

https://www.gjsentinel.com/opinion/letters/printed-letters-sept-11-2020/article_d30f26fc-f3c4-11ea-bd8d-d381d2cc8cbe.html

Printed Letters: Sept. 11, 2020

Sep 10, 2020

State politics show why Electoral College works

There is a major push to eliminate the Electoral College, replacing it with the popular vote only. On the surface many would say this is the way it should be, including me at one time. Once I learned the reason those founding our country set up the Electoral College system, I realized they were much smarter than people today driven only by politics.

Those promoting change to a popular vote will tell you this system would ensure that every vote counts, forcing candidates to campaign everywhere. This just is not true. The race for Colorado governor clearly proved this. Then-candidate Jared Polis did not campaign, offer to debate, or spend any time on the Western Slope. Why? He knew collecting a majority in the Denver and Boulder area would be more than enough to win the election. He didn't need Western Slope support, and showed the Western Slope was irrelevant to the election.

On a national basis, a popular vote scenario means cities on the East and West coasts. The rest of the Western Slope.

BONOBOS

Fre

Those who set up our Electoral College system understood this and established this system to make, and maintain, the relevance of every place in the country. To this end, an Electoral College system in Colorado would make each county in the state relevant and improve representation. In this system every county would get one electoral vote. With this system Mesa County, Delta County, Montrose County, like all counties suddenly become relevant. If success depends on each county throughout the state, future politicians will spend time across the state, and maybe listen to concerns of everyone, not just population centers. Some would say this gives small-population counties an advantage. To this argument, adjustments could be made to the winner of the popular vote, recognizing that the popular vote does, in fact, carry merit. A balance between popular vote and a statewide Electoral College is not rocket science. It may be a more equitable solution than the one-size-fits-all position.

There are a lot of ideas to address voting, vote tallies, and how winners should be chosen. Most, if not all, ideas are driven for political reasons. The consideration for change should be based on fair representation for all, not just for population centers or select regions of the country, or state.

RANDY LITWILLER

Crawford

Colorado Women's Alliance opposes paid family leave

While it may seem counter-intuitive, the Colorado Women's Alliance opposes the paid family leave proposition on this fall's ballot. Understand that we are not opposed to employers providing paid family leave for the birth or adoption of children, care of ill family members, or employees, themselves. In fact, we commend them.

What we oppose is mandating employers to do so, creation of a new, expensive, government-run program, and requiring both employers *and* employees to pay into the program, whether or not they need it or use it. Employees will be mandated to pay into the program, through a deduction in their paycheck, even if their employer already provides a generous leave benefit. This amounts to a pay cut and will disproportionately impact low-income, particularly female, employees. For someone making \$25,000 a year, the employee's portion of the payment is \$113 and that can grow each year. That may not sound like much but if you are a single mother, trying to pay rent, buy groceries and school supplies, you just don't have a spare \$113.

For small businesses, many of which are female-owned, they have to pay an equal amount for each and every employee. This can really add up for small businesses. This year has been particularly difficult for small business; many cannot survive the pandemic shutdowns. This would be a double blow that most cannot withstand.

For these reasons, we urge a "no" vote on Proposition 118.

BOBBIE DANIEL

Chair-elect

Colorado Women's Alliance

Grand Junction

Pendley is a victim of character assassination

So here we go again with the character assassination of William Perry Pendley because they disagree with his point of view. In the 25 years since I met Mr. Pendley, I learned more about him through his newsletters and talks. Those newsletters and talks confirmed my first impression of Mr. Pendley. He is highly intellectual, knowledgeable, ethical, hard-working, and a constitutionalist.

The federal government has always purchased new land for public use and has also sold and given away our public lands. Mr. Pendley has just purchased more lands for the federal government, proving he is not against public land. He believes in multiple use of our public

land. The people of the United States should question how much land We the People should own. If 75% of your county is public land, is that too much public land?

The problem with public lands is the cost to the people of the United States. Our public employees say they do not make enough money off public land to keep up with maintenance. That is why politicians had to take monies from our offshore royalties to pay for this maintenance.

The case of Mr. Pendley being a racist is hard to make, because at the Mountain States Legal Foundation, he represented minorities. Mr. Pendley's nonprofit litigated affirmative action cases, reverse discrimination cases, racial quotas and preference cases.

In the Washington Examiner op-ed, Mr. Pendley wrote about a play by Phelim McAleer, who presented the fact about the shooting of Michael Brown, where a young black woman testified that the officer was justified in the shooting.

We know that Brown did not stop running and that he did not say, "Hands up; Don't Shoot." We know that the lie that Brown stopped, put his hands up, and said "don't shoot" was fostered by politicians, news media and special interest groups for their own personal agenda.

Regarding climate change, I do not know how Mr. Pendley feels on this issue; he is not being hired to deal with the climate. He is being hired to manage public lands. When did it become a requirement that to work for the federal government you have to believe in climate change?

WALTER FEES III

Grand Junction

How many lives shattered by Trump's refusal to tell truth?

Two items have captured my attention recently, with the first one being an ad for Sen. Cory Gardner's campaign in which he appears in a restaurant which was closed at one time due to COVID protocols and the owner praises him for getting them help and for passing the forgivable loan bill for small businesses.

It is of interest that the bill sponsored by Sens. Marco Rubio and Susan Collins and co-sponsored by both Republican and Democratic members of the Senate and House does not mention Sen. Gardner's involvement; therefore, was his effort expended merely in being in the chamber to cast a "yes" vote on the measure?

Secondly, and of more concern, is the release of recorded interviews in which President Trump proudly admits to lying to the American public concerning the dangers of COVID-19 in order to avoid a "panic." Does he really doubt the resolve of the public to respond to a national crisis — as we have many times over in the past — when presented with the truth of the gravity of the situation? How many lives lost, families destroyed, and the economy in shambles by not following known medical guidelines and providing medical assistance and supplies by this, another lie, rather than truly reporting the potential harm and the need to protect one's self and their community?

RICHARD POWELL

Grand Junction

Biologists, not voters, should decide if wolves belong here

A few years ago the citizens of Colorado voted to ban the hunting of bears using bait. Since then the population of bears has exploded. Almost every week now we hear news reports of bears breaking into cabins, cars and sometimes injuring people.

Who are the wizards who decided we need wolves in Colorado? Bad idea!

A pack of wolves in order to survive must make a kill at least once or twice a week. That means an elk, a deer, or a moose, or a farmer's cow that is worth about \$2,000.

Who is going to pay the farmer back? The citizens of Colorado should not vote on wildlife issues. Leave those decisions to the experts at the Colorado Parks and Wildlife. They do an excellent job on managing our wildlife. How long will it be before a family camping in the woods is attacked by a pack of wolves? Our deer and elk have enough problems with the bears, coyotes and the mountain lions. We should vote NO on the reintroduction of wolves in Colorado.

DENNIS JARVIS

Grand Junction