

BALLOT ACCESS NEWS

San Francisco, California

May 30, 1991

Volume 7 Number 3

MISSOURI BALLOT ACCESS PASSES

On May 17, the last day of the legislative session, the Missouri legislature passed the ballot access improvements which were first introduced in 1989, and again in 1990. The provisions are in House Bill 184. That bill contains many other unrelated election law changes as well. The Governor has until July 14 to either sign or veto the bill. Please write Governor John Ashcroft, Jefferson City, Mo 65101 and ask him to sign HB 184.

The bill 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 abolish the burdensome requirement that statewide petition contain approximately 4,000 signatures in each of at least five congressional districts. And the bill would make it clear that a third party statewide petition may nominate candidates for any partisan office, without the need for separate petitions for any district or county offices.

At one point the ballot access improvements seemed doomed. On May 16, the Senate voted to delete all the ballot access improvements from the bill. Missouri activists organized a rapid telephone campaign to the office of the Senator who was most responsible for the deletion. The next day he changed his mind and made a motion, which passed, to restore the provisions. The bill then passed the Senate, went to a conference committee, and again passed both houses, all on May 17. The bill passed the Senate for the second time, only seven minutes before the session adjourned for the year. Credit for the bill's success goes to Ken Bush, lobbyist for the bill; to Senator Frank Flotron and Representative Sheila Lumpe; and to the Missouri Libertarian Party and the Rainbow Lobby.

Assuming the Governor signs the bill, this will be only the eleventh time in U.S. history that a state legislature has eased the requirements for a new party to get on the ballot, in the absence of any lawsuit or initiative pressuring the state government to do so.

NEW MEXICO EASES INDEPENDENT CANDIDATE REQUIREMENTS

On April 2, the New Mexico Governor signed HB 570 into law. It lowers the number of signatures needed for an independent candidate, from 5% of the last gubernatorial vote, to 3%. HB 570 contains other unrelated election law changes and was initiated by the Secretary of State.

There are now only two states left which require a statewide independent candidate to show support by more than 3% of the electorate in order to get on the general election ballot: Wyoming requires a statewide independent to submit a petition signed by 5% of the last vote cast; Hawaii requires a non-presidential statewide independent to obtain support from 10% of the voters, by vote in the primary, in order to qualify for the general election ballot.

SUPREME COURT TAKES ILLINOIS CASE

On May 20, the U.S. Supreme Court agreed to grant a full hearing in the Harold Washington Party's lawsuit against Illinois elections officials, *Norman v Reed*, no. 90-1126 and 90-1435. This will be the first U.S. Supreme Court decision on the question of how much support a new party needs in order to qualify for the ballot, since 1986. The case will be argued in the fall and there will probably be a decision early next year.

The case is virtually certain to win, since the Supreme Court already ordered the Harold Washington Party on the ballot last year, after the State Supreme Court voted to keep it off. However, the U. S. Supreme Court acted without a hearing and without issuing any opinion to explain its order. Assuming the case does win, it will be the first time the U.S. Supreme Court has done anything favorable on ballot access since 1983, and will be the first victory in that Court involving the number of signatures required, since 1979.

The chief issue in the case is whether a party needs 25,000 or 50,000 signatures to get a full slate of candidates for Cook County office on the ballot. Also at issue is a law (unique to Illinois) which says that a new party is compelled to run a full slate of candidates.

DEBATE ISSUE HEATS UP

HR 791, the "Democracy in Debates" bill introduced in January by Congressman Timothy Penny of Minnesota, picked up another co-sponsor this month, Congressman Jose Serrano of New York. Furthermore, U.S. Senator Paul Wellstone of Minnesota has promised that he will soon introduce it in the Senate. The bill would require that major party candidates for president must debate any third party or independent presidential candidates who are on the ballot in at least 40 states and who have raised at least \$500,000 in small private contributions.

The idea that presidential debates should be mandatory got a boost on May 17 when Senator Phil Gramm succeeded in amending S. 3 (the campaign finance bill) to provide that Democratic and Republican presidential nominees must debate each other four times, or lose their general election federal campaign funds. The vote on the Gramm amendment was 44-43. On May 23, the Senate passed the entire bill by a vote of 56-42. Although the Gramm amendment doesn't mention third party or independent presidential candidates, it will be easier for the Penny-Wellstone bill to gain support, now that the Senate has already accepted the idea that presidential debates should be mandatory.

