions and our further considerations here in terms of the kind of report and recommendations we would be making.

CO-CHAIR HERMAN: Terry Shumaker.

MR. SHUMAKER: Thank you, Madam Chairman.

Mr. Sweeney, thank you for your testimony. I would like to talk about the interrelationship of two of your points, the front-loading or elongating the calendar and the issue of who goes first.

We in New Hampshire, as I believe almost everybody on this Commission, if not everybody, support getting more diversity earlier in the nominating calendar. The other points that you raised about union participation, as the executive director of the largest labor union in New Hampshire, who has worked very closely with numerous of your affiliates in New Hampshire recently and very proudly to elect a Democratic governor that testified before this commission at the last meeting -- wouldn't bringing the calendar back to something more spread out, more like 1992, the last time we elected a Democratic President without an incumbent in the White House,

wouldn't that address many of the concerns that you have raised with regard to union member participation?

Our state has 23 percent union membership participating in the Democratic Party. That isn't that much off the national average. But in '92 Governor Clinton did not get a grasp of the nomination until much later. He was a better candidate for it. He didn't win our primary, I would remind everybody, but he did talk a tremendous amount about jobs and economic issues in our state. He had to win big, dense union states such as Illinois, Michigan, and New York before he succeeded in becoming the nominee.

So my question to you, Mr. Sweeney, is if we are successful, if we attack this problem, in coming up with a way to make the calendar longer, which you have recommended, which Mr. From from the Democratic Leadership Council in his letter to the Commission has recommended, and numerous other witnesses have, wouldn't that address most of the concerns that you've raised?

MR. SWEENEY: It would certainly address some of the concerns. I think that there are other considerations that we should be exploring as well, and I do think that the diversity issue is a major, major issue and the focus on workers' issues, not just for organized workers but for unorganized workers as well. We have found in a lot of our work that -- we have formed a new union that is reaching out to unorganized workers and the focus has been on political issues and electing candidates to office who are worker-friendly and who have a record of accountability. It's clear in all of our polling and our focus groups that unorganized workers living next door to organized workers have similar interests when it comes to jobs, health care, retirement security, and the economy. It's important that we focus on unorganized workers in a political campaign to build our support. And NEA does a good job.

MR. SHUMAKER: Thank you. I will convey that.

**DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE
COMMISSION ON PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION TIMING AND SCHEDULING
July 16th, 2005**

Page 22 of 42

CO-CHAIR PRICE: Thank you, Mr. Sweeney. We appreciate your testimony. We look forward to continuing to talk with you and work with you.

MR. SWEENEY: Thank you.

SENATOR LEVIN: Can I clarify? I don't know if you have more time.

CO-CHAIR PRICE: Excuse me?

SENATOR LEVIN: Is there time for an additional question for Mr. Sweeney?

CO-CHAIR PRICE: For you, Senator, we'll take time for an additional question. No, please, please. Let's take another minute.

SENATOR LEVIN: I just wanted him to clarify. The first point that I heard you say, as I understand what you said, is that there should be no allowance for any state to go outside of the window unless other states more diverse also are allowed to go with them. Is that -- did I hear that correctly?

MR. SWEENEY: Yes.

SENATOR LEVIN: Because when you addressed Mr. Stratton's answer I heard something a little, that I thought was different. I just wanted to make sure that that point that you made at the beginning is your first point. Then would you then clarify that or just expand on that, why you believe that? Is it as good to have states, more than two states out of the window, as it is to have all states in the window? Between those two options, more than two states in front of the window versus all states in the window, you have a preference between those two?

MR. SWEENEY: I think that the process should be fair, and what I was focusing on was that if an exception's going to be made for one then it has to be offered to others as well.

SENATOR LEVIN: But as between having exceptions to the window or no exceptions

to the window, is there a preference between those two?

MR. SWEENEY: Right. That's up to the Commission.

(Laughter)

CO-CHAIR HERMAN: You're now speaking as a Commission member.

SENATOR LEVIN: You'll put that hat on later.

(Laughter)

CO-CHAIR PRICE: Don Fowler has a request.

MR. FOWLER: Mr. Sweeney, I just want a copy of your testimony, if I can get it from you or Karen?

CO-CHAIR HERMAN: I think staff will provide the testimony of all speakers that have come before the Commission today.

CO-CHAIR PRICE: I'll take this opportunity to also say that there are some organizations that did not appear here today, that could not come. But we do have a statement, for example, from the DLC. We will have others. So all of this will be distributed.

Thank you, Mr. Sweeney.

MR. SWEENEY: Thank you.

CO-CHAIR PRICE: I'd now like to call forward my friend and colleague Bill Jefferson. Congressman Jefferson from Louisiana represents the Second District of Louisiana. He's currently serving his eighth term in the House. A North Carolina colleague, Mel Watt, is currently the chair of the Congressional Black Caucus. He could not be here today, but Bill Jefferson has graciously agreed to bring the Black Caucus's statement to us.

We want to welcome you, Jeff. Thank you for coming and we'll hear from you at this time.

**DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE
COMMISSION ON PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION TIMING AND SCHEDULING
July 16th, 2005**

Page 23 of 42

PRESENTATION OF HON. BILL
JEFFERSON

MR. JEFFERSON: Thank you very much. Members of the Commission, Madam Chair, the Co-Chairs, and other members who are here: I want to thank my chairman, Mel Watt, for giving me the opportunity to come before this committee to present the views of the Black Caucus on this issue and to be a part of this very important discussion about the Democratic Party's presidential primaries and the nominating process and the schedule.

The Democratic nominations process and schedule have been the source of much frustration and criticism since at least 1968. Some of our members thought that the problems had been cured when the Delegate Selection Commission established by 1972 nominee George McGovern, chaired by now-Senator Barbara Mikulski, made its recommendations. Representative James Clyburn, now a member of the CBC, served on that commission and recalled a few days ago as part of our discussion leading to this moment that we thought we had solved the problems back then, but looking back, he says, it seems we may have created more problems than we solved. Recent results highlight clear deficiencies with the schedule and the method by which our party selects its nominee for President. These concerns are in three major areas: the lack of ethnic and economic diversity within the early primary states, which often have the greatest influence in determining which candidate gets the nomination; primary state front-loading; and inadequate time and opportunity for discussion of issues.

The current process continues to make citizens, particularly minority citizens, feel that their votes don't matter as much as the votes of voters in primary states with early primaries. In 2000, Vice President Al Gore had locked up the nomination by March 7th and at that time only 17 states had held their primaries or caucuses. This phenomenon was repeated in 2004. In the eyes of the

media and for all practical purposes, John Kerry had secured the Democratic nomination by March 2nd, Super Tuesday. However, only 17 states and the District of Columbia had held their primaries. The 18 states that in essence determined the Democratic Party's 2004 nominee for President included only 20 percent of the American people and, of greater concern to the Black Caucus, only 5 of those states had African American populations greater than 12.3 percent, somewhat reflective of the African American percentage in the United States.

But it should be pointed out that, with between 80 and 90 percent of African American voters voting for the Democratic nominee every year, the effective participation of African Americans in influencing the Democratic nomination ought to be somewhere near 25 percent, because with the country evenly divided half and half that's the effect of the partnership between African Americans and the Democratic Party, a 25 percent partnership more or less.

Now, I'm from a southern state and more than half of the African Americans who vote in this country are found in the southern states. The rest are in a few cities in the Northeast and in the Midwest. But more than half easily are in the South, and the result of the process has been that before you ever get into those states that matter it's over with. So you can see how the greatest number of African Americans in the country never get a chance to participate at all in the nominating process. And as things have gone on with these campaigns that you've seen, at the end of the day they don't get to participate in the campaign either when that's all done, because that seems to be, for some reason or other, a written-off part of the country.

