BALLOT ACCESS NEWS

San Francisco, California | May 12, 1989 | Volume 4 Number 12

CONGRESS

On May 3, the House Administration Committee (which encompasses the Elections Subcommittee) passed a voter registration bill, HR 2190, whose chief sponsor is Majority Leader Tom Foley. Co-sponsors of the bill include leaders of the Republican Party as well as leading Democrats. This is the first federal voter registration bill that has cleared any committee. The bill mandates postcard registration, although not election-day registration.

HR 2190 will probably receive a vote on the floor of the House near the end of May. Progress of the bill is good news for supporters of fairer ballot access. If the bill becomes law, the proportion of Americans who are registered voters will increase substantially. This will improve the validity rate of petitions. There is a very strong correlation between the usual proportion of valid signatures in any particular state, and the level of voter registration in that state.

Furthermore, Congressman John Conyers has been inactive in support of his own bill, HR 1582, the ballot access bill, because he didn't want to dilute support for the voter registration bill. But once the voter registration issue has been settled in the House, he plans to work hard for HR 1582. Because Conyers had not solicited co-sponsors yet this year for HR 1582, the bill has only one co-sponsor, Congressman Charles Bennett of Jacksonville, Florida. Bennett co-sponsored the bill because one of his constituents, Bruce Knight, asked him to. After the House has voted on the registration bill, Conyers will solicit additional co-sponsors.

Chances are better than ever that the ballot access bill, HR 1582, will receive a hearing from the Elections Subcommittee. Congressman Al Swift has indicated this year that he would probably hold hearings on it, once the poll-closing and voter registration bills were settled. Congress is also interested in working on campaign financing reform, but a special task force is working on that, which leaves the Elections Subcommittee relatively free. If HR 1582 does receive hearings this year, the ballot access issue may finally receive the attention in the news media that it deserves. All supporters of improved ballot access owe a "thank you" to the Rainbow Lobby, which has worked hard for four years to get congressional attention to ballot access.

MASSACHUSETTS BILL ADVANCES

On April 26, the Massachusetts House Elections Committee passed HB 3211, by Rep. John Businger of Brookline, which cuts the number of signatures for third party and independent candidates in half. The action was taken after the Committee heard oral testimony from several Libertarians, and written testimony from the Socialist Party. Massachusetts currently has the most restrictive ballot access laws in the northeastern USA.

BAD BILLS DEFEATED

1. On April 18, Georgia Governor Joe Harris vetoed House Bill 351, the bill which would have converted the petition format to the one used in Florida, in which only one signature can appear on a sheet. The sheets would be postcard-sized. The bill did not deal with notarization of petitions, but since already-existing law requires petitions to be notarized, the effect of the bill would have been to require tens of thousands of notarizations.

2. Kansas House Bill 2428 failed to get through conference committee, and the legislature has now adjourned until next year. Third party activists carried out a vigorous public information campaign against the bill. Another reason it failed to pass, was that the Senate added a provision for a presidential primary into the bill, and the House was opposed to this idea. The bill's original purpose was to triple the signature requirement for statewide independent candidates. The bill could still be revived next year, but Senator Sallee, chairman of the Senate Elections Committee, says that it is dead.

GOOD BILLS STALLED

1. Oregon House Bill 3230, which would reduce the requirements for a third party to get on the ballot and to remain on, is stalled in the Senate Government Operations & Elections Committee. The chairman of that committee, Senator Glenn E. Otto, a Democrat from Troutdale, has assigned the bill such a low priority, that it will never get a hearing date in his committee. Please write Senator Otto, State Capitol, Salem Or 97310, and ask him to hold hearings on HB 3230. Tell him that under current law, it takes twice as many signatures to get a third party presidential candidate on the Oregon ballot, as it takes for a Democratic presidential candidate to get on the ballot of all the presidential primaries in the entire nation. Incidentally, Senator Otto has not had any opponents on the November ballot against him, in either of his last two elections. (see Ore. editorials on page 5).

