

Steven Sepe

From: Sara V <saravieira803@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 24, 2025 7:54 PM
To: House State Government and Elections Committee
Subject: Oppose HB 5712

My name is Sara Vieira and I am from Coventry, RI. I oppose HB 5712.

Fusion Voting is unconstitutional because it violates the principle of one person, one vote.

Fusion Voting was banned in South Carolina in 2022 and Delaware banned it in 2011.

The following case was brought to the US Supreme Court regarding the Constitutionality of fusion voting:
Source: https://ballotpedia.org/Fusion_voting

Fusion voting - Ballotpedia

Fusion voting allows more than one political party to nominate the same candidate. Under this process, if a candidate receives multiple nominations, the candidate will either appear on the general election ballot multiple times or once with all affiliations listed, depending on their state.

ballotpedia.org

Twin Cities Area New Party sued Minnesota to overturn ban on fusion voting (1994)

In 1994, the Twin Cities Area New Party attempted to nominate [Andy Dawkins](#) for the [Minnesota House of Representatives](#). Dawkins, however, had already been nominated for that office by the Minnesota Democratic Farmer Labor Party. Minnesota does not permit fusion voting; consequently, state officials refused the nomination of the Twin Cities Area New Party. The party filed suit, alleging that state law violated the party's free association rights, which are protected under the [First Amendment](#) and the [Fourteenth Amendment](#). A district court ruled in favor of the state, but the [United States Court of Appeals for the 8th Circuit](#) reversed that decision, finding in favor of the Twin Cities Area New Party. The case was appealed to the [United States Supreme Court](#).^{[14][15]}

On April 28, 1997, the United States Supreme Court ruled 6-3 in favor of the state, finding that the prohibition on fusion voting did not unduly burden the associational rights of citizens. Chief Justice [William H. Rehnquist](#) penned the majority opinion.^{[14][15]}

“ We conclude that the burdens Minnesota's fusion ban imposes on the New Party's associational rights are justified by 'correspondingly weighty' valid state interests in ballot integrity and political stability. In deciding that Minnesota's fusion ban does not unconstitutionally burden the New Party's First and Fourteenth Amendment rights, we express no views on the New Party's policy based arguments concerning the wisdom of fusion. It may well be that, as support for new political parties increases, these arguments will carry the day in some States' legislatures. But the Constitution does not require Minnesota, and the approximately 40 other States that do not permit fusion, to allow it.[16]

There are major concerns about the funding of Fusion Voting as well.

In summer 2022, the Center for Ballot Freedom received a \$10 million grant from the Stronger Democracy Award. The Stronger Democracy Award is a \$22 million grant competition allegedly working to advance reforms in civic engagement and policymaking, as well as voting and elections. The Stronger Democracy Award is sponsored by Additional Ventures, a donor-advised fund housed at the left-of-center [Silicon Valley Community Foundation](#) (which has ties to Zuckerbucks/CTCL)...



Center for Ballot Freedom - InfluenceWatch

The Center for Ballot Freedom is an organization which advocates for instituting "fusion voting," a voting system in which candidates may be endorsed by multiple political parties and votes on any "party line" for a candidate are combined to determine the winner. It seeks to reduce the power of the two-party system and establish a [...]

www.influencewatch.org

Thank you,
Mrs. Sara Vieira