So it's clear that the current system does not reflect the diversity of the Democratic Party, and because it does not it continues to perpetuate the belief that the votes of some individuals, particularly the votes of minorities, do not matter or count as much.

**DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE
COMMISSION ON PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION TIMING AND SCHEDULING
July 16th, 2005**

Page 24 of 42

This needs to be changed to give a broader range of Democratic voters an opportunity to express their thoughts and meet the candidates. This would allow all voters to feel and indeed be an important part of the system and to know that their votes and opinions are valued and that the eventual nominee is someone who has a broad base of support among all factions and groups within the Democratic Party.

The members of the Congressional Black Caucus would encourage the Commission to consider some of the principles found in the 1999 Vanishing Voter Project at Harvard University. We believe that the following three principles are essential to helping the Democratic Party revamp its nominations process and place greater value on the diversity of its membership:

One, having greater diversity, racial and economic, in the early primary states; two, creating a nomination process that remains competitive for a longer period of time, in order to give the public a greater opportunity to engage and learn about the candidates and to engage in a more thorough discussion of the issues and how they affect various constituencies; and finally, creating a system that increases the likelihood that voters in all states will have an effective voice in the selection of the party's nominee.

These recommendations do not require that we get caught up in which state is first and which state comes after debate. We see a lot of that going on with state legislatures and state parties trying to find a way to get in the process by nudging ahead of the last state. But we do believe that this would be counterproductive. We think, though, that creating regional windows would help define expectations, redefine them, help increase the dialogue and exchange of ideas, and help establish credibility with the African American population, and establish criteria by which candidates can be better judged.

These are the views that I have been asked to convey to this Commission by the Black Caucus and I thank you for considering the views of the CBC. Thank you very much.

CO-CHAIR PRICE: Thank you very much, Congressman Jefferson. Do we have questions from Commissioners? Harold Ickes.

MR. ICKES: Congressman, thank you for your statement. I'm sympathetic to much of what you've said. I guess I have a problem in how to achieve what I think you want, in which you said voters in all states should have a voice in choosing the nominee. By that I assume you mean an effective voice. When you look at the '04 calendar, of the 56 jurisdictions that selected delegates to the '04 convention, 38 of those were primaries and 18 were so-called caucuses. Debbie and I have been having a discussion here offline as to whether Michigan is a caucus or a primary. Phil listed it as a party-run primary.

CO-CHAIR HERMAN: We really need to get that cleared up for the record.

MR. ICKES: I'm not sure you want all this in the record.

(Laughter)

MR. ICKES: 85 percent of the delegates elected at the district level, the so-called district level, came from primary states and 14.8 percent came from caucus states in '04. But if you -- it's fairly easy -- I think implicit in what you are saying, Congressman, is you're really asking this Commission to take a very strong hand, not only in who goes first, but in laying out a complete calendar, because if you have a bunch of big states that go early by definition they're going to shut down the process. So if you want, whatever the window is, if you want virtually all the states to have an effective voice in the selection of the nominee, it seems to me implicit in what you're saying is you're asking this Commission to take a very strong hand and virtually dictate a calendar that would be substantially, substantially different from what we saw in '04 and what we've had in '02 and '96, etcetera.

**DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE
COMMISSION ON PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION TIMING AND SCHEDULING
July 16th, 2005**

Page 25 of 42

MR. JEFFERSON: I'm not sure whether you get to where we are talking where we want you to go by dictating this or the other. It might be that there can be some agreement reached amongst you that will be short of that being described as the methodology. But I do believe – and my views are frankly presented in a very narrow way. You present them in a much more overarching environment.

But we simply at the end of the day, however it's achieved, get to the point that most of the African American voters in this country will have a stay because at the end of the day they'll be a 25 percent partner with the Democratic Party in electing the President. That's been the history. So there ought to be at least that much in the process of nominating. How that's achieved and the methodology of it, all the rest, I don't come to offer a conclusion on that yet. I think we can think about that and perhaps be in a position to do that. But right now we simply want to alert you to the fact that we feel that it's important that that consideration be at the heart of what is being decided by this Commission and by others who have a say in the scheduling of the process that at the end of the day selects our nominee.

MR. ICKES: Well, if I may, not necessarily as a question but just as a follow-up comment. Right now our system is a *laissez faire* system and states decide the calendar. That's the long and the short of it. We impose a window with a couple of exceptions, but within that window it is up to state legislatures, state legislatures, to decide when they're going to run their particular state system.

It seems to me that if we're talking about really more states having an effective voice, however that's defined, I wouldn't necessarily be against it, but that's a pretty tall order.

CO-CHAIR PRICE: Secretary Herman?

CO-CHAIR HERMAN: Thank you, Congressman Price. Welcome, Congressman Jefferson. And I also want to

acknowledge the presence of Mrs. Jefferson, who is with us today. Congressman, before you arrived we had a very insightful presentation by Andre Pineda giving us really more texture around what is going on with the Latino vote today. We had a lively response by Commission member Temo Figueroa on just the geographic mix of the Latino vote in terms of how we have traditionally looked at pockets of population.

You mentioned earlier in your testimony that the population numbers of course of African Americans in the southeastern region, particularly the southern tier of the United States, of course, is very dense, yet as a party we have not traditionally of course in recent years spent as much time and effort in cultivating southern states and certainly African Americans in particular who live in those states.

What is your view as we look at the calendar in the future, as we look at the significance of the African American vote, of how we should think about southern states in particular?

MR. JEFFERSON: I think it's been a huge mistake writing off the southern part of the country, and it's been huge disappointment to African American voters, who are simply left out of the process of selecting a President, and even for having an effective voice in electing a President once one is nominated. So this whole idea of -- in my state of Louisiana, for instance, in 1992 and in 1996 President Clinton won the state, and we believe that could have been repeated in subsequent elections. But for some reason or the other we've found ourselves in the position where we don't run the election to cover enough states at the end of the day, and we started drawing back to just enough states to win and we leave out places where we can have real effect later on.

If President Clinton had left Louisiana in late September when there was some argument that he should have, he wouldn't have won the state. But he stayed there because he understood that the vote he's depending on

**DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE
COMMISSION ON PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION TIMING AND SCHEDULING
July 16th, 2005**

Page 26 of 42

kind of comes together a little late, pays attention perhaps later than others, and coalesces around the issues a little later. So he stayed there and he won.

We were in October -- talking about my state, in October when Vice President Gore was running we were within 3 or 4 points of President Bush at the time. But for whatever reason, they decided that wasn't good enough and kind of moved out to some other places, making some critical decisions that they would do better in I suppose maybe in larger places or whatever. But the bottom line is if better than half of the African American vote, I think nearly 60 percent of it, is in southern states, if African Americans are going to be a part of this process in a meaningful way, then both the nominating process and subsequently the election process must take them into account in real ways. Otherwise it really causes a great deal of dissatisfaction and at the end disaffection amongst the ranks of African American voters from the Democratic Party and that is not good for the Democratic Party's future.

It also leads people who want to find a way to participate, I think, to have the other party find real ways to make inroads, and that is what we see happening more and more with various narrow issues that are making a difference now.

CO-CHAIR PRICE: Well, Bill, let me just have a follow-up question about South Carolina in particular. You indicated Congressman Clyburn has a lively interest in this, some very strong ideas, and those ideas I'm sure are reflected in your statement. The whole idea of the early scheduling of South Carolina and the kind of focus that was placed on it last time was partly designed to address the concerns you expressed. How would you evaluate that? In what ways did that help? In what ways did it fall short?