2. On April 12, 1989, Representative Art Pope of Raleigh introduced an outstanding ballot access reform bill, and on May 8 it passed out of the House Elections Subcommittee. Unfortunately, on May 10, the Judiciary Committee sent it back to the subcommittee for consideration of amendments. The bill may re-emerge, but not in time to pass until next year. Pope is a member of the Libertarian Republicans, and was elected as a Republican last year. His bill, HB 1199, reduces signature requirements for new political parties, and for independent candidates, to one-fourth of their current levels. The bill also deletes wording on new party petitions which implies that all voters who sign the petition are members of the party; and the bill also lowers the vote requirement for a party to remain qualified, from 10% of the last vote for President or Governor, to 1%.

OTHER LEGISLATIVE NEWS

California: on May 17, there will be a hearing in the Assembly Ways & Means Committee on AB 368, which changes the date of the presidential primary from June to March.

Also on May 17, in the Assembly Elections Committee, there will be a hearing on AB 633, which expands the period for an independent presidential candidate to circulate the petition, from 60 days, to 105 days. The bill only exists because a lawsuit last year declared the old 60-day period unconstitutional. The sponsors of AB 633, Assemblyman Richard Mountjoy and Secretary of State March Fong Eu, have refused to amend the bill to also reduce the number of signatures. In 1990, a statewide independent candidate will need 140,005 valid signatures. There has never been an independent candidate in the history of the United States, in any state, who ever overcame a signature hurdle greater than 101,297 signatures.

Indiana: HB 1433, which establishes procedures for third party and independent candidates to get on the ballot in special elections, was signed by the Governor on May 5.

Iowa: Senate File 371, which moves the deadline for independent and third party candidates to submit petitions from the end of August, to mid-August, was signed by the Governor on May 8. The bill also lets voters sign more than one petition for different candidates for the same office, and it provides that when a third party submits a slate of presidential elector candidates, there must be one elector candidate from each congressional district in the state. These policies had already been in effect.

Nevada: On April 28, the Governor signed AB 132, which changes the election law so that candidates of small, qualified parties will never again be required to run in single-member districts against more than one opponent from either the Democratic Party, or the Republican Party (previously, Nevada law had been interpreted to permit placing two Democrats on the November ballot against a single Libertarian candidate, in a single member district, if no Republican was in the race).

Nevada third party activists had been hoping to get AB 132 amended, to also decrease the requirement for a party to remain qualified, but no such amendment was made.

New Jersey: on April 14, the Governor signed AB 2885, to change the petition deadline for third party and independent presidential candidates to late July or early August (depending on the calendar). The old deadline, in late April, had been held unconstitutional in 1984.

New York: The Attorney General's proposal to let candidates qualify for the ballot without any petition, if the candidate has received enough campaign contributions, has been introduced as Senate Bill 2780. No hearings have yet been held on it.

Ohio: The first hearing was held on April 26 on SB 137, which would permit independent candidates to choose a partisan label (not similar to the name of a qualified party) to be printed on the ballot next to the candidate's name. Two more hearings must be held before the Senate Elections Committee can act on the bill. The first hearing seemed to indicate the bill will receive a favorable report.

Washington: On May 3, the Governor signed HB 1572, which makes minor changes in the procedure for getting third party and independent candidates on the primary ballot , and the procedure for getting third party and independent presidential candidates on the November ballot. They are:

1. A statewide convention must now be held either on any day between the last Saturday in June and the first Saturday in July, or it must be held on any day between the Saturday before the last Monday in July and the preceding Saturday. That is, convention planners can now choose a day from among fourteen different days. Formerly, the convention could only be on one particular Saturday in late July.
2. Third party candidates for presidential elector must be named within 10 days after the convention. Formerly, the law didn't say when they must be named, and in practice the Secretary of State accepted them up until election day in November.
3. The number of attendees is fixed at 200 for statewide office. Previously the requirement was one-hundredth of 1% of the last vote cast for President, which had been between 190 and 200.
4. The bill codifies existing practice, by permitting multiple conventions around the state so that the attendance of various meetings in different places, can be cumulated toward the goal of 200 attendees.

