BALLOT ACCESS NEWS

San Francisco, California | May 1, 1991 | Volume 7 Number 2

CONGRESSMAN OWENS TO INTRODUCE BALLOT ACCESS?

PROBABLE NEW SPONSOR IS BROOKLYN REFORM DEMOCRAT

According to a congressional staffer who does not wish to be identified, Congressman Major Owens, a Brooklyn, New York Democrat, is likely to introduce the ballot access bill that Congressman John Conyers introduced in the last three sessions of Congress.

Owens was first elected to Congress in 1982. In New York city politics, he has always been identified with the reform Democratic movement, which sometimes stands apart from the regular Democratic Party organization.

The ballot access bill, which was HR 2320 in 1985 and HR 1582 in 1987 and 1989, would set a ceiling on the number of signatures that states can require, for a new party or independent candidate to get on the ballot. It would only apply to federal office. Although no hearings were held on the bill previously, this year the Chairman of the House Elections Subcommittee, Congressman Al Swift of Washington, has said he will hold hearings on it.

Since Owens hasn't stated formally that he will introduce the ballot access bill, supporters of the bill will "hold their fire" until an announcement is made.

NORTH CAROLINA VICTORY

On April 16, U.S. District Court Judge Franklin Dupree held the 10% petition requirement for certain independent candidates unconstitutional. *Obie v North Carolina Board of Elections,* no. 90-353-CV-5. The decision is a welcome contrast with a decision of the 9th circuit in 1989, upholding a Hawaii 10% requirement for independent candidates. North Carolina doesn't plan to appeal.

MISSOURI BALLOT ACCESS BILL GAINS

On April 23, the Missouri House passed HB 622, which contains the ballot access improvements that almost passed in 1990. HB 622 is sponsored by Representative Robert Quinn, a Democrat, and contains other unrelated election law changes. During the first week in May, the Missouri Senate will vote on SB 178, by Senator Frank Flotron, a Republican, which contains the same ballot access provisions. Also, Flotron will try to amend the provisions into another House Bill which has already passed the House, to save time. The legislature adjourns May 17. Call the Fair and Democratic Elections coalition, (314) 997-9876, for a further update.

The bills would lower the number of signatures from 1% of the last gubernatorial vote (currently over 20,000 signatures) to a flat 10,000 signatures, for statewide third parties and independent candidates. The bill would also do away with the burdensome requirement that statewide petitions contain approximately 4,000 signatures in each of at least five congressional districts.

POLITICAL PARTY SPEECH HEARING

On April 23, the U.S. Supreme Court heard arguments in *Geary v Renne,* no. 90-769, the case over whether a state can make it illegal for a political party to endorse or oppose a candidate for non-partisan office. The California Constitution was amended in 1986 to make it a crime if a qualified political party passes a resolution, either in support of, or against, a candidate for non-partisan office. In California, all county, city, school, and judicial elections are non-partisan.

During the hearing, it seemed that Chief Justice William Rehnquist and Justice Byron White believe that it is constitutional for a state to make it illegal for political parties to speak about non-partisan candidates. White wrote the 1973 opinion upholding the constitutionality of the Hatch Act (which makes it illegal for federal employees to engage in any partisan political activity on their own time), and he seemed to feel that the California ban is just another legitimate ban on speech.

The California law is being defended by the San Francisco City Attorney's office. The Assistant City Attorney who argued the case stated that it does not violate the First Amendment to ban speech by political parties, because California allegedly gives so many benefits to political parties, that they have become dangerously powerful, and therefore it is just and necessary to limit their speech. However, it is not even factually true that California is especially generous to political parties, or that they are particularly powerful.

Also, it is not valid constitutional theory that free speech rights can be curtailed, just because the speaker is given benefits by the state. The only reason anyone advances this theory is because the Supreme Court ruled last year that corporations can be barred from spending their own money to advance the election of any particular candidate (although corporations can set up a PAC and the PAC can spend money for this purpose). Defenders of the California law argue that a political party should be treated as a creation of state governments, just as a corporation is a creation of state governments. This ignores the history and function of political parties, which are almost always formed by people, not by governments.