MR. JEFFERSON: Well, frankly, it helped, but by the time we got to South Carolina even, for all the purposes that were practical things were over with. I just think that you have to somehow find a way to have a

longer period before the selection is decided, and that period must include a broader range of states, not just one of them, and they must be involved at a point where they actually can make a difference in the decision about who the nominee is.

CO-CHAIR PRICE: Jim Roosevelt.

MR. ROOSEVELT: Congressman, thank you very much for your remarks and for the interest of the caucus. I'd like to make just two quick comments. One is that your remarks are very consistent with Chairman Dean's commitment to a 50-state process, and that is being implemented not just in this consideration here, but in the staffing of state parties from the DNC level which is taking place now, rather than three years from now. So I think it goes very well together. The second is I just point out, with respect to South Carolina, that while there are a number of definitions of "party-run primary," South Carolina is another party-run primary. That is a factor that we have to take into account as we look at this calendar here. Some primaries in addition to some caucuses are organized and financed by state parties, which require particular considerations for financing and notice and so on.

CO-CHAIR PRICE: Any other questions for Congressman Jefferson?

No response.)

CO-CHAIR PRICE: All right. Bill -- oh, I'm sorry.

MR. FOWLER: I just want to make an observation. Congressman Jefferson, it's good to see you again.

MR. JEFFERSON: Thank you, sir.

MR. FOWLER: He's one of God's really good people, I want to tell you. For those of you who don't know him personally, he's a wonderful fellow. I've looked from my own memory -- there might be some errors in here in one or two places --

**DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE
COMMISSION ON PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION TIMING AND SCHEDULING
July 16th, 2005**

Page 27 of 42

MR. ICKES: Don, you have to pull the mike closer.

MR. FOWLER: I don't think it's on. Is it?

CO-CHAIR HERMAN: Yes, it's on. Speak into it.

MR. FOWLER: I might have made one or two errors with respect to states, but in almost none of the states that have the highest percentage of African American populations were they included among the targeted states in the '04 campaign, almost none of them. There are some states that have high concentrations of African American populations in particular cities, like Detroit or Michigan and Ohio. But in terms of the statewide population -- Louisiana was targeted for a while and taken out. Florida was, stayed in. But those are the only two states with high African American population that were among the targeted states.

CO-CHAIR HERMAN: Statewide. I would suggest that in order to make sure that we do have a Democratic Party that's viable in all states, we have to have a policy at the DNC level that puts the resources there, as Governor Dean has indicated. Also, I think we have to look at this process of nominating our presidential candidate to encourage greater Democratic activity in those states that have a percentage of African American population.

I can go on with other kinds of indications of the health of the party, but in most of those states that have very high percentages of African American population they have majority Republicans in their Congressional delegations, they have one or two Republicans in the United States Senate, and they have Republican governors. It is a crying need on the part of the party generally. It's not just a southern problem. It's not just a southern problem.

It affects the health of the party nationally. Congressman, thank you for your comments. I think they are well taken and we need to listen.

MR. JEFFERSON: Thank you, sir.

CO-CHAIR PRICE: Thank you.

MR. JEFFERSON: You're very welcome.

CO-CHAIR PRICE: We appreciate your being here.

CO-CHAIR HERMAN: Thank you very much, Bill.

MR. JEFFERSON: Thank you, Madam Chair.

CO-CHAIR PRICE: We now turn to our friend Curtis Gans, if he'll come forward. He's the Director and has been for many years of the Center for the Study of the American Electorate. That center is now based at American University here in the District. Over 25 years, I think it is, Curtis has built a reputation as one of the country's preeminent experts on voter turnout and participation and a primary source of information for many reporters, newspapers, wire services. He's a frequently quoted pundit, but he's also a man who knows what he's talking about by virtue of the analysis and the work that his center has undertaken. So, Curtis, we appreciate your being here. If you'll briefly summarize your statement and then we'll include the full text in our hearing record.

**PRESENTATION OF CURTIS GANS,
DIRECTOR, CENTER FOR THE STUDY
OF THE AMERICAN WAY**

MR. GANS: Well, I want to thank both you and Secretary Herman for inviting me here, the rest of you for putting up with me, and you know who to blame. I have -- as Harold (Ickes) knows in particular, this set of issues sort of started in 1968. He and I had a little to do with the formation of the Harold Hughes Commission. The first time I testified was to the McGovern Commission in 1969. And we haven't gotten it right yet. I think the problems that we face, though, are four. One is front-loading and rushing to decision within a month. The second is

**DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE
COMMISSION ON PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION TIMING AND SCHEDULING
July 16th, 2005**

Page 28 of 42

grouping our primaries into mega-primaries. The third is not permitting by virtue of long prior to contests filing deadlines late-entering candidacies. The fourth is campaign finance limitations. They all conspire together.

If you're going to have a primary system in which results are within a month, in which you have to run in mega-states, in which certain early states become more important by virtue of the fact that you have to run in mega-states, you have to raise 25 to \$30 million in advance. If you can only do that at a maximum of 1 to \$2,000 per head, you are advantaging those people who are rich, who are famous, or who have access, broad access to interest group money. You are forcing people to start their campaigns at least a year before a single vote is cast. You are creating by virtue of that a long ersatz campaign in which people get judged by their gaffs and by how much money they raise rather than by their ideas and their votes, and the press becomes a much -- truly important part of the process.

You then go to two contests, and I don't think -- we'll get to that later, which two contests are early -- that are intense, that are grassroots, but that by virtue of being followed by mega-contests essentially are exaggerated in importance. The winner of Iowa and New Hampshire in a race in which the next contest has 20 states and you're going to make a decision within a month has an enormous advantage over any other, any other candidate. Nobody can catch up with either the publicity or the money that is going to flow to that candidate.

You're then going into these mega-primaries which put an emphasis on the worst aspects of American politics, which is television advertising and tarmac campaigns, and makes almost impossible the best aspects of American politics, which is retail campaigning. You make a judgment within month, which is not adequate time for any candidate to be fully tested, and we're talking about the most important office of the most powerful nation on Earth.

If that candidate proves somewhat inadequate, you don't have any recourse in late-entering candidates to make possible a change. You have rendered the convention a meaningless publicity exercise, where it could be helpful in bringing together both decisions and unity. What we have created is the worst of all possible worlds. You can look at the 2004 process. We made a decision within a month and the theory was we would have all this time to organize and define the issues. But people had to spend too much money, so that essentially the other side got to define the issues. We emerged with a candidate that was untested and we lost the advantage of the debate within the party about the nominee that was sending President Bush's popularity down incrementally every week.

I believe that we need finally to get it right. To my mind, getting it right deals with four fundamental principles: have a long enough track so that people will be tested in a variety of situations over a variety of time and we can then be confident that we will have a nominee that's worthy of the office and able to carry the party's message.

Secondly, create a system which puts a maximum amount of emphasis, surely in the early stages, but as much throughout the process, in retail campaigning, in involving people in grassroots activity.

Thirdly, do change the filing deadlines so that people do not have to enter at the beginning. Create a system where people have flexibility and the party has flexibility and that we have an answer to our mistakes in process.

Create a system that is durable, that we do not have to re-invent every time. Create a system that is not rotating, because many primaries are tied -- many state offices are tied to primary dates and you don't want to have to change that ever four years. Back in 2000, as Jimmy Roosevelt knows, I was backing the Delaware plan. I was backing the Delaware plan because it gave us a principle of organizing the primary process that did not require large amounts

**DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE
COMMISSION ON PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION TIMING AND SCHEDULING
July 16th, 2005**

Page 29 of 42

of money to be raised, where it made it possible for people to get in the game and then use the process in the game to raise money and to develop organization. It emphasized retail campaigning.