The bill does not deal with the biggest ballot access problem in Washington state, i.e., the requirement that no third party or independent candidate can appear on the November ballot (except for president), unless the candidate polls 1% in the primary. No third party candidate for Governor or U.S. Senator has managed to overcome the 1% hurdle, since it was passed in 1977.

PUBLIC FINANCING

In April 1989, the Federal Election Commission warned Congress that the fund used to finance presidential elections is about to run out of money, since fewer taxpayers are checking the "Yes" box on their tax forms, asking whether the taxpayer desires that $1 of his or her tax money go into the fund. Only 21% of taxpayers checked "Yes" in 1988, the lowest proportion ever.

BALLOT ACCESS NEWS (ISSN 10436898) is published by Richard Winger, Field Representative of the Coalition for Free and Open Elections, $6 per year, thirteen times per year, every 4 weeks, at 3201 Baker St., San Francisco CA 94123. Second class postage paid at San Francisco CA.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to *Ballot Access News* at 3201 Baker St, San Francisco Ca 94123.

FREE ELECTIONS OVERSEAS

1. On April 9, Tunisia held its first free election since it became independent from France in 1956. For the first time, more than one political party was allowed to compete.

2. On April 30, Cuba held municipal elections in which voters could choose among competing candidates. There were a total of 29,597 candidates for 14,300 posts.

3. In early May, Paraguay held its first free election since World War II. A presidential election was held in which several parties presented candidates.

4. Nicaragua will hold a presidential and parliamentary election in February 1990. All organized parties will be given ballot access, free television and radio time, and will have the right to campaign "wherever voting-age citizens congregate". Opposition parties still have complaints, but it is likely that most of the largest opposition parties will contest the election, rather than boycotting it.

5. An opposition political party has been formed in Hungary.

6. Poland will hold free elections, with competition between different political parties, in June 1990.

PETITIONING AT THE POLLS

On February 2, 1989, the Florida Supreme Court reaffirmed the decision of the Florida Court of Appeals, that a law which forbids anyone but polling place officials and voters from being within 50 feet of the polling place, is unconstitutional. *Firestone v News-Press Publishing Company,* 538 So 2d 457.

The Court did say that it is constitutional to keep people (other than voters and polling place officials) outside of the room in which voting is being conducted in. The decision will help petitioners in Florida, who have learned that the area outside polling places (especially at the March presidential primary) is a good place in which to collect signatures on nominating petitions.

URUGUAY

The April 14 *Ballot Access News* stated that Uruguay has a national initiative procedure, but that it had never been used. Actually, it was just used for the first time. Uruguay's parliament had passed a blanket amnesty for crimes against human rights committed by the former government, a military dictatorship. Opponents of the blanket amnesty law succeeded in getting an initiative on the ballot, to repeal it. *New Yorker* magazine of April 10, 1989 tells the story of the struggle to complete the petition and to get it validated. The law requires that the petition be signed by 25% of the number of voters who voted in the last election. The initiative was defeated at the polls on April 16 by a margin of about 57%-43%, but observers in Uruguay and outside it, agree that the initiative worked to the advantage of the nation, by venting the issue.

POLITICAL PRIVACY

On April 5, 1989, U.S. District Court Judge James L. King, a Nixon appointee, ruled part of the Florida campaign contribution disclosure law unconstitutional, because it fails to provide any exemption for candidates who are members of groups subject to harassment. *McArthur v Firestone,* no. Civ 85-3070. The plaintiff, Harvey McArthur, was a Socialist Workers Party candidate for Mayor of Miami. In 1982 the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that the Socialist Workers Party need not reveal the names of its campaign contributors, but Florida elections officials in the current case had stated that the Supreme Court decision doesn't apply to non-partisan elections (Miami has non-partisan city elections). Florida hasn't yet decided whether it will appeal.