Wellstone advocated that third party candidates be included, during the Senate debate, although he didn't formally offer an amendment to provide for the idea. Anyone who wishes a copy of his remarks may obtain one from *Ballot Access News*. Enclose a self-addressed stamped envelope.

OWENS PROMISES TO INTRODUCE BILL

On May 6, Congressman Major Owens of Brooklyn promised to introduce the ballot access bill which had been introduced in the past by Congressman John Conyers. Owens sent the bill to Legislative Counsel on May 13. The bill would outlaw severe state restrictions on ballot access for third party and independent candidates, in federal elections. As of May 29, the bill still hadn't been introduced. The Rainbow Lobby, which initiated the bill, hasn't been able to learn the reason for the delay.

KENTUCKY LAWSUIT FILED

On May 24, the Libertarian Party filed a lawsuit, *Libertarian Party of Kentucky v Ehrler*, federal district court, Eastern District, Lexington Division, no. 91-231, against three Kentucky ballot access restrictions:

- (1) the requirement that no voter may sign a third party or independent candidate's petition, unless that voter is registered under the same party affiliation as the third party or independent candidate;
- (2) the February deadline for turning in non-presidential petitions;
- (3) the requirement that each petition signer include his or her Social Security number on the petition.

The requirement that a voter may not sign an independent candidate's petition, unless the voter is a registered independent, has never been tested in court anywhere. No state has ever had such a restriction, except for Louisiana between 1919 and 1948, and no one ever challenged the Louisiana law during its lifetime. The Kentucky restriction was passed in 1990. The related Kentucky restriction which says that no one can sign a petition for a third party unless that person is registered as a member of that party, is similar to laws which were held unconstitutional in North Carolina, South Dakota, Nebraska, Nevada and New Mexico during the 1980's.

The early deadline for non-presidential independent and third party candidates is almost certainly unconstitutional, since there is no technical reason for the deadline to be in February. Kentucky does not require new parties to nominate their candidates in the primary.

The requirement that petition signers show their Social Security number on the petition is almost certainly a violation of the Federal Privacy Act. In 1983, the Kentucky Attorney General issued a formal opinion, no. 83-437, stating that if the state were to require the Social Security Number, the requirement would be void. Nevertheless, the 1990 session of the legislature, in apparent ignorance of the Opinion, passed this requirement.

ALABAMA

The Alabama Secretary of State believes he will have a sponsor for his package of election law reforms by the middle of June. The package includes making it easier for a party to remain qualified, and change in the deadline for new parties to qualify, from April to June.

ALASKA DEADLINE VICTORY

On September 21, 1990, Alaska Superior Court Judge Dana Fabe ruled that Alaska's August 1 deadline for new party and independent candidates to turn in signatures for a place on the November ballot, is unconstitutionally early. The state did not appeal, although the legislature still hasn't amended the election law to reflect the new policy. Judge Fabe ruled that the deadline may not be earlier than the date of the Alaska primary, which is the fourth Tuesday of August.

The case was brought by the Green Party, and was called *Sykes v State of Alaska Lieutenant Governor*, no. 3AN-90-7508-CI. The case is historic. It is the first time any Green Party in the United States had won (or even filed) a ballot access lawsuit. Also, it is only the second time a filing deadline in August of the election year has been held unconstitutionally early (the first such decision was won by independent presidential candidate Eugene McCarthy in 1976, against Rhode Island).

The Alaska Green Party had brought the lawsuit because it couldn't quite complete its 1990 petition by the deadline. However, it did submit enough signatures a week later, and then filed the lawsuit when the state rejected the signatures which had been filed after August 1.

NORTH CAROLINA BILLS

On May 6, Representative Art Pope's HB 934, which would lower the number of signatures needed to qualify a new party from 2% of the last gubernatorial vote to one-half of 1%, was defeated in the House Elections Committee, by one vote. The bill received support from only one Democrat on the Committee. All but one of the Republicans voted for it. The bill would have passed if Representative George Miller, a Democrat from Durham, had voted for it. He was a co-sponsor and was at the hearing, but he abstained. If he had voted, there would have been a tie, and then the committee chairman, Mickey Michaux, who supports the bill, could have voted.

Another bill by Representative Pope, HB 391, which makes it easier for non-statewide independent candidates to get on the ballot, passed the House on May 2 and is now pending in the Senate Election Laws Committee. It lowers the petition requirement for all independents (other than statewide candidates) to 4% of the number of registered voters. Current law requires 5% for congressional and multi-county legislative candidates, and 10% for single-county legislative candidates and county office. The 10% requirement was held unconstitutional earlier this year in federal court. The bill has no effect on statewide independent candidates, who need petitions signed by 2% of the registered voters.