With the exception of the Latino community, it essentially involved minorities, because Rhode Island is a small state and Delaware is a small state, and unions in other places. I'm not wedded to that -- I'm not wedded to the Delaware plan, although I think it's a very good plan. I'm wedded to finding a principle that elongates the process, allows for retail politics, provides the party flexibility, and maybe even provides the party with the opportunity for convention decision.

We need not think that conventions have to be 1968 and 1972. An interesting convention probably would help the party rather than hurt the party. I would welcome -- Secretary Herman, you asked the question about the southern states to me at the end of this. But that's my message: Find a system that gives this party the flexibility, opens the opportunity for the maximum number of people, provides an incentive for grassroots, and gives us a long enough track to make a judgment so that we are sure that our nominee is the best nominee. Thank you.

CO-CHAIR PRICE: Thank you. Any questions? Yes, Don Fowler and then Steve.

MR. FOWLER: If you combined your first two points, you have a process that's spread out, that's not front-loaded, and you have states that are relatively small and therefore susceptible to retail politics --

MR. GANS: But your state's one of those.

MR. FOWLER: Yes. I would approve of that, clearly. I still question whether you could get to the ultimate goal that you're looking for because of the way the media intervenes in this process. Iowa and New Hampshire are relatively small states, at least in terms of population, and it's my judgment that the impact that they have is

not because of the great wisdom of the people in Iowa and New Hampshire, but because the media play the importance of those two states so greatly that it just warps the rest of the process. How do you deal with that?

MR. GANS: Well, the way you deal with that from my point of view is the way the Republicans dealt with it in 2000. If you remember, there was a fellow by the name of John McCain that got enormous publicity for whopping George Bush in New Hampshire. One week later or ten days later, John McCain got whopped in a state called South Carolina. The way you deal with Iowa and New Hampshire -- and I have a great partiality for New Hampshire since I was able to put a certain candidate on the map in 1968 in New Hampshire -- is by following them fairly closely with sequential individual primaries in which whatever the publicity they got that week becomes something different the next week. If you make group primaries, then that media attention becomes enormously important. If you follow with individual primaries and caucuses, it becomes not very important and the battle over New Hampshire and Iowa becomes unimportant. They can be first so long as you follow it with other things very shortly afterward that are individual and manageable and can change the character of press coverage.

CO-CHAIR PRICE: We'll have two more questions before we move on. Steve and then Harold.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Gans, I want to ask you a question about the fundraising implications of your suggestions. In 2004 Howard Dean had raised and spent \$40 million by the time we got through the grassroots states, Iowa and New Hampshire. John Kerry had spent, raised and spent \$30 million. Neither one of them had spent any appreciable amount of money in any other states on organizing or radio and television advertising. I don't understand how by stretching the process out we would somehow or other change the financial realities of the campaign.

**DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE
COMMISSION ON PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION TIMING AND SCHEDULING
July 16th, 2005**

Page 30 of 42

MR. GANS: Okay. Iowa and New Hampshire don't become as important, okay. I mean, Kerry was right to recognize that he needed to borrow \$6 million of his own dollars because of the importance in this situation of winning those places because you're going to go to the mega-primaries. What we used to do 30 and 40 years ago is -- and I can speak from my experience in the McCarthy campaign in '68. We spent a total of \$500,000 in New Hampshire. Now, that would be about \$2 million in present dollars, but it's not your 25 or \$40 million. That gave us the opportunity to raise money for the next contest, which was Wisconsin, about two weeks later. And you just didn't have that in-advance fundraising necessity. If you set up a system of sequential individual primaries, I believe and I hope there will be some individuals who won't go into New Hampshire, who will choose their first contest to be South Carolina or, as Jimmy Carter did, Florida. But that's only possible if you do sequential individual primaries.

CO-CHAIR PRICE: Harold.

MR. ICKES: Thank you. Curtis, since my question of Congressman Jefferson, part of it was missed, just to recite the facts: In '04, of the 56 jurisdictions that selected delegates, 38 of those were primaries and they selected 85.2 percent, give or take, of the so-called district delegates. Of those primaries, of those 38 primaries, I'm including, just so that we understand, New Mexico, which was a party-run primary, South Carolina, which was a party-run primary, Michigan, which Mrs. Dingell and I are having a dispute as to whether it's a party-run primary or not, D.C., which I guess some people call it a party-run primary, and Utah, which was a party-run primary. But it seems to me what both you and Congressman Jefferson are very strongly suggesting to this Commission is that we abandon the laissez faire system that we have on since the beginning of time and which is impacted very dramatically by state law and that we choose a calendar that in our wisdom -- and forgetting unintended

consequences for the moment -- is sort of an ideal calendar and we tell states: This is when you're going to do it and if state law doesn't permit it you, California, are going to run a state-run primary. The same with New York, etcetera. I may not be necessarily against that, but I just want to understand the implications of what you're laying out. That's question one. Question two is would you briefly address my question about a six to seven-month general election that I posed to the Congressman?

MR. GANS: Let me do that one first because I think that's a total disaster, a six to seven-month general election. It is an enormous waste of resources. It undermines the benefits of the focus on the party during the pre-nomination period. The fact is that the public as a whole tends to focus on elections between Labor Day and November, and that's where you want to concentrate your resources. Is that a satisfactory answer?

MR. ICKES: Well, there are implications, but it's a satisfactory answer.

MR. GANS: Okay. On your other question, I would hope that this Commission and Mr. Roosevelt's committee and then the DNC will come forward with an organizing principle, set of principles. I think it's a little early to make a judgment as to whether you want to exert the force of the party, and the reason I say it's a little early is for two reasons, one of which is people may come to the conclusion that this is a good idea and you can through the normal process of lobbying get changes made. But the other is that in 2000 we came very close in both parties to adopting something like the Delaware plan and it essentially got shot down by the presidential candidates -- is this right, Jimmy? Jim? Jim, is this right? It got essentially shot down by the presidential candidates. Something like the Delaware plan got essentially shot down by Vice President Gore about a month before the convention and by then-Governor Bush about a day before his convention, which is to say I think there is a community of interest in both political parties in rationalizing this.

**DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE
COMMISSION ON PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION TIMING AND SCHEDULING
July 16th, 2005**

Page 31 of 42

So that there might be, and I hope there will be a bipartisan impetus to state legislation. The only thing that I think we learned out of the 2000 experience is if you don't do it in the next two years it won't get done because it'll be part of the presidential process, political process, and I think you don't want that. Alexis, would you mind if I answered your other question? I don't think we are going to get a decent general election process until we take a very close look at the current operation of the winner take all system of the Electoral College. We have run two elections sequentially under exactly the same profile. Only 18 states were in play and one state could have changed whether a majority or plurality winner of the popular vote got to the presidency. I think that both of those things are dangerous for this country and I think we need to look at that very seriously.

CO-CHAIR HERMAN: Thank you very, very much, Curtis, for your remarks, for being with us today. I think it was very helpful. Thank you.

MR. GANS: Thank you.

CO-CHAIR HERMAN: I would now like to call forward the person who is going to represent the Congressional Women's Caucus and that of course is none other than Diane Feldman. Diane is the President of the Feldman Group, a highly regarded national political research firm, and of course Diane's clients have included everyone from the President of the United States to many organizations, including organized labor. Diane, thank you for being with us today.

PRESENTATION OF DIANE FELDMAN,
PRESIDENT, THE FELDMAN GROUP

MS. FELDMAN: Thank you, Secretary Herman, Representative Price, and Congresswoman Solis, for inviting me today.

It kind of goes without saying that, no matter what decision you make about the calendar, a majority of voters in that state will be women. About 60 percent of Democratic

primary voters are women. That is true in every state without exception. And about 60 percent of Democratic voters in the general election are women. So that I think probably considering women is not an immediate reflection on the calendar in any case.