The Supreme Court will probably issue its opinion during June or July. It is possible that the Supreme Court could rule that the plaintiffs (who were individual members of the San Francisco County Democratic and Republican Central Committees) lack standing to bring the case. There are no political party plaintiffs in the case, although the Democratic and Libertarian Parties of California filed an *amicus curiae* brief in opposition to the California law.

BAD OREGON BILL VETOED

On April 9, Oregon Governor Barbara Roberts vetoed SB 286A, which would have forbad a qualified Minor Party from nominating anyone for office who hadn't been a registered member of that party for a year. This was Governor Roberts' first veto, so it got lots of publicity. Roberts is especially knowledgeable about election law, since she was Secretary of State before she was Governor. Her veto message defended the rights of political parties to decide for themselves whom to nominate. She didn't mention that the bill might be unconstitutional, but it probably is; in 1986 the U.S. Supreme Court declared that it would be unconstitutional for a state to tell a party that it cannot nominate a non-member for public office.

VIRGINIA DEMOCRATS SAVED

On April 19, Governor Douglas Wilder signed House Bill 3005 into law. It changes the definition of "Political Party" from one which polled 10% for any statewide race at the last statewide election, to one which polled 10% for any statewide race at *either* of the last *two* elections.

The bill was created and passed with lightning speed. It had been introduced on April 3 and had passed the legislature by April 9. The bill saves the Democratic Party of Virginia from being considered unqualified. The only statewide race in 1990 in Virginia had been a U.S. Senate race, and the Democratic Party had failed to run any candidate for that office, so obviously it didn't poll 10% of the vote and thereby lost its status.

Although the State Board of Elections had known about the problem since before the election, it had stated that it didn't plan to disqualify the Democratic Party regardless of what the law said. However, after some Republican legislators noticed the situation and began talking about bringing a lawsuit to keep the Democratic Party off the ballot, the Democratic-controlled legislature decided to act.

NORTH CAROLINA BILLS INTRODUCED

On April 19, Representative Art Pope introduced HB 934, which would decrease the number of signatures needed to qualify a new party from 2% of the last gubernatorial vote, to one-half of 1%. This would mean a reduction from 44,000 signatures to 11,000. Currently, North Carolina requires more signatures to get a third party presidential candidate on the ballot than any state other than California and Florida.

The Chairman of the House Elections Committee, Representative Mickey Michaux, has been favorable in the past toward easing ballot access restrictions, so North Carolina activists are cautiously optimistic that the bill will at least reach the House floor.

Representative Pope also introduced HB 391, to lower the petition requirement for independent candidates for district office from 5% or 10% of the number of registered voters (depending on what kind of office is involved) to 2%. Pope is a member of the Republican Liberty Caucus, not the Libertarian Republican Organizing Committee as was stated in the April 3 *Ballot Access News.*

ALABAMA HEARING GOES WELL

On April 26, the U.S. Court of Appeals, 11th circuit, heard *New Alliance Party of Alabama v Hand,* no. 90-7680, the case over the validity of Alabama's April deadline for a new party to submit signatures for a place on the ballot. The lower court had held the deadline unconstitutional, and the state appealed to the 11th circuit. The judges assigned to the case are Frank M. Johnson (a Carter appointee), Phyllis A. Kravitch (a Carter appointee), and Lewis R. Morgan (a Johnson appointee). All three of the judges have had ballot access and party rights cases before. Judges Kravitch and Morgan have acquiesced in some very bad ballot access decisions in the past, and even Judge Johnson has only a mixed record on ballot access. However, all three judges tend to be "activist" judges, with no built-in reluctance to declare laws unconstitutional if the law does, in fact, seem unconstitutional.

