

U.S. Senate: It is hard to imagine an institution that violates the principle that every person's vote should have equal influence more severely than the U.S. Senate. The constitutional provision that each State send two members to congress was established by the U. S. constitution as a compromise between large States and small States. Each senator is elected statewide. The problem is obvious. The vote of a individual in a small state with a small population has far greater influence than a vote for a Senator from a large State. Consider California which has 59 times the population of Wyoming.

Solution: One possible solution is to increase the number of senators elected from large States. We assume that most people would still prefer a smaller, more deliberative body than the House of Representatives. To avoid disputes, all States could be represented by a minimum of 2 senators. Then, there could be a total number of Senators of perhaps 300 (a topic obviously that needs to be debated) apportioned among the states according to the decennial census.

In addition, it is strongly urged that, rather than represent the entire state, senators be elected from regions within the State, determined through census data to establish voting districts that are equivalent in voting population, and as compact as possible in geographical boundaries

Advantages: This would ensure that each person's vote had approximately the same weight as any other persons voting for a member of the United States senate. In addition, it would enable the Senators to more adequately represent the wishes of voters in the area they represent. This would be partly due to the ability of candidates to maintain a closer relationship to voters. It should also, due to the smaller size of the electoral district reduce the costs of elections (perhaps enabling more people to run for office.