I should also note about 60 percent of African American voters are women. Mr. Pineda tells me 52 percent of Latino voters are women and Ms. Lew tells me that a majority of Asian Pacific Islander voters are women. So I think it would be enormously difficult to exclude women regardless of what calendar you choose.

That being said, I did want to talk briefly about the importance of women as swing voters and as voters who look at values -- women are also a majority of swing voters -- and then speak briefly about the very different emphasis of women Democrats primary voters, who are very radically different than swing voters.

In the discussion of values and the importance of values, a lot of that has focused on women because they clearly rank values as an enormously important part of their decision making process in the candidate. In the Emily's List Women Vote Monitor recently completed, even while women were particularly distressed at the economy, 50 percent said that they consider values a more important dimension for them in looking at the future of the country. Only percent said economics and 19 percent said both.

The first thing I want to say about values is to be a little bit clear about the term, because there are four different concepts that we tend to embrace in the dialogue when we talk about values and yet I think it's the latter two that are important and the former two that often get more attention.

The first thing that we often mean by values is personal values. By that I mean the personal behavior that's exhibited by a candidate -- whether they go to church, how long they've been married, and what their personal beliefs may be. I don't think as a

**DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE
COMMISSION ON PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION TIMING AND SCHEDULING
July 16th, 2005**

Page 32 of 42

party we will ever win on being the party of the greater number of elected officials who exhibit appropriate personal behavior, nor do voters want that of us. In fact, in the same Emily's List survey women and men both listed very different values that were central to them as individuals and different values -- a different list of values in what they wanted from their elected officials. The personal values that Republican women listed tended to center on religion that Democratic women listed tended to center on taking care of people in need, and swing Women talked about family. And yet when we asked about the values that should be exhibited by elected officials, they talked about personal responsibility; and that they wanted elected officials to lead on were values of community. So those are very different and they come up with different answers.

The second thing that we tend to mean by values is needs. If you ask voters in focus groups what values are important to them, they are as likely to say education and health care as anything else. Having a good education, having access to health care, are in fact values and values that we've discussed as a party for some time.

The latter two definitions of values that I'm about to give are I think critically important in this discussion, particularly because I think they give us a way potentially to move from a more shallow definition of constituency politics to a more genuine sense of coalition politics, which I think is very different and perhaps an important consideration for the work of this Commission.

Definition number three of values is about ideals and beliefs. When the Republicans say this is still the best country on Earth, they are expressing a belief. When they say that's because we're a country of freedom, that's also expressing a belief. That's a level of dialogue that is equally important to men and women and not always a level of dialogue that we're considering when we talk about values.

The final, which I think is also a way to help us move from constituency to coalition politics, is about identity and how people define themselves, their role in their community, and their role in the world. While the values definition of ideals does not distinguish particularly between men and women, this final definition of identity does. Women, 46 percent of women on a scale of zero to five say that the notion that they take care of other people defines them. They choose a five on that, whereas only 24 percent of men do. The value of care giving is a particular value to women and is probably the underpinning of why so many of them vote Democratic. That is equally true of swing voter women and speaking to them on that level is important as we look at what values it is that they want us to relate to as a party. All of that was really to say that when we speak about women as a constituency in the general election speaking to them on the values level is critical and also the values level on those latter two definitions is probably critical in moving from constituency to coalition politics.

As I said, Democratic primary women are completely different. The very small percentage of women who choose to vote in Democratic primaries are not so much value voters as issue voters. The Emily's List Diary Project has been particularly useful in pointing to the very high level of sophistication that women primary voters show. They report making decisions on issue parameters, principally on issue parameters. They do also look at personal leadership qualities of effectiveness. They are dismissive of tactics which to them look disrespectful to them and they are particularly dismissive of or critical of negative advertising.

I should also note in the course of women Democratic primary voter discussions that they are largely resolution for what I call the January shift in the choice of our presidential nominee. The last two presidential cycles, we have seen a September surge for a candidate that was not ultimately the candidate of sort of a January judgment.

**DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE
COMMISSION ON PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION TIMING AND SCHEDULING
July 16th, 2005**

Page 33 of 42

The criteria change. It goes from authenticity to presidential quality. Also what happens in part is that non-college-educated women, who are a majority of women in the primary electorate, don't really engage until January and they are less interested in issues of authenticity and less interested in kind of representativeness of the party and more interested in the qualities of leadership and issue mix that they want to see in the next president, and their choice is often very different from those voters who engage in September.

So I know that everyone who has been through the primary process the last couple of times has noticed the criteria shift in January and I did just want to note that it is particularly non-college-educated women that produce that shift.

CO-CHAIR HERMAN: Thank you very, very much, Diane. Are there questions that we would have now for Diane from Commission members? Roxanne Conlin.

MS. CONLIN: Diane, help us to understand what the implications of your studying these issues are for us as a calendar commission. What things should we be looking for in our establishing of a calendar that will address the issues that you've been talking to us about?

MS. FELDMAN: I think that the others have really covered the need in the calendar to make sure that we talk to a variety of different kinds of people. I do think that the retail political interests of women are probably higher than the retail political interests of men in that preserving some notion of retail politics and seeing these candidates as individuals is particularly important, so that it does not simply become a media war in which, frankly, they have less interest.

CO-CHAIR HERMAN: Are there other questions?

(No response.)

CO-CHAIR HERMAN: Diane, could I ask you regarding the shift in the last election on non-college-educated women. Taking into account what you've just said about retail politics being more important for women generally, what would you say in particular moved that group of women?

MS. FELDMAN: Also, there was a similar shift in the 2000 election in the primary cycle as well. I'm not so sure that it's that they moved as that they wait longer to start to consider the candidates, that the interest on the part of activists, people who are affiliated with groups, starts much earlier than it does among other Democratic primary voters, and that the interest level in the candidates among non-college-educated Democratic women doesn't really begin until January. So the large percentage or larger percentage of undecided voters that you see in September in polling than you see in January is way disproportionately non-college-educated women, and they don't tend to make a decision about the progress of the party. They tend to make a decision about who they think can both serve as President and lead as President and become President, and that that produces a different dynamic for candidates beginning in January than we see in the late summer and the early fall.

CO-CHAIR HERMAN: Mike and then Don Fowler.

MR. STRATTON: Dr. Feldman, let me ask about a deeper question on this concept of the shift.

CO-CHAIR HERMAN: Mike, would you speak into your mike.

MR. STRATTON: Yes, ma'am. Yes, Madam Chair. Dr. Feldman, relative to the shift, you talked about our women voters being more impacted negatively by negative media, negative advertising. As this shift occurs September to January, are you able to discern whether that is driven by media, combination media and free press, or how that shift is driven? I guess that gets back at something that I went at Mr. Sweeney about,

**DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE
COMMISSION ON PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION TIMING AND SCHEDULING
July 16th, 2005**

Page 34 of 42

this whole issue of Iowa and New Hampshire and their importance in the process.

MS. FELDMAN: I think I understand your question. I don't think that the shift is necessarily driven by the campaign so much as it is driven by the voters, that there is a question for people who engage early about the party, what we stand for, politics, whatever frustrations they may have.

Both in 2000 and 2004 there was a lot of September conversation about what candidate represented authenticity as a value, for example. That was not a discussion in which a lot of the primary electorate, much less the general electorate, was engaged. So the value of authenticity and who is it as a personality who reflects our values as a party is a September conversation. Voters on their own, without input I think from the candidates or the media, in January kind of settle down and say, okay, we're choosing a President of the United States, the next commander-in-chief of our armed forces.