At the hearing, Judge Kravitch asked the Alabama Deputy Attorney General point-blank, "What *is* the state interest in requiring the petitions to be turned in by April?" The Deputy Attorney General was forced to say that there is no compelling reason for the deadline to be so early. Judge Morgan asked how the early deadline injures the New Alliance Party. The New Alliance Party's attorney listed four ways in which the deadline interferes with the ability of the party to carry out campaigns. It seems likely that the 11th circuit will agree with the U.S. District Court that the deadline is too early. Alabama provides that new parties nominate their candidates by convention, not primary, so there is no technical reason why the deadline shouldn't be much later in the election year.

A victory in this case may have implications for Florida ballot access. Florida requires a huge number of signatures to get a new party on the ballot, and says that they cannot be collected before January 1 of an election year and are due in mid-July. Florida is also in the 11th circuit. A good decision in the Alabama case might make it possible to fight the Florida law in court.

OREGON THREATENS INDEPENDENTS

HB 3010, which would provide that Oregon voters who voted in the primary could not sign petitions for independent candidates, will have a hearing sometime in May. The bill is sponsored by both Democrats and Republicans. Oregon already requires a high number of signatures to get an independent candidate on the ballot (3% of the last presidential vote for statewide and congressional candidates, 5% for other candidates), so if it passes, it will be almost impossible for independents to get on the ballot.

Oregon provides that a statewide independent candidate need not petition if 1,000 voters attend a meeting in support of the candidate. HB 3010 would also provide that the attendees could not have voted in the primary.

Please write the House State & Federal Affairs Committee, State Capitol, Salem Or 97310, and ask the committee not to pass HB 3010. Only 4 states now provide that someone who voted in the primary, cannot sign an independent candidate's petition.

INDIANA

HB 1742, which legalizes write-in voting, has passed both house and is in conference committee. The bill is sure to pass because last year a federal court found that Indiana's ban on write-in voting is unconstitutional.

Unfortunately, the bill was never amended to also improve ballot access, as activists had hoped. Several influential State Senators have promised to introduce a bill next year to improve ballot access, however.

MAINE BILL INTRODUCED

Representative Dick Gould of Maine, a Democrat, introduced Legislative Document 1482, a comprehensive ballot access improvement bill, on April 2. It will have a hearing in the House & Senate Legal Affairs Committee on May 2. The bill would lower the requirements for a new party to get on the ballot, permit a small qualified party to nominate by convention rather than by primary, ease the deadline for getting a new party on the ballot, make it easier for a party to remain qualified, improve the deadline for independent presidential candidates, and make it easier for an independent candidate to get on the ballot. The bill has several co-sponsors.

CALIFORNIA BILLS

1. Assembly Bill 177, which would delete all restrictions on when and where qualified parties can hold meetings, passed the Assembly Elections Committee on April 30.

2. Assembly Bill 560, which would cut down the number of campaign spending reports by a candidate who raises less than $1,000 for his or her campaign, passed the Assembly Elections Committee on April 25.

3. A part of Senate Bill 70, by Independent State Senator Quentin Kopp, which would have provided that voter registration forms carry an option for independents that reads "No party", was defeated in the Senate Elections Committee on April 22. The vote was unanimous against the idea. Under existing law, the option for independent voters on the form reads "Declines to state". Many voters who wish to be registered independents are reluctant to choose that option. Legislators resist changing the terminology because they don't want voters to register as Independents.

BAD CHANGE IN DELAWARE

Ballot Access News recently learned that the 1990 session of the Delaware legislature changed the deadline for independent candidates, from August 15, to July 15. It is possible that the new deadline is unconstitutional, at least for independent presidential candidates, since the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in *Anderson v Celebrezze* in 1983 that it violates the Constitution for a state to require a petition for an independent presidential candidate to be submitted before the two major parties have chosen their national tickets. One major party (the one holding the presidency) always holds its national convention in mid-August; the other major party always meets in mid-July.