The Florida decision will bolster the plaintiffs in a similar lawsuit in San Francisco, California, *Socialist Action Party v Smith,* no. C89-0147-CAL. Socialist Action candidates for city office in San Francisco in 1988 refused to disclose the names of their campaign contributors, and filed a lawsuit on January 19, 1989, to protect themselves from civil and criminal sanctions. Most members of the Socialist Action Party are former members of the Socialist Workers Party. San Francisco also has non-partisan city elections.

CANDIDACY VICTORY

On April 25, federal district court judge Mark A. Costantino, a Nixon appointee, struck down New York law prohibiting school employees, public officeholders, and some party officials, from running for election to local school boards. *Fletcher v Marino,* no. 89-CV-LL05, eastern district of New York.

The decision was surprising, since in 1982 the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in *Clements v Fashing* that there is no right to be a candidate for public office. However, Judge Costantino has a good record in voting rights cases. In 1984 he declared New York election laws unconstitutional which kept candidates off the ballot because their petition cover-sheets made slight errors in stating how many signatures were on the petition. Judge Costantino's 1984 action was especially bold, since the highest state courts in New York had upheld the same requirement just days earlier. Judge Costantino was vindicated when the legislature thereafter amended the law to provide that such tiny errors should not be grounds for disqualifying candidates from the ballot.

COFOE

Readers are urged to join COFOE, which works on ballot access problems. Dues of $10 entitles one to membership with no expiration date; it also includes a one-year subscription to *Ballot Access News* (or a one-year renewal). Political parties which are members of COFOE include the Libertarian, New Alliance, Communist, Socialist and Prohibition Parties. Address: Box 355, Old Chelsea Sta., New York NY 10011.

STATUS OF PENDING LAWSUITS

Alaska: the Alaska Supreme Court could release a decision in *Sigler v McAlpine,* no. S-2988, at any time. The issue is the constitutionality of the June 1 petition deadline for a third party or independent candidate (for office other than president).

California: the 9th circuit could release a decision in *Geary v Renne,* no. 88-2875, at any time. The issue is whether a political party can endorse candidates in a non-partisan election, and whether an endorsed candidate can mention that endorsement in his or her statement in the Candidate's Handbook, which is government-printed.

Colorado: briefs are being filed in the 10th circuit in *Thournir v Meyer,* no. 89-1082. The issue is whether a candidate for Congress must have lived in the state for a year, before running.

Florida: in *Fulani v Krivanek,* 88-671-CIV-T-10B, the case over the constitutionality of an election law which requires that a new political party must pay to have its petitions checked, there will probably be a hearing in June 1989 before federal Judge William T. Hodges. Although Judge Hodges refused to issue an injunction against the petition-checking fees last year, there is yet no ruling on the law's constitutionality.

Hawaii: in *Burdick v Takushi,* no. 13157 in the State Supreme Court, no hearing date has been set, even though all briefs were submitted five months ago. The issue is whether Hawaii law permits write-in votes or not. If the response is that Hawaii does not permit them, then the case will return to federal court to determine if the write-in ban is constitutional.

Indiana: in *Fulani v State Election Board,* 88-3122, the 7th Circuit could issue a ruling at any time. The issue is whether the U.S. Constitution was violated when elections officials placed George Bush and Michael Dukakis on the November 1988 ballot, even though their elector candidates weren't submitted by the legal deadline.

Also pending in Indiana is *Paul v State Election Board,* no. IP-88-982-C, over the constitutionality of Indiana's ban on write-in voting. The state has asked for three consecutive thirty-day extensions to file its brief, and each time federal Judge Sarah Evans Barker has granted the extension. The state's brief is now due May 15, 1989.