Authenticity goes way down on their list of what they're looking for and who in fact can serve in that role goes way up. Anyone who has been through that process I think noted it's just right after Christmas the criteria change, and they do so quite dramatically and sometimes a little bit surprisingly.

CO-CHAIR HERMAN: Our last question for Diane will be Don Fowler.

MR. FOWLER: My question is very similar to Mr. Stratton's. The people who make up their mind late in the process -- and I'm focusing specifically on women with this question -- are they demographically different from the people who participate in the nominating process? And if so, how?

MS. FELDMAN: There are three different time periods. There's the difference of those within the nominating process of when they make up their minds, and those people who make up their minds early in the nominating

process are different than those who make up their mind later in the nominating process. The early in the nominating process are much more likely to be members of a group. They are disproportionately male, although by no means majority male, and they are disproportionately college-educated and newspaper readers.

Those who make up their minds later in the nominating process -- and I'm really focusing on the early states here because I think there are other states where they wait until after Iowa and New Hampshire. But the January decision makers are overwhelmingly disproportionately women and overwhelmingly disproportionately women without college degrees. So the criterion shift as part of those. Then the general election swing-voting women are a completely different group yet again, who are obviously not sufficiently aligned with either party to have participated in the primary process at all and have a different set of values yet again that they are looking for.

I don't think you can even say that women who participate in Democratic primaries are representative of women who do not. They're not.

CO-CHAIR HERMAN: Thank you very, very much, Diane, for your insightful and always right on the point comments. Thank you. We're down to our last two presenters for the morning. But before moving to our spokesperson for Americans for Democratic Action, I want to recognize Jehmu Greene, who came in after the roll call. Jehmu is of course the President of Rock the Vote. She's been with us for most of the morning, so we welcome Commission member Jehmu Greene.

I'd like to call forward now Bruce Caswell, who is here on behalf of Americans for Democratic Action. Dr. Caswell is an Associate Professor at Rowan University, where he specializes in elections and political participation and urban and state politics and generally, I think it's fair to

**DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE
COMMISSION ON PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION TIMING AND SCHEDULING
July 16th, 2005**

Page 35 of 42

say, Bruce, American political thought.

**PRESENTATION OF BRUCE CASWELL,
AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION**

MR. CASWELL: Yes. Thank you, Secretary Herman and Representative Price, and members of the Commission, for the opportunity for ADA to present its views. Most of you probably know that ADA through its Executive Director, Amy Isaacs and previous Executive Director Leon Sholl and through others such as Carol Casey, who at one point worked for the DNC, and Professor Bill Crotty of Northeastern University and others, ADA has had a position and involvement in this issue going back to the 1960s.

The last time that we did this, four years ago I guess it was, we presented a very detailed proposal that was put together primarily by a group of political scientists and activists. Until last year at least, that proposal was on your website. I went looking for it last week and it's not there any more, but I'm sure someone on the staff could dig it out.

This year we have been following this process very carefully. Amy attended the first, your first session. She is unable to be here today because for family reasons and I'm sure she really regrets not being here. But we've been following this issue and we spent a lot of time, in fact a surprising amount of time, talking about it at our national convention in June.

We decided a couple of things. We decided first of all that this year we would not submit a detailed proposal, as we did in the last cycle, and we decided that we would not endorse a specific proposal, although there were some very creative ideas being floated about. We decided instead to adopt some principles which we thought would be helpful to you.

First of all, for us the most important issue is fairness. We don't think it's fair that the same small geographical group of people has a disproportionate influence on the process cycle after cycle. We also don't

think it's fair that this group is not demographically representative of the country, and we think it's probably politically unwise that this group is not demographically representative of the Democratic Party base, because you can't ignore your base indefinitely and expect them to continue to be loyal to you.

We have some suggestions for how we might solve this. First of all, we -- our position has been consistently, for as long as I can remember, we would like the window to start later. We suggested in our resolution that's on our website March 1st. That's an arbitrary date, but that's considerably later than the window as it exists now.

We would also like the party to take some steps to prevent front-loading, and this is in direct response to Harold Ickes' question. We think that the party should take steps to spread out the selection of delegates over the entire window. We think that this will improve engagement in the process and the public's awareness of the issues and the process.

We are also committed to retail politics. We think that this is probably best realized through the caucuses. So in our proposal we give the caucuses a preference. They're allowed to start a month earlier than the primaries. It could be four weeks or three weeks or five weeks, but we chose a month arbitrarily. The idea here is that it's easier -- there is more retail politics involved in caucuses and it's easier for a candidate without a lot of financing to make an impact, to raise some issues; and if you give them enough time, if they're successful in early caucuses, they can then raise money and be competitive in the primaries. That's been one of the problems with Iowa and New Hampshire in the past. This is an element of the front-loading issue.

So we think if the party does those things it will give you a candidate that's more representative of the party and more representative of the country and it will create a better political debate. We are not

**DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE
COMMISSION ON PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION TIMING AND SCHEDULING
July 16th, 2005**

Page 36 of 42

convinced that it will necessarily give you a more electable candidate. We don't know how to do that. But we think that it will give you the candidate -- it will create a better political discussion and give you a candidate that's more representative of the base.

All of these things are linked. I know our next speaker is going to -- Mike Malbin's going to talk about campaign finance reform. One of the problems with the front-loading process, where the delegate selection has been collapsed into a few weeks, is that it places emphasis on the raising of large sums of money before the process starts, in the so-called pre-primary phase. If you think Iowa and New Hampshire are not demographically representative of the party or the American electorate, the pre-primary phase is representative of people who can write large checks. That's a very narrow demographic and it's also relatively invisible, that portion of the process sometimes called "invisible primary."

That's the essence of our proposal. I have an electronic version I'll give to the staff and some copies if you want, and the resolution is on our web page. Thank you very much for the opportunity to participate again and I'll take any questions.

CO-CHAIR HERMAN: Thank you very, very much, Dr. Caswell. Do we have questions? Jim Roosevelt.

MR. ROOSEVELT: Dr. Caswell, how would you deal with the fact that the Republican Party window begins end of January, beginning of February, and is already set for the next cycle?

MR. CASWELL: Well, I wouldn't. We didn't even address that issue. But I wouldn't. I would just let it go. This is the Democratic Party's business. You're asking me to address questions of strategy and tactics in the election, and I don't think anyone's figured out what the relationship between the nomination process and electability is.
CO-CHAIR HERMAN: Harold Ickes.

MR. ICKES: I skipped last time, so I have to take advantage of this.

(Laughter.)

MR. ICKES: I think an overarching or, if not and perhaps the overarching, basis of the discussion we've been having seems to me, does the system that we now know and love or hate end up with the strongest candidate. So as you look back -- for the general election. As you look back over the last two decades and think about what the system produced, I guess my question is do we need to change the system in order to produce a stronger candidate and as you look -- and address that specifically. As you look back at '88, '92 -- and some of these are -- you have to pull out '96 and maybe you want to pull out 2000 just because of the uniqueness of those.

But if you look back at '84, '88, '92, and '04, if we had a completely redesigned or a somewhat redesigned system would we have ended up with a stronger candidate? It seems to me -- than the ones we did? It seems to me that Curtis Gans tried to address this in saying that we should have later filing dates. I'm not sanguine that that's going to produce a different set of candidates than would have been produced in those years.

But it's not clear to me that all of the suggestions that we've been talking about would have ended up with any different candidate than we did in those years.