MASSACHUSETTS BILL ADVANCES

HB 3393, a bill to provide that a party remains qualified if it meets the vote test in *either* of the last two elections, passed the House Elections Committee on April 23. The initiative which Massachusetts voters passed last year, easing the ballot access requirements, didn't make it clear whether the vote test applies every two years or every four years.

Some Massachusetts legislators are unhappy that the initiative which passed last year makes it so easy for third party and independent candidates to get on the ballot for the state legislature, and are thinking of amending HB 3393 on the floor to raise those requirements.

RHODE ISLAND BILL ADVANCES

House Bill 6780, which would change the deadline for a third party or independent presidential candidate from mid-July to early September, passed the House on April 23. It is now pending in the Senate Judiciary Committee.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

SB 195, which would restore filing fees, passed the House on April 30. None of the fees exceed $100.

ALABAMA

On May 3, Alabama Secretary of State Billy Joe Camp will hold a press conference to announce his support for a package of election reform bills. One of the provisions will be a proposal to change the vote requirement for a party to remain qualified, from a vote of 20%, to a vote of 2%. Alabama currently has the highest vote requirement in the nation for a party to remain qualified. Camp, a Democrat, was once active in third party politics himself.

NEW YORK BILL GAINS

On April 17, AB 3117 passed the Assembly Elections Committee. It directs the state courts to construe ballot access laws liberally, which means that the courts should not keep people off the ballot just because they make miniscule errors in their petitions.

However, the *New York Times* of April 30 carries a story which predicts that AB 3117 will not be enacted into law this year. The story does report that another election law reform, AB 7974 (also known as SB 4238) did pass the legislature on April 29. It makes it easier to register to vote by easing the deadline to register, from 60 days before a primary, to 25 days.

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.

VOTER REGISTRATION BILL

On April 24, the U.S. Senate Rules Committee passed S. 250, which would force the states to provide postcard registration forms and also force them to let people register to vote when they apply for drivers licenses. The vote was 7-4. The bill is opposed by the Bush administration. There is still no equivalent bill in the House. The House passed similar legislation in 1990 and is waiting to see if the Senate passes the bill before acting.

THRO SYMPOSIUM

THRO, Inc., held a Better Government Symposium on April 20 in Tampa, Florida, at the Sterling Suites Hotel. THRO, like the Coalition to End the Permanent Congress, was formed to work against institutional barriers to free competition in congressional elections. All of the people who attended the meeting were asked what specific reforms or activities they were interested in, and over 10% of them listed "third party activity". Howard Phillips, who is working to form the U.S. Taxpayers Party, was one of the speakers.

CANDIDACY VICTORY

On April 8, the U.S. Court of Appeals, 9th circuit, ruled that the right to be a candidate is so important, that a settlement entered into in which an employee of a school district promised not to run for the school board, is unenforceable. *Davies v Grossmont Union High School District,* no. 91-55140.

Thomas Davies had been held in contempt of court because he ran for the School Board in 1990, (and was elected) after promising that he would never "seek, apply for, or accept future employment, position, or office" with the school district. He had made that promise to settle a 1988 lawsuit that involved a dispute between him, his wife and the Board.

The opinion was written by Judge Stephen Reinhardt (a Carter appointee) and co-signed by Judges Dorothy Nelson (a Carter appointee) and James R. Browning (a Kennedy appointee). It is important because it puts the 9th circuit on record that the right to be a candidate is fundamental, something the U.S. Supreme Court has not stated. The School Board will not appeal to the Supreme Court.

DEBATE BILL GAINS CO-SPONSORS

HR 791, the "Democracy in Debates" Bill, gained three new co-sponsors during the last month: Barbara Boxer of California, Andrew Jacobs of Indiana, and William Lipinski of Illinois. All are Democrats. The bill now has 6 co-sponsors as well as the main sponsor, Timothy J. Penny of Minnesota.

COLORADO

HB 1137, which lets people who are not registered Republicans or Democrats serve as election judges, passed the legislature on April 2.

