

Subject: Testimony regarding proposed election law bills H.J. No. 58, H.J. No. 59, S.B. No. 901, and H.B. No. 6464

From: Rick Aiello, Shelton, Connecticut

Regarding H.J. No. 58 (Proposal for a state constitutional amendment to allow no-excuse absentee voting), this can increase the opportunities for vote harvesting and voter fraud, both of which have been evident in local and national elections for years to varying degrees. One likely result of such an amendment would be greater numbers of votes but at the cost of reducing their quality. But anything that can be used to expand such fraud should be opposed, especially in a Constitutional amendment, since everything in the state Constitution must comply with the national Constitution.

Regarding H.J. No. 59 (Resolution approving an amendment to the state constitution to allow for early voting), I am not a fan of early voting (which H.J. No. 58 will also allow). Early voting has the potential to cast votes before certain candidates have enough chances to campaign fully and meet as many voters as possible and delivering their platforms. Such a situation obviously would unfairly favor the Democrat majority in Connecticut over Republican challengers.

There is also the matter of existing election issues, the worst of which were brought out in the hugely fraudulent national election of November 2020. One such issue is that of eligible voter verification. I believe it is premature to consider any Constitutional changes related to elections until there is sufficient attention paid to Registrars verifying citizenship and poll workers verifying voter identification and absentee voter signatures. It is also premature to consider such Constitutional changes until the November 2020 election has been fully audited and confirmed to have been conducted according to valid law (and if not so confirmed, state Constitutional changes should be delayed until the 2020 election is confirmed as valid).

Regarding S.B. No. 901 (An act extending to June 30, 2021, changes implemented for the 2020 state election as a result of COVID-19) and H.B. No. 6464 (An act extending to May 31, 2021, several changes implemented for the 2020 state election as a result of COVID-19), my only comment is that the state should not base any action on what the World Health Organization says and should determine whether any declared emergency is an actual emergency, such as an attack by a foreign nation, an invasion from space, nuclear attack, etc. Furthermore, "emergency powers" are not authorized in the Constitution and are therefore unlawful. The WHO has flip-flopped on COVID-19 so many times that its credibility is zero and, besides, what lawful authority does the WHO have over Connecticut?