MR. CASWELL: And it's not clear to us either. We're not arguing that the process will produce a better candidate. But I want to take a different tack on that. I think the process can produce a better party. You can engage more people in the party and mobilize the base, and that's the problem with the process now, is it doesn't totally engage and mobilize the base. In a year like 2000, that could easily have made the difference in the election, perhaps even in this last election. I think you're not going to solve this all through this schedule or even a discipline on delegate selection imposed

**DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE
COMMISSION ON PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION TIMING AND SCHEDULING
July 16th, 2005**

Page 37 of 42

through the scheduling process. There has to be other things.

I was interested in the discussion about Latino participation earlier. I spent part of -- I spent January and part of December in Iowa working in the Iowa caucuses in rural Iowa, and some of the communities we dealt with were Latino, Mexican American communities and labor communities. And they really wanted to be involved in the process. But the democratic process in the United States was unlike the democratic process they were acquainted with in Mexico, and of course the Iowa caucuses are not like anything else anyway. They really needed some help in becoming comfortable in participating in that process. If the party would make an investment in these communities, even in the non-competitive blue states, it would build the party and mobilize the base, going into these communities and showing people how to participate in caucuses and primaries and creating future Democratic leaders.

CO-CHAIR HERMAN: Maria Echaveste.

MS. ECHAVESTE: You just touched on something that's been troubling me all morning, which is I've heard a number of presentations that have identified a series of problems -- unelectability of candidate, lack of investment in particular constituencies, the role of money, the role of media. So my question to you is what do you think we as a Commission -- what questions should we be trying to answer? Because what I'm hearing is somehow adjusting the primary calendar, changing front-loading, adding another, are supposed to solve a lot of problems. I don't believe that all of the problems that we've identified are going to be solved with a particular calendar. But if we understand what question we're supposed to be trying to answer, that we could actually have some impact. What would you say?

MR. CASWELL: Well, it's more than one question. We don't pretend to know what impact the calendar might have on who the nominee is. It might have some, but we don't pretend to know what that is. I do think

that it's very clear that front-loading has made money more and more important and it has made the pre-primary process more and more important, because now you have to raise the money before the primary process starts at all.

There was a time when you can go into Iowa and New Hampshire and do well and then raise the money to compete in the rest of the primaries. You can't do that any more. So front-loading is something that you really ought to be addressing. By eliminating front-loading you expand the base, expand the opportunity to see the candidates, you create more opportunities to engage people in the process. If you would combine that with the DNC targeting some communities who are providing them with a political education how to participate, that would have -- both could affect the outcome of the election and could also build the party for the long run.

CO-CHAIR PRICE: Bruce, let me on behalf of the Commission thank you for your testimony. We appreciate your being here. Give our best to Amy Isaacs. All right, we'll call Michael Malbin as our last witness. Michael has been very patient. Michael is an old friend who for many, many years has toiled in the vineyards of the study of campaign finance and party politics. He is the Executive Director currently of the Campaign Finance Institute. That's a nonpartisan organization affiliated with George Washington University. The Institute recently convened a blue ribbon task force in financing presidential nominations and I'm sure his main agenda here today is to summarize the findings of that task force. But Michael, we appreciate your role over the years, your occasional willingness to puncture conventional wisdom, and your interest in what we're doing here today.

PRESENTATION OF MICHAEL MALBIN,
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, CAMPAIGN
FINANCE INSTITUTE

MR. MALBIN: Thank you, Representative Price, Secretary Herman, members of the Commission, for asking me to do just what

**DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE
COMMISSION ON PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION TIMING AND SCHEDULING
July 16th, 2005**

Page 38 of 42

you said I'm going to do. The Campaign Finance Institute Task Force on Financing Presidential Nominations has been at work for three years. It's been a major part of what CFI has been doing during that time period. It was a distinguished, broad-based task force. It included a mix of political professionals, scholars, and others. Among others, it included former DNC Chair Charles Manatt, Carl Darr, former DNC General Counsel, Don Foley, who was the Convention Manager for the party in 1996, Ruth Jones of Arizona, Phil Noble of South Carolina -- since you both mentioned those states -- along with an equally good roster of Republicans, third party folks, scholars, and others. I brought copies of the task force report, inside which is tucked the testimony. You should have it. It's this (indicating). I will refer to it. If you don't have it I have a couple of extras here to pass around.

The recommendations, by the way, are easily digested on the contents page, and for anyone who doesn't have it who's around the outside of the room, you can get it at www.campaignfinanceinstitute.org. It's on a .pdf downloadable file.

But anyway, a threshold question has to be for you what does this task force and the work of it have to do with your Commission. Our answer is that the two are thoroughly intertwined. As was said earlier, an American presidential election may well be the single most important election in the world. It's certainly the single most important one in this country. The country needs to have a system that will produce, in answer to the question to the last person that will produce the strongest candidates for the party and the country. That's the overriding purpose of an election, and then also to engage citizens, and we say that should mean also to engage small donors.

But the first goal is strong candidates for party and country. It was asked earlier would changing the system and changing the calendar have produced different candidates over the past couple of decades. I don't want to venture there. I do want to say that,

the way the finance rules are structured, that whatever you do with the calendar may well produce something that is not desirable moving forward.

The front-loaded system, given the current state finance system, heavily favors the person who can raise enough money early to blow through the first primaries. That person may turn out to be a strong candidate, but the system doesn't test that proposition long enough for comfort before it's over, and less well known and less well funded candidates deserve a chance to be heard, not just for their sake but for ours.

I imagine there's some way you could change the nominating process radically to do away with the front-loading part of the problem. But I would argue that unless you look at or at least make some recommendations in the general directions of the campaign finance system along with the calendar, that whatever you do will be overwhelmed by the money issues.

So even if you don't have detailed proposals, I would urge you to urge Congress to repair the public funding system. What are the problems? What are the solutions? As John Sweeney said earlier today, we all know that the system's in serious trouble. The question is how do. Again as you all know, most candidates stayed in the public funding system until recently. The system worked well as long as everybody played by the same rules. But front-loading gives people a huge incentive to opt out if they can raise more money than the spending limit and then, as I say, break through the early primaries. Once one of them breaks out, then any candidate who stays in the system within the current spending limit or the spending system gets trapped. So the next time there's a real question whether any candidate can within the current spending limit even make it as far as the first primary realistically, let alone to Super Tuesday.

Fortunately, there is a two-step solution. It's

**DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE
COMMISSION ON PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION TIMING AND SCHEDULING
July 16th, 2005**

Page 39 of 42

not a terribly complicated one. The first part is to raise the spending limit at least somewhat. CFI's task force thought that limit should be the same as it is for the general election, which was \$75 million in 2004. Before you laugh at that amount, because after all Kerry and Bush each spent about \$250 million, I do want to remind you that I just said it's the first step.

The second step is that candidates need an escape hatch so that if a candidate takes public money and then has to run against someone else who opts out then the candidate should be able to keep the public money, but should be able to raise enough private money to match the person who opted out. So that you have this limit that's a limit only if everybody's playing, and if the person isn't playing then the spending, the public money, is acting as a floor, it's acting as a beginning for the campaign.

So, two questions come in. First, if everybody stays in can you really run a race at \$75 million? The answer is yes, as long as everybody plays by the same rules and you all know it. The last time around \$75 million was a lot more than Dean or Kerry spent up until the end of the real contest part of the phase. It's less than Bush spent in 2000. Most of the additional money, as we all know, was spent between Super Tuesday and the convention, when it was really about the general election.

Okay, so what about that period that began with Super Tuesday or whenever the contest was effectively over?

The answer here again depends upon whether people are all playing by the same rules or not. But if they are, in either case the answer really can be the party, rather than simply blowing the whole public funding system away. If all candidates play by the same rules, the Supreme Court and the FEC have said, hey, you can do unlimited independent spending as long as -- as well as bringing your coordinated spending earlier in the time frame.

