

**TO: Joint Committee on Government Administration and Elections**  
**FROM: Bob Crnic, 45 Old Hawleyville Rd., Bethel, Ct. 06801**  
**RE: Opposition to SB 1146 (Act to eliminate candidate cross-endorsements)**  
**DATE: 03/25/2013**

**Written**  
**3/25/13**

**To Whom It May Concern:**

**I oppose SB 1146 for the following reasons:**

- 1) Sec. 1 states "No candidate who is not enrolled as a member of a party may be endorsed by such party." This proposed addition is an unprecedented restriction on political freedoms guaranteed by our constitution. The notion that a political party can only nominate a member of its own party is categorically unacceptable.
- 2) Connecticut currently has approx. 450,000 registered Republicans, 770,000 registered Democrats and 875,000 Un-affiliated voters. It also has 20,000 voters registered to various minor parties. Sec. 1 of the proposed bill would prevent an un-affiliated voter from being able to run on a party line. Is that a message that this joint committee is comfortable conveying to 875,000 un-affiliated voters in CT?
- 3) Sec. 1. Of the proposed bill would also prevent Major or minor parties from cross-endorsing another party's candidate which is a common practice in municipal elections. The notion that this practice would now be illegal is hard to justify to the electors at large.
- 4) With only 20,000 CT voters registered to a minor party, this bill would weaken the almost insignificant impact minor parties currently have.
- 5) The motive behind this proposed bill is blatantly political in nature serving no other purpose than to benefit the two major political parties.
- 6) It is legally in-defensible to restrict electoral participation to party endorsements and is a clear form of political discrimination.
- 7) The proposed text changes in Sec. 2 seem to imply that the elimination of cross-endorsements would eliminate the potential of voting for a candidate on more than one party line. This is a gross misrepresentation of the electoral process which has historically prevented the ability of electors voting for a candidate on more than one party line. The older mechanical election machines prevented that possibility - is that not the case currently with the new scanners?
- 8) Currently, a petitioning party with a slate of candidates cannot "endorse" candidates of its own party until it satisfies the minimum 1% minority party rule. It's initial slate would consist of candidates who may be registered to a major party or be un-affiliated. This bill's proposed text would prevent petitioning parties from running a slate of candidates.

**In Summary, I urge all joint committee members to oppose SB 1146**

**Robert Crnic / 45 Old Hawleyville Rd. Bethel, Ct. 06801**