NORTH DAKOTA

The Libertarian Party has asked the ACLU to file a lawsuit against a North Dakota law which makes it illegal for a new party to begin petitioning until January of the election year. A response from the ACLU is expected by mid-June.

MAINE BILL SHRINKS AND ADVANCES

Legislative Document 1482 received a hearing in the Maine House and Senate Committee which handles election law bills, on May 3. The following week, the Committee passed the bill, after eliminating most of its provisions. The bill now only makes one ballot access improvement. It gives a qualified political party the right to decide for itself, who can sign petitions to enable its members to get on their own party's primary ballot.

Under existing Maine law, a candidate who wishes to get on the primary ballot of a qualified political party, needs a petition signed by a fairly substantial number of signatures (most states do not require a candidate who is running in a party primary to submit a petition, but some, including Maine, do). In Maine, only voters who are members of that candidate's party may sign the candidate's petition.

Since the Libertarian Party is now a qualified political party in Maine, and since it still has a very small number of registered voters, the existing law would have made it impossible for individual Maine Libertarians to place themselves on the Libertarian Party primary ballot. This is because the number of signatures (2,000 for statewide office) is higher than the number of Libertarian registrants. But under the bill, the Libertarian Party has the right to pass a party bylaw which says that any registered Maine voter may sign the petition of an individual Libertarian who is trying to get himself or herself on the Libertarian primary ballot.

Assuming the bill passes and assuming the Maine Libertarian Party changes its bylaws, individual Libertarians who wish to appear on the party primary ballot will still need to collect signatures, but at least any registered voter will be able to sign.

WRITE-IN VOTING

1. Hawaii: the rehearing request in *Burdick v Takushi* is still pending. This is the 9th circuit lawsuit over whether it violates the U.S. Constitution for a state to ban write-in votes. The original panel of the 9th circuit had upheld the ban. Syndicated columnist James J. Kilpatrick attacked the write-in ban in his column of May 3.

2. Indiana: HB 1764, which legalizes write-in voting, was signed into law on May 12. The provisions legalizing write-in voting had been contained in HB 1742, but a conference committee transferred them into HB 1764.

MASSACHUSETTS PARTY NAME

Last month, the Massachusetts Secretary of State gave permission for the Independent High Tech Party to change its name to the Independent Voters Party. The party is the only ballot-qualified third party in Massachusetts. Most states, including Massachusetts, have nothing in their election code on the subject of whether a qualified party may change its name, but most states have granted permission for this when asked. The issue had never come up in Massachusetts before.

PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARIES

1. California: The Executive Board of the state Democratic Party will decide on June 23 whether to adopt the proposal to choose half the party's national convention delegates by caucus, in March, leaving the other half to be chosen in the June presidential primary. In the meantime, AB 1820, the bill to move the date of the presidential primary from June to March, is showing signs of life. It passed the Assembly Elections Committee on April 30 and is now in the Ways & Means Committee. If the Democratic Party believes the bill can pass in time for the 1992 primary, the caucus proposal almost certainly will not pass.

2. Kansas will definitely hold a presidential primary in 1992. Even though the legislature adjourned without appropriating any money to hold it, the Secretary of State has ruled that the primary will be held and the counties, rather than the state, will pay for it.

INDIANA PRESIDENTIAL ELECTORS

On June 10, the U.S. Supreme Court will probably announce whether it will hear the New Alliance Party's appeal in *Fulani v Hogsett*, no. 90-1608, the case in which the party sued the Indiana Secretary of State for damages, for putting George Bush and Michael Dukakis on the November 1988 ballot even though they failed to meet the deadline for identifying their candidates for presidential elector. The lower court had held that the New Alliance Party had standing to sue, but that no award of damages was justified, since the party filed the case too late.

It's not likely the U.S. Supreme Court will hear this case, but the case does establish for the history books that even major parties sometimes fail to meet legal deadlines.

BAD OREGON BILL DIES

Oregon provides that an independent candidate can get on the ballot in one of two ways: (1) a petition signed by 3% of the last vote cast (or 5% if the candidate is running for legislature or county office); (2) a convention, attended by 1,000 voters if the candidate is running for statewide office (and lesser numbers for lesser offices).