Maryland: there is still no decision from the 4th circuit in *Dixon v Board of Elections,* no. 88-1735, on the constitutionality of Maryland's filing fee for a write-in candidate to have his or her write-in votes counted. No other state has such a fee.

In *Ahmad v Raynor,* the Maryland ballot access case, the Maryland Libertarian Party's brief was filed in the U.S. Supreme Court on May 5, no. 88-1795. In June the Court may announce whether it will hear the case.

Missouri: the Libertarian Party of Missouri still needs to raise $500 by June 1 to finance its appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court in *Manifold v Blunt,* the case over whether it is unconstitutional for a state to have an earlier date for a new party to name its candidates for presidential elector, than for a previously qualified party. Since the vote in the 8th circuit on this question was 5-5, there is a fair chance that the Supreme Court would accept the case. If you can contribute money for the appeal, write Mike D'Hooge, 11738 Parish Dr, Bridgeton Mo 63044.

Nevada: there was a hearing in *Libertarian Party of Nevada v Del Papa* on April 28 in U.S. District Court in Las Vegas before Judge Lloyd D. George. The initial problem which brought the lawsuit into existence has now been cured by the legislature (see article on Nevada in the Legislative section of this issue). However, the party also complained about a 1987 law which changed its status from a party which nominates by primary, to a party which nominates by convention. The party argues that the bill should not have taken effect immediately, but should have been effective *after* the 1988 election. It's not clear if the judge will rule on this issue. He might consider this issue moot, since in 1988 the party didn't poll enough votes to retain its place on the ballot.

New York: on May 5, federal Judge Charles Haight, a Nixon appointee, upheld a New York election law which requires a Republican candidate for citywide office in New York city, to submit 10,000 signatures on a petition, in order to appear on the Republican primary ballot. *Hewes v Abrams,* no. 89-CIV-2679, Southern district of New York. Hewes wants to run for Mayor. It is not known if he plans to appeal.

Ohio: Both sides are preparing briefs in *Rosen v Brown,* no. C-88-2973, Northern district of Ohio. The issue is whether the state must print "independent" on the ballot next to the name of independent candidates.

Texas: there will be a hearing on June 28 in *Ybarra v Rains,* no. 442729, Travis County Court, the case over the constitutionality of Texas' May deadline for submitting third party petitions. If the plaintiffs win (plaintiffs are members of the New Alliance Party), only Maine will have a petition deadline, for independent presidential candidates, earlier than July of the election year.

West Virginia: on May 11 there was a hearing in the 4th circuit in *Socialist Workers Party v Hechler,* no. 88-2199, before Judges Kenneth Hall, James Wilkinson and Glen Williams. Judge Hall has a bad record on ballot access cases. The issues include (1) whether the petition deadline for non-presidential third party and independent candidates of May is constitutional; (2) whether the petition must state that the signers "pledge" themselves to vote for the candidates named on the petition; (3) whether candidates who cannot pay the filing fee must submit two entirely different petitions, each of them difficult.

Cases involving nation-wide issues: (1) In *Schau v Flaherty,* C-88-4754, federal court, New Jersey, the case over whether New Election Service may broadcast election data on election night which artificially adjusts all Republican and Democratic candidate percentages to always add up to 100%, Judge John C. Lifland denied an NES motion to dismiss the case on April 4, 1989. Therefore, the case will proceed. (2) still pending are the two debate cases filed by Lenora Fulani, New Alliance Party presidential candidate in 1988, against the League of Women Voters and the Commission on Presidential Debates. (3) In *USA v Kokinda,* no. 87-5107, 4th circuit, the case on whether the post office can prohibit First Amendment activity on its sidewalks, the government's request for a rehearing *en banc* is still pending.