Is independent spending ideal? No, it's got all sorts of problems, acknowledge that. But

again, as long as everybody is by the same rules you can spend and it works. Okay, what if you're not playing by the same rules? What if one party says it's using public money and the other is not? Our recommendation here is in that situation let the party's candidate playing by the rules go for unlimited coordinated spending. Then that would let the candidate fully coordinate with the party and functionally be equivalent to the side that didn't play.

Now, without getting lost in the details here, many of which are here and I'd be happy to go over with you, the point is to make sure that the spending limits don't become a trap and that also that we want to change the incentives so candidates can afford to take public money without feeling suckered. Then we also want to change the focus of public funding in two other ways. First, let the candidates get the money a lot earlier. Let them get it as soon as they qualify for it, because the point of it is to help the candidates get started. Let them get it the first quarter or second quarter of the odd-numbered year even.

Second, let the system encourage candidates to foster small donors. Instead of the current one for one match for 250, why not go for three for one match for the first \$100? If you'd have given Howard Dean the choice in June of '03 to go for three for one match and an escape hatch, I can't believe that he would have opted out of the system. Maybe, but I just really, I don't think so. I can't believe it.

Now, in case you're wondering, are small donors still a problem after '04, because after all so much small Internet money was raised in '04, in our report on tables 10 and 11 -- if you look it over, it's broken down by month -- the answer is that except for Dean everybody was relying on \$1,000-plus contributions until Super Tuesday or until the general election phase.

This is fundamentally still a large donor-funded, small financial base proposition. So yes, it's important to encourage small donors. Okay, but if you have a candidate

**DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE
COMMISSION ON PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION TIMING AND SCHEDULING
July 16th, 2005**

Page 40 of 42

who can raise lots of small contributions, won't that effectively skew the whole system in favor of that candidate or cost huge amounts of money? The answer to that is that we say there should be a limit on the amount of public funding a candidate can get, because the point is about getting you a start. We said \$20 million or so maximum in public funding. The number doesn't matter. The point is some kind of a limit so that by the time you've reached that limit candidates should be able to raise money on their own to get up to the rest of the 75.

Now, the good news about all this is that it does not require a lot of new regulations. In a sense, it's easing up on some of the old regulations to make the system more compatible with practical politics. And it won't cost very much. It can all be paid for with an income tax check off of five dollars instead of the current three, which barely makes up for the cost of living.

Moreover, the proposal, our proposal -- the current system is basically not -- is not only not functioning; I can't imagine a serious candidate taking it, and therefore it's got problems for all sorts of other candidates. Our proposal has the flexibility to work whether you stick with a front-loaded system, stretch it out, call for a Delaware plan. It doesn't matter. It has the flexibility to work with that.

Let me just conclude with some recent history. Since 1976 only three kinds of candidates have been able to break away, have been able to afford to break away from public funding. First of all, they are the rich candidates, three of them, who were able to put some personal funds into the race: Perot, Forbes, and Kerry, to some extent Kerry.

Third, there was -- second, there's the phenomenon candidate, a sort of phenomenon candidate, who had an intense following on an emotional issue and was able to use small donations to get to do that, and that was Dean.

Third was one very well-connected front-runner who was favored by his party's

establishment and interest groups, and that was Bush.

Without a revised public funding system, these kind of candidates will be the norm. They may in fact be the only ones, the only serious ones. The country will not have a chance to make up its mind about other potentially worthy candidates. Without public funding, John Edwards, Wesley Clark, Richard Gephardt, and Joseph Lieberman simply would not have lasted long enough for the voters to weigh in.

I'm not saying any of them should have been President. I'm saying the public deserves to make that choice. And '04 was no anomaly. Every single year since 1976, beginning with Jimmy Carter and Ronald Reagan in '76 -- Bush 41 in 1980, Gary Hart, Jesse Jackson, Paul Tsongas, Pat Buchanan, and John McCain -- none of them, none of them would have been viable without public money. All of them were cash-empty at the point when they got public money, running against somebody who had tons more money in the bank, and then they used the public money to be viable and go to the next step.

All of these candidates earned significant public support, testing the front-runners until the voters and not just the donors could make a decision. Three of them -- Carter, Reagan, and the elder Bush -- became Presidents. In every case, in every case, the eventual winner either became stronger by being tested or the public learned something important about the front-runner because of that test. Every year the public came away as a winner. For that reason, I urge you to make this issue a part of your deliberations about front-loading.

I'll be happy to answer your questions, and in addition I know there's a lot of campaign finance expertise around this table, especially legal expertise, people I know to have lots of legal expertise. But if you should want technical expertise, be aware that we've been providing lots of help to people developing different kinds of

**DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE
COMMISSION ON PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION TIMING AND SCHEDULING
July 16th, 2005**

Page 41 of 42

proposals on this subject and would be happy to do so for you. Thank you.

CO-CHAIR PRICE: Thank you, Michael. I think we can benefit from looking at your report, but I think what you just said, the way your statement put a finer point on it in terms of the relevance of our work, I do hope we can have that and can circulate that. So thank you. Any questions? Yes, Maria.

MS. ECHAVESTE: Just where does Clinton fit into your model of raising money? You talked about phenomena; you talked about the person who has a lot of money, the person who has been sort of blessed by the party. So where did --

MR. MALBIN: The reason he's not on the list of candidates I read is that at no point was he really thoroughly out of money. He took public money. It was helpful to him. All of the ones I read were ones who were just dead out of money at some point and then they got the check. He took it and it was part of his mix and I'm sure he was helped by it. I mean, he was.

CO-CHAIR PRICE: Carl.

SENATOR LEVIN: What is the likelihood of there being any Republican support for that kind of proposal?

MR. MALBIN: We're in the process of building support. One of the endorsers, by the way, is Gary Bauer, just for your information. The people on the task force included Ken Blackwell, Jeff Bell. We would be happy to get Congressional sponsors. We haven't started shopping it around. We're doing it. If you want to help that would be great.

SENATOR LEVIN: I'm talking about Republican support.

MR. MALBIN: I understand, I understand.

SENATOR LEVIN: For instance, would John McCain do you think support it?

MR. MALBIN: John McCain has introduced last time and will this time a proposal that's

similar to this, and there were a number of Republican sponsors on that. Lindsay Graham will be a sponsor on this. I think there are other members who are not part of the McCain-Feingold coalition who perhaps look in the mirror when either shaving or doing their hair or whatever and see a potential President, who say, hey, I'm not a front-runner, who might be interested.

There are also people who just think the process ought to be open to more folks. And yes, I'm hearing of potential support, but none who have yet put in a bill, so I can't tell you their names.

CO-CHAIR HERMAN: Thank you very, very much, Mr. Malbin, for your presentation and for a needed reminder and insight in terms of the challenges that we will face as we look at the calendar as it relates to campaign finance reform. With Michael's presentation, that concludes our speakers. I want to thank all of our presenters on behalf of the Commission for your time, for your fine presentations, and really for giving all of us a lot to think about. We will move as a body to the East Room, which is just down the hall to the right. But before adjourning, I'd like to ask, are there any other questions from Commission members?

(No response)

CO-CHAIR HERMAN: If there are none, then the chair will entertain a motion to adjourn our formal session for today.

VOICES: So moved.

MR. ROOSEVELT: Second.

CO-CHAIR HERMAN: All those in favor?

(A chorus of ayes.)

CO-CHAIR HERMAN: Those opposed?

(No response.)

CO-CHAIR HERMAN: We stand adjourned.

**DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE
COMMISSION ON PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION TIMING AND SCHEDULING
July 16th, 2005**

Page 42 of 42

(Whereupon, at 1:03 p.m., the meeting was adjourned.)