BETTER CAMPAIGN FINANCE IDEA

The April 3 *B.A.N.* stated that U.S. Senators Paul Wellstone and David Pryor intend to introduce a better type of campaign reform bill, one which does not discriminate against independent and third party candidates. Actually, Wellstone and Pryor plan to offer their plan as an amendment to S. 3 when that bill is debated on the Senate floor (S. 3 is the campaign finance bill authored by Senators George Mitchell and Wendell Ford which does discriminate, and which cleared the Senate Rules Committee earlier this year). Probably the Senate will take up campaign reform in late May.

THIRD PARTY CANDIDATES ELECTED

1. Two Libertarians were elected to New Hampshire town offices on March 12: Howard Wilson was elected Selectman of Andover, and David Benson was elected Budget Committee member of Salem. Wilson won a 3-race with 44.0% of the vote, and Benson won a two-person race with 58.1%. Both elections were non-partisan, but the public was aware that both men were Libertarians.

2. The Progressive Coalition elected the Mayor and two city councilmen in the Burlington, Vermont city elections on March 5. The elections were partisan. The winners were Mayor Peter Clavelle, who had no Democratic or Republican opponents and who defeated three independent candidates with 78.0% of the vote; Dana Clark, who defeated a Democratic and a Green Party opponent with 54.8% of the vote; and Brian Pine, who defeated a Democratic opponent with 55.7% of the vote. At the March city elections in Burlington, the Coalition campaigned against American involvement in Iraq.

HAROLD WASHINGTON PARTY OUTPOLLS REPUBLICANS IN CHICAGO

On April 2, at the Chicago Mayoral race, the candidate of the Harold Washington Party placed second, far ahead of the Republican candidate. The vote was Daley, Democrat, 70.7%; Pincham, HW Party, 25.1%; Gottlieb, Republican, 3.7%; and Warren, Socialist Workers, .6%.

SUPREME COURT TO HEAR POLL CASE

On April 15, the U.S. Supreme Court announced that it will hear the case *Burson v Freeman,* no. 90-1056. The issue is the validity of state laws which prohibit any political speech within 100 feet of a polling place, on election day. The Tennessee Supreme Court had declared the law unconstitutional last year, stating that although political speech can be outlawed in the polling place itself, there is no need to curtail it outside the polling place. Similar laws have been declared unconstitutional in several other states, but this is the first such case to reach the U.S. Supreme Court. If the ban is upheld, the ability of news organizations to conduct exit polls will be threatened, so it is likely that news organizations will file *amicus curiae* briefs, asking the Court to uphold the action of the Tennessee Supreme Court.

