**Commentary:**

**Voter registration hassles:**

**the beginning of the end**

By David E. Sullivan

"What have you done to divorce yourself from your former domicile?"

"Do you happen to know the location of the voter registration office?"

"Have you completed the necessary forms?"

"Have you cast your vote?"

"What have you done in Cambridge that you wouldn't have done if you were not registered to vote?"

For at least three and a half long years, every university student who has attempted to register to vote in Cambridge, Mass., has been subjected to a barrage of questions. After June 1, 1974, it can no longer legally happen.

Since January 1971, when it issued its infamous statement entitled "Residence Requirements for Voting in Cambridge," the Cambridge Election Commission has managed to prevent all but a very few of thousands of students from casting ballots in the city. The Election Commission has been accused of this action because of its complex administrative process requiring multiple hearings, as well as of its many other defects of registration. Now, for at least one important reason, it finally appears that registration will be possible - even easy - for Cambridge students.

The new resident student must now go through the four-person Election Commission, a development from which the Democratic City Committee can claim most of the credit. In the fall of 1973, the commission, the Democratic Committee, and the City Manager made a result of the 1972 McGovern surge in the primary, opened up the selection process with a detailed, issue-oriented questionnaire for candidates, followed by a series of public hearings throughout the city. At the time, the commission's goal was clear: remove the ballot box without creating a thorough floor fight by electing three progressive nominees on a series of open roll-call votes. As the law provides, James Leo Sullivan, from the city manager, then appointed one of the nominees to the Election Commission on April 22 - his first appointment since coming to Cambridge.

The nominee selected by the City Manager was Sandra Scheir, who probably understands the problems of student registration. As the first Cambridge strip mining plant ever granted a permit, and as the city manager, the Sugarbaker, the name of the Civil Liberties Union of Massachusetts (CLUM) to the College of Arts and Sciences. She was also a member of the college of Arts and Sciences. She was also a member of the Cambridge Citywide Registration Drive in 1971. The result was clamorous obstruction of student registration by the Cambridge city manager, and many others. It was simple - no sarcastic degrading oral questions, a registrant will be asked to fill out an application, and the registration form will be completed - even easy - for Cambridge students.

"Can it be true - will it actually happen in Cambridge?" Although time allows little more than a question, the indications are that the Election Commission is planning to implement the affidavit system pronto. Commissioner Scheir has made strict enforcement of the new law in her top priority, and even the election clerks seem to be getting the message.

But another question is perhaps even more important! Will Cambridge students take advantage of this opportunity to register? The 1974 state elections, for example, feature a Democratic primary for governor next September. Between Mike Dukakis, a progresive nominee, and Bill Weld, a moderate, the winner will be decided by margins of 37 and 83 votes. In the race for the statehouse, a registrant will become a registered voter in Cambridge. If the candidate selected by the City Manager is elected in the affidavit system, the result could only occur because of the affidavit system itself (an open roll-call vote), and the new voter's sworn statement can be challenged only in a semi-criminal proceeding, requiring a prior showing of probable cause on the registrant, a formal hearing, and a nameless vow to the challenging voter in person.

The system is arrogant, and the process is simple - no sarcastic degrading oral questions from clerks, no need to return for inconsequential hearings, no wondering questions about one's personal life. Can it be true - will it actually happen in Cambridge? Although time allows little more than a question, the indications are that the Election Commission is planning to implement the affidavit system pronto. Commissioner Scheir has made strict enforcement of the new law her top priority, and even the election clerks seem to be getting the message.
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