B6

The Oregonian

Founded Dec. 4 1850. Established as a daily Feb. 4, 1861. The Sunday Oregonian established Dec. 4, 1881. Published daily and Sunday by the Oregonian Publishing Co., 1320 S.W. Broadway, Portland, Oregon 97201.

FRED A. STICKEL, President and Publisher
WILLIAM A. HILLIARD, Editor

ROBERT M. LANDAUER, Editorial Page Editor
PETER THOMPSON, Managing Editor
ROBERT N. SCHOENBACHER, Advertising Dir.
PATRICK L. MARLTON, Circulation Dir.
DONALD J. STERLING JR., Asst. to the Publisher

THURSDAY, APRIL 13, 1989

Open up ballot access

Oregon is among the most restrictive states in allowing minor political parties to qualify candidates for the election ballot. That record is not worth preserving.

Broad participation in the electoral process should not be discouraged. The Oregon Legislature should make it easier for minor-party candidates to get on the ballot.

Even if these candidates turn out to be political long shots, their ideas would be welcome in the campaigns.

Too often, major-party candidates in Oregon run unopposed. This fosters voter apathy.

It also usually means that issues are not debated. Worse, the records of incumbents are not reviewed or challenged.

To qualify as a nominating party, Oregon requires a minor party to collect signatures of voters equal to 5 percent of the last general election's votes cast for all candidates for representative in Congress in the district in which the party wishes to run candidates.

In 1988, Oregon law required a new political party to obtain 51,578 petition signatures in order to gain recognition and thus qualify a candidate for president on the ballot.

Only two states — California and Florida — require minor parties to get more signatures than Oregon does to certify themselves and their candidate slate for the ballot.

House Bill 3032 would change this provision.

It would require a minor party to qualify itself for nominating candidates by obtaining signatures representing 2.5 percent of the number of voters registered in an electoral district for which it wants to enter candidates. That would be the state for statewide candidates and the specific electoral districts for other partisan offices.

The change would mean, for example, that a minority party would need the signatures of 38,211 registered voters for a nominee for governor, rather than 51,157, in order to qualify for the 1990 ballot. That remains a difficult chore, but it is a reasonable requirement.

HB3032 also would allow a minor party to qualify candidates for the 1990 ballot if its candidate for public office in the last general election received at least 1 percent of the entire vote cast for a representative in Congress. The requirement now is 5 percent.

Five percent is too strict a test, and 1 percent may be too liberal. Both approaches are arbitrary. The 1 percent provision should be pushed upward, perhaps to 2 percent or 2.5 percent. But the intent of the legislation is supportable, and a modified bill should be passed.

SALEM, ORE.
Statesman Journal

OPINION

Editorials 4/7/89

Issue will get hearing

Encouraging third-party candidates and their ideas is worth debating.

If we're unhappy with what we get from Democrats and Republicans, maybe we should make it easier for other parties to get on the ballot and show us what they have to offer.

On the other hand, would this chop the voting public into so many small segments that no one gets a majority, and we stumble through some of the comedies that we have seen in France and Italy?

In any case, encouraging third-party candidates and their ideas is worth debating. The Legislature offers the forum at 8:30 a.m. today in Room E at the Capitol when the House State and Federal Affairs Committee holds a public hearing on House Bill 3230. This bill, supported largely by the Libertarian Party, would make it easier for local and statewide third-party candidates to get on the ballot in Oregon.

Oregon has some of the toughest ballot access restrictions in the country. For example, we require 51,157 petition signatures to qualify a third-party candidate for a major statewide office. Washington state requires 187. California requires 76,172, but, of course, it has a much bigger population.

The pros and cons of opening the ballot to choices other than Democrats and Republicans are worth debating. It must be a public issue, however, because it's not likely that the two parties controlling the Legislature would show much zest for allowing other parties into their club.

LIBERAL PARTY

The Liberal Party of New York is the only third party that has been on the ballot of any particular state, without interruption, ever since the Truman presidency. It was founded in 1944 as a party in New York state only, and it became fully qualified in that state in 1946. In order to retain qualified status, it must always poll at least 50,000 votes for Governor of New York. The next New York gubernatorial race is in 1990.