1992 PETITIONING

STATE	REQUIREMENTS		SIGNATURES COLLECTED				DEADLINES	
	FULL PARTY	CAND.	LIBT	NAP	GREEN	WKR WLD	PARTY	CAND.
Alabama	12,157	5,000	*finished	2,700	0	0	law void	Aug 31
Alaska	2,035	2,035	0	0	already on	0	Aug 5	Aug 5
Arizona	21,109	10,555	*8,500	0	*500	0	May 16	Sep 18
Arkansas	20,890	0	can't start	can't start	can't start	can't start	May 5?	Sep 1
California	(reg) 79,188	134,781	already on	0	*20,500	0	Dec 31, 91	Aug 7
Colorado	no procedure	5,000	0	0	0	0	–	Aug 4
Connecticut	no procedure	14,620	can't start	can't start	can't start	can't start	–	Aug 7
Delaware	(reg.) 145	(es) 2,900	already on	(es) 130	0	0	Aug 22	*Jul 15
D.C.	no procedure	(es) 2,600	can't start	can't start	can't start	can't start	–	Aug 18
Florida	180,935	60,312	0	0	0	0	Jul 14	Jul 15
Georgia	26,955	27,009	already on	can't start	can't start	can't start	Aug 4	Aug 4
Hawaii	4,534	4,177	already on	0	*1,500	0	Apr 22	Sep 4
Idaho	8,180	4,090	already on	can't start	can't start	can't start	Aug 31	Aug 25
Illinois	no procedure	25,000	can't start	already on	can't start	can't start	–	Aug 3
Indiana	no procedure	29,890	0	0	0	0	–	Jul 15
Iowa	no procedure	1,000	0	0	0	0	–	Aug 14
Kansas	15,661	5,000	already on	0	0	0	Apr 11	Aug 4
Kentucky	no procedure	5,000	0	0	0	0	–	Aug 27
Louisiana	(reg) 110,000	0	approx 150	0	0	0	Jun 30	Sep 1
Maine	26,139	4,000	already on	0	0	0	Dec 12,91	Jun 2
Maryland	10,000	(es) 70,000	*already on	0	0	0	Aug 3	Aug 3
Massachsts.	no procedure	11,715	can't start	can't start	can't start	can't start	–	Jul 28
Michigan	25,646	25,646	already on	0	0	already on	Jul 16	Jul 16
Minnesota	92,156	2,000	can't start	can't start	can't start	can't start	ap. May 1	Sep 15
Mississippi	just be org.	1,000	already on	0	0	0	ap. Apr 1	Sep 4
Missouri	no procedure	20,860	0	0	0	0	–	Aug 3
Montana	9,531	9,531	already on	0	0	0	Mar 12	Jul 29
Nebraska	5,834	2,500	100	0	0	0	Aug 1	Aug 25
Nevada	9,392	9,392	already on	0	0	0	Aug 11	Sep 1
New Hamp.	no procedure	3,000	already on	0	0	0	–	Aug 5
New Jersey	no procedure	800	0	0	0	0	–	Jul 27
New Mexico	2,069	20,681	already on	already on	0	already on	Jul 14	Sep 8
New York	no procedure	20,000	can't start	can't start	can't start	can't start	–	Aug 18
North Carolina	43,601	(es) 65,000	*40,000	0	0	0	in doubt	Jun 26
North Dakota	7,000	4,000	can't start	can't start	can't start	can't start	Apr 10	Sep 4
Ohio	34,777	5,000	0	0	0	0	Jan 6	Aug 20
Oklahoma	45,566	35,132	0	0	0	0	Jun 1	July 15
Oregon	(es) 36,000	(att.) 1,000	already on	0	*300	0	Aug 25	Aug 25
Penn.	no procedure	(es) 27,000	can't start	can't start	can't start	can't start	–	Aug 1
Rhode Isl.	no procedure	1,000	can't start	can't start	can't start	can't start	–	in doubt
South Carolina	10,000	10,000	already on	already on	0	0	May 2	Aug 1
South Dakota	6,419	2,568	0	0	0	0	Apr 7	Aug 4
Tennessee	19,759	25	0	0	0	0	ap. May 1	Sep 3
Texas	38,900	54,269	already on	can't start	can't start	can't start	May 25	May 11
Utah	500	300	already on	0	0	0	Mar 16	Sep 1
Vermont	just be org.	1,000	finished	0	0	0	Sep 17	Sep 17
Virginia	no procedure	(es) 14,500	can't start	can't start	can't start	can't start	–	Aug 21
Washington	no procedure	200	can't start	can't start	can't start	can't start	–	Jul 25
West Va.	no procedure	6,534	0	0	0	0	–	Aug 1
Wisconsin	10,000	2,000	already on	can't start	can't start	can't start	Jun 1	Sep 1
Wyoming	8,000	7,903	*0	*0	*0	*0	May 1	Aug 25

The chart shows petitioning. LIBT is Libertarian; NAP is New Alliance; WKR WLD is Workers World. Other qualified nationally-organized parties are American in S. C., Prohibition in N. M., and Socialist Workers in N. M. "FULL PARTY REQ." means a procedure by which a new party can qualify itself before it knows who its candidates are. Not every state has such a procedure. "CANDIDATE REQ." means a procedure whereby a petition names a particular candidate (some of these procedures permit a party label, others only the label "Independent"). An asterisk means the entry has changed since the last issue.