HB 3010, as originally introduced and mentioned in the May 1 issue of *Ballot Access News*, would have provided that voters who voted in the primary, could not sign an independent candidate petition, nor could they attend an independent candidate nominating convention. On May 10, the House Federal & State Committee amended the bill to provide that only convention attendees must not have voted in the primary. Under the amended bill, independent candidates who qualify for the ballot by petition would not be affected. The committee passed the amended bill by a vote of 5-2.

On May 22, the House voted to send the bill back to Committee because of a technical error in the drafting of the bill. Under the rules, the bill cannot be brought back again unless the Speaker of the House grants a waiver, and he refused to do that in time for the bill to pass.

FLORIDA VETO HELPS INITIATIVES

On May 29, Florida Governor Lawton Chiles vetoed HB 1809, which would have made it illegal for proponents of an initiative to pay signature-gatherers by the signature. It would have permitted signature-gatherers to be paid by the hour, or to be paid a salary. In 1988 the U.S. Supreme Court said it is unconstitutional to ban all forms of payment to signature-gatherers.

Governor Chiles is the second Florida Governor in a row to veto this proposal. Last year, then-Governor Bob Martinez vetoed a similar bill.

Meanwhile, the same idea is making progress through the California legislature. On May 15, the California Senate Elections Committee passed the identical proposal. On May 30, it passed the Senate Appropriations Committee.

ILLINOIS DISQUALIFIES SOLIDARITY

On May 22, Illinois Attorney General Roland Burris ruled that the Illinois Solidarity Party lost its statewide status as a qualified party on November 6, 1990. Burris held that the party did not poll as much as 5% of the "entire vote cast" in the election held that day. The election law requires a party to poll at least 5% for any statewide office, in order to remain qualified to nominate statewide candidates (in order to remain qualified for all office, it must poll 5% for Governor).

Illinois official election returns show that the Illinois Solidarity Party candidate for Trustee of the University of Illinois, Martin Ortega, received 226,103 votes. On election day, 3,420,720 voters voted. Since voters are permitted to vote for three candidates for that office, and since there were three Democratic and three Republican candidates for Trustee, there were a total of 8,404,967 votes cast for the office. Illinois law is ambiguous about what "entire vote cast" means. If it means the number of people who voted, then Illinois Solidarity easily qualified, since its vote, divided by the number of people who cast a ballot, equals 6.6%. But if "entire vote cast" means the number of people who voted for the particular office, then the party does not qualify.

The Illinois Solidarity Party, which has functioned as the Illinois branch of the New Alliance Party since 1988, has not yet decided whether to appeal the ruling.

U.S. TAXPAYERS PARTY

The U.S. Taxpayers Party, lead by Howard Phillips, has not begun petitioning for a place on the ballot anywhere yet. However, Phillips has been actively wooing several political parties which exist in only one state and which are ballot-qualified. He hopes that the American Independent Party of California, the Independent Voters Party of Massachusetts, the Tisch Independent Citizens Party of Michigan, the Right-to-Life Party of New York, the American Party of South Carolina, and the Independent Party of Utah, will join in nominating the presidential candidate of the U.S. Taxpayers Party, whoever that may turn out to be.

NEBRASKA PRESIDENTIAL ELECTORS

Next year, Nebraska will join Maine in electing presidential electors by congressional district, rather than entirely at-large. Each congressional district will elect its own elector. Thus, it will be possible for either or both states to send a split delegation of presidential electors to the state capitol. Nebraska has 3 congressional districts.

Under the U.S. Constitution, each state may decide for itself how to choose presidential electors, as long as the state does not discriminate against any of its voters. During the first 35 years after the Constitution was adopted, half the states let the voters of each congressional district choose their own presidential elector. After 1824, though, all the states began providing that all of the electors should be elected at-large. In 1892 Michigan reverted to the old system of choosing one elector from each district, and the U.S. Supreme Court upheld Michigan's decision (although Michigan abandoned the practice after just one election). In 1971, Maine went back to the old district system, and this year the Nebraska law was changed to that system.

N.O.W. COMMISSION

The Commission for a Responsive Democracy held a hearing in San Francisco on May 4, and will hold its final hearing in Washington, D.C. sometime in June. Then the Commission will, of course, get to work on assimilating what it has heard.