Most of the time, the Liberal Party merely cross-endorses Democratic Party candidates, so that such candidates appear twice on the ballot, once as a Democrat and once as a Liberal. However, occasionally it runs its own candidates. In 1986, it ran John Dyson for the U.S. Senate in opposition to the Democratic and Republican Party candidates, and in 1982 it ran William Finneran for State Comptroller in opposition to the Democrats and Republicans. The Liberal Party hasn't cross-endorsed a Republican nominee for statewide office since 1974.

Now, however, the Liberal Party is in the news because it has decided to cross-endorse Rudolph W. Giuliani, the most prominent Republican in the 1989 New York city mayoral race. The party made this decision in the face of a threat by the Democratic governor of New York, Mario Cuomo. Cuomo had stated that if the Liberal Party backs Republican Giuliani, then in 1990 Cuomo might refuse to accept the Liberal Party's gubernatorial nomination. Since the party must poll 50,000 votes in 1990 for Governor in order to survive, and since most voters who usually vote for the Liberal Party will be inclined to vote for Cuomo for re-election in 1990, the Governor's threat is powerful. If Cuomo won't accept the Liberal nomination, the party must run its own candidate for Governor in 1990, or cross-endorse the Republican gubernatorial nominee, and in either event, it would probably fail to poll 50,000 votes. In 1986, the party's candidate for U.S. Senator only polled 60,099 votes. Of course, Cuomo's decision to reject the Liberal nomination might be harmful to Cuomo himself, so he may not carry out his threat.

[ ] **RENEWALS:** If this block is marked, your subscription is about to expire. Please renew. Post office rules do not permit inserts in second class publications, so no envelope is enclosed. Use the coupon below.

IOWA LOSS

On March 31, federal Judge Charles R. Wolle, a Reagan appointee, upheld Iowa law which forces all voters to register as Democrat, Republican or Independent. The judge merely cited the state interest in cutting election administration costs. He ignored Supreme Court precedents which state that constitutional rights cannot be curtailed just to save public funds. The ACLU is appealing to the 8th circuit. *Iowa Socialist Party v Nelson*, no. 86-842A.

1990 PETITIONING

The first petitioning for 1990 ballot status has begun. The Maryland Libertarian Party has almost 5,000 signatures on its petition to qualify the party (10,000 are required). The Libertarian Party national ballot access committee is handling the work. In exchange, the Maryland Libertarian Party has promised to complete its 1992 petition by its own resources.

ELECTION RETURNS

On April 26, Wyoming voters filled a vacancy for the state's sole seat in the U.S. House of Representatives. The vote was:

Republican	Thomas	74,384	52.55%
Democratic	Vinich	60,845	42.98%
Libertarian	McCune	5,825	4.11%
Independent	Johnson	507	.36%

The Libertarian showing was the best showing by a third party candidate for Congress from Wyoming since 1920, when the Farmer-Labor Party polled 10.7%. Two important Wyoming newspapers endorsed the Libertarian, in protest against the mud-slinging of the Democratic and Republican campaigns.

On April 4, Madison, Wisconsin voters elected 3 members of the Labor-Farm Party to the 22-member Common Council (city council), which is officially non-partisan. Also on April 4, three Libertarians were elected to city advisory office in Wichita, Kansas.

SECOND CLASS PAID AT SAN FRANCISCO CA

TIME VALUE

[ ] YES! I want to receive ***BALLOT ACCESS NEWS.***
I enclose $6.00 for 1 year______ (overseas: $10)

[ ] I want to make an additional contribution. Enclosed is $________

Name ______________________________

Address ______________________________

City ______________ State ______ Zip ______

Ballot Access News, 3201 Baker St. San Francisco CA 94123 (415) 922-9779