RON DANIELS

Ron Daniels, who earlier announced his intention to run for president as an independent presidential candidate, now labels himself a "prospective" candidate, and says he will reveal at the end of June 1991 whether he will run.

PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY NEWS

1. Colorado: SB 64, which provides for a presidential primary for the first time in the state's history, was signed into law on April 17. The primary will be in March.
2. Illinois: SB 1315, introduced by Senator James Phillip, the Republican leader, would change the date of the presidential primary from March to May. It passed the Election Committee on April 25.
3. Kansas: the legislature still may pass a bill cancelling the 1992 presidential primary. It must act by May 4.

HAROLD WASHINGTON PARTY CASE

The U.S. Supreme Court will decide on May 14 whether to hear *Norman v Reed,* numbers 90-1126 & 90-1435, the case in which the Illinois State Supreme Court voted to keep the Harold Washington Party off the ballot for Cook County office last year. It is very likely the U.S. Supreme Court will accept the case, since last year that court summarily ordered the party on the ballot, with no hearing. Now the court needs to explain its action.

BRODER SLAMS WRITE-IN DECISION

On April 14, David Broder's political column severely criticized the March 1 decision of the 9th circuit which upheld Hawaii's write-in ban. Broder works at the *Washington Post* and his column is carried by many other newspapers as well. Broder concluded his column, "Most important of all, write-ins symbolize the sovereignty of the individual citizen, on which the whole notion of democracy rests. How three appellate judges could fail to recognize that principle is beyond my comprehension."

[ ] **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.

BALLOT ACCESS GROUPS

1. ACLU, American Civil Liberties Union, has been for fair ballot access ever since 1940, when it recommended that requirements be no greater than of one-tenth of 1%. 132 W. 43rd St., New York NY 10036, (212) 944-9800.

2. ANDRE MARROU, a former Alaska state legislator, assists lobbying efforts in state legislatures. Contact him at 5143 Blanton Dr., Las Vegas Nv 89122, tel. (702) 435-3218. Since 1989 he has lobbied for ballot access bills in seven states. He points out that legislators are more likely to listen to ex-legislators than to ordinary citizens, and also that he has a great deal of experience.

3. COFOE, the Coalition for Free and Open Elections. Dues of $10 entitles one to membership with no expiration date; this also includes a one-year subscription to *Ballot Access News* (or a one-year renewal). Address: Box 355, Old Chelsea Sta., New York NY 10011. Membership applications can also be sent to 3201 Baker St., San Francisco Ca 94123.

4. COALITION TO END THE PERMANENT CONGRESS, has a 9-point platform which includes easier ballot access for independent and minor party candidates. The Coalition opposes institutional advantages which make it easy for members of Congress to get re-elected. Write to Box 7309, North Kansas City, Mo. 64116, or telephone (816) 421-2000.

5. FOUNDATION FOR FREE CAMPAIGNS & ELECTIONS, has non-profit status from the IRS. Consequently, it cannot lobby, but deductions to it are tax-deductible. The Foundation was organized to fund lawsuits which attack restrictive ballot access laws. 7404 Estaban Dr., Springfield VA 22151, tel. (703) 569-6782.

6. RAINBOW LOBBY, organized in 1985, initiated the Democracy in Debates bill in Congress and maintains a lobbying office at 1660 L St., N.W., Suite 204, Washington, D.C. 20036, tel. (202) 457-0700.

SECOND CLASS PAID AT SAN FRANCISCO CA

[ ] I want to receive *BALLOT ACCESS NEWS.*
I enclose $6.00 for 1 year (overseas: $10)
Make check out to "Ballot Access News".

To receive it by First Class Mail, enclose $8.00

[ ] I want to join COFOE. Enclosed is $_____
(includes one-year subscription to this newsletter, or one-year renewal).
Make check out to "COFOE". Minimum dues are $10.

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____