CANDIDACY DECISION APPEALED

The May 1 *Ballot Access News* reported on the case *Davies v Grossmont Union High School*, in which the 9th circuit held that the right to be a candidate is fundamental, and therefore an agreement in which someone promised never to run for the School Board, cannot be enforced against the person who made that promise.

Contrary to what the last issue said, the San Diego, California area school board is appealing the case to the U.S. Supreme Court. It is case 90-1720. The Supreme Court will probably announce in early July whether it will hear the case. If the Court wishes to make a statement about the right to be a candidate (which would have a terrific impact on the movement to limit terms of legislators), it might very well hear this case. In 1982 the Court ruled in *Clements v Fashing*, 457 U.S. 957, that the right to be a candidate is not fundamental, but there was no majority decision, merely a controlling decision signed by four justices, so the area is still murky.

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. © 1991 by Richard Winger. Permission is freely granted for reprinting *Ballot Access News*.

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

1992 PETITIONING

STATE	REQUIREMENTS			SIGNATURES COLLECTED			DEADLINES	
	FULL PARTY	CAND.	LIBT	NAP	GREEN	*POPULIST	PARTY	CAND.
Alabama	12,157	5,000	finished	2,700	0	0	law void	Aug 31
Alaska	2,035	2,035	*1,000	0	already on	0	*Aug 25	*Aug 25
Arizona	21,109	10,555	*12,000	0	*2,500	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	*22,000	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	*141	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	*0	*0	1,000	Aug 4	Aug 4
Hawaii	4,534	4,177	already on	0	*1,600	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	*can't start	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
Massachs.	(reg) 33,000	11,715	can't start	can't start	can't start	can't start	Jul 1	Jul 28
Michigan	25,646	25,646	already on	0	0	0	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	*12,409	already on	already on	0	0	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	*55,000	*200	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	*500	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	*3,000	0	0	0	May 1	Aug 25

The chart shows petitioning. LIBT is Libertarian; NAP is New Alliance. Other qualified nationally-organized parties are American in S. C., Prohibition in N. M., Socialist Workers in N. M., and Workers World in Michigan and 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.

ATHEIST CASE HEARING

On May 8, there was a hearing in the 4th circuit in *Silverman v Ellisor*, the case over whether it violates the U.S. Constitution for South Carolina to bar atheists from being governor. At the hearing, it appeared that Judge James Sprouse (a Carter appointee) leaned toward believing that the plaintiffs do have standing, and it appeared that Judge Paul Niemeyer (a Bush appointee) leaned the other way. The third judge, Herbert Murray (a Nixon appointee) didn't ask any questions during the hearing, so it was impossible to know what he was thinking. A decision is likely in three or four months. If the judges rule that the candidate has standing, the case will probably be sent back to the lower court for a decision on the merits.

TERM LIMITATION INITIATIVE

The next vote on term limitations will almost surely be on November 5, 1991, in Washington state. Proponents have 102,000 signatures and need 150,000 valid signatures by July 5, and are certain they will qualify.

ANTI-MARIJUANA PROHIBITION PARTY

A new political party in Michigan is attempting to get on the ballot and already has 2,000 signatures. The party believes that laws against marijuana should be repealed, and supports the Bill of Rights. This new party's platform is similar to the platform of the Grassroots Party, which appeared on the Minnesota and Iowa ballots last year. The new party in Michigan does not wish its name to be publicized, because the party's founder considers the name so desirable that he feels other groups would "steal" the name of the party, if it were better known. The party can be reached at P.O. Box 46853, Mt. Clemens, Mi 48046, or telephone (313) 358-9869. *Ballot Access News* will mention the name of the party if and when it succeeds in getting on the Michigan ballot.

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. **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.
3. **COALITION TO END THE PERMANENT CONGRESS**, formed in 1988 to work for reforms to make congressional elections more competitive, has a 9-point platform which includes easier ballot access for independent and minor party candidates. P.O. Box 7309, North Kansas City, Mo. 64116. Membership is \$25 per year.
4. **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.
5. **PROJECT 51-'92**, a Libertarian PAC, actively assists lobbying efforts in state legislatures (as well as organizing support for Libertarian petition drives). Contact Andre Marrou, 5143 Blanton Dr., Las Vegas Nv 89122, tel. (702) 435-3218.
6. **RAINBOW LOBBY**, organized in 1985, initiated the Conyers ballot access bill in Congress and maintains a lobbying office at 1660 L St., N.W., Suite 204, Washington, D.C. 20036, tel. (202) 457-0700. It also works on other issues relating to free elections.

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 _____