BALLOT ACCESS NEWS

San Francisco, California July 22, 1991 Volume 7 Number 5

MISSOURI REFORM VETOED

On July 11, Missouri Governor John Ashcroft vetoed the Ballot Access Bill, HB 184. His veto message does not mention the ballot access portion of the bill, but instead criticizes another part of the bill, one which changes the method by which the St. Louis School Board is elected.

The veto was front page news in major daily Missouri newspapers. Earlier, the two largest newspapers in the state had urged the Governor to sign the bill, because of the ballot access improvements and also because of provisions in the bill improving other voting procedures.

The veto is a major disappointment. The bill substantially eased ballot access requirements both for new political parties, and for independent candidates. The bill had been introduced in 1989 and 1990 but had not passed in those years. An attempt may be made in September to override the veto. The legislature returns for just two days on September 11 to consider overriding any of the Governor's vetoes. HB 184 had support from over 90% of the legislators when it passed initially.

Governor Ashcroft is a Republican who cannot run for re-election in 1992, since he will have served two terms. He may run for the U.S. Senate.

9TH CIRCUIT SAYS "NO" TO WRITE-INS

On June 28, the 9th circuit refused to rehear *Burdick v Takushi,* the decision which said that it is constitutional for Hawaii to ban write-in votes. Alan Burdick, the voter-plaintiff, will appeal to the Supreme Court.

MAJOR DEADLINE VICTORY

On June 24, 1991, the 11th Circuit ruled that Alabama's April deadline for turning in petitions to form a new party is unconstitutional. This is the first U.S. Court of Appeals decision striking down a deadline to qualify a new party, since 1980. In 1984 the 10th circuit had suggested that the Wyoming deadline for a new party might be unconstitutional, but had not ruled on the question; in 1985 the 11th circuit had suggested that Georgia's July deadline might be unconstitutional, but had merely remanded the case back to a lower court. This new Alabama decision will make it much easier to win similar cases, including two now pending in Kentucky and Texas. It may also make it easier to win the case still pending in U.S. District Court in Florida over the constitutionality of a 10¢ fee charged by the government for checking each signature on a ballot access petition (Florida, like Alabama, is in the 11th circuit).

The decision was signed by Judges Phyllis Kravitch, Frank Johnson (Carter appointees) and Lewis Morgan (a Johnson appointee). It says that ballot access hurdles are unconstitutional unless they are necessary for a compelling state interest. Alabama has until September 24 to decide whether to appeal to the Supreme Court.

LEGISLATOR JOINS LIBERTARIAN PARTY

On July 16, Calvin Warburton, a member of the lower house of the New Hampshire legislature, changed his registration from "Republican" to "Libertarian" and also became a dues-paying member of the Libertarian Party.

Warburton represents the towns of Epping and Raymond, in southeast New Hampshire. He is one of 4 representatives for the Rockingham County 6th district. He is 81 years old and has been in the legislature since 1978. His district leans to the Republicans but not overwhelmingly so; it elected a few Democrats during the 1980's. Some of Warburton's re-election margins have been slim; in 1986 he won by only six votes. In 1990 he won by 329 votes. He will probably run for re-election in 1992.

Warburton says he switched parties because only the Libertarian Party stands for economic, personal and social freedom. He criticized the New Hampshire Republican Party for planning to impose new state taxes.

EXPERTS ASK SUPREME COURT TO THROW OUT BAD BALLOT ACCESS LAWS

For the first time ever, a group of political scientists have filed an *amicus curiae* brief with the U.S. Supreme Court in a ballot access case. The brief is on the side of the Harold Washington Party and argues that restrictive ballot access laws damage the election system. It was filed on July 5 in *Norman v Reed,* numbers 90-1126 and 90-1435. The case will be argued in the fall of 1991. It concerns the constitutionality of three Illinois rules:

1. A law, unique to Illinois, which requires a new party to submit a complete slate of candidates;

2. A ruling from the State Supreme Court which doesn't permit a party which is already qualified in one portion of the state, to become established in another part of the state, even if it is the same party;

3. A requirement that a party submit 50,000 valid signatures in order to run for county office in Cook County, even though only 25,000 signatures are required to qualify a slate of the party's statewide candidates.

The brief was filed by the Committee for Party Renewal, a group of political scientists and others who believe that political parties are valuable organizations which have been harmed by restrictive election laws in the United States. The Committee believes that political parties are the chief means by which the people can control their government, and sponsored the lawsuit *Eu v San Francisco County Democratic Central Committee*, in which the Supreme Court in 1989 ruled that parties have a First Amendment right to structure themselves as they wish.

The only other organization which filed an *amicus* brief with the Supreme Court in this case, on the side of the Harold Washington Party, is the ACLU of Illinois.

STILL NO BALLOT ACCESS BILL

Congressman Major Owens still hasn't introduced the bill to outlaw harsh ballot access laws, which he promised to do on May 6. However, the bill is back from Leg. Counsel, and Owens may introduce it any time he wishes.

MARSHALL'S RESIGNATION HURTS

Justice Thurgood Marshall is one of the Supreme Court Justices during the last decade who really cared about the interests of people who support political parties other than the Democratic and Republican Parties. His announcement of resignation, made on June 27, is bad news.

Like some other justices, Marshall got better on ballot access and on the rights of political parties, the longer he served on the Court. He was appointed in 1967 and voted with the 6-3 majority in *Williams v Rhodes* the following year (that was the Ohio case in which the Supreme Court ruled for the first time that overly restrictive ballot access laws are unconstitutional). But Marshall also voted in 1971 to uphold the Georgia ballot access laws which were almost as bad as the Ohio ones, in *Jenness v Fortson.* In 1972, Marshall was one of only 3 justices who would have interfered with the Democratic Party's right to decide for itself who should be seated at its own national convention, in *O'Brien v Brown.* And in 1976, he was one of 4 justices who would have kept independent presidential candidate Eugene McCarthy off the ballot in Texas, even though the Texas election law was clearly unconstitutional in providing no means for an independent presidential candidate to get on the ballot.

But in 1979, Marshall wrote *Illinois State Board of Elections v Socialist Workers Party,* a magnificent ballot access decision which stated that ballot access laws are unconstitutional unless the state can show that they are needed for a compelling reason. In 1983, he comprised part of a narrow 5-4 majority in *Anderson v Celebrezze* which said that early petition deadlines for independent presidential candidates are unconstitutional. In 1986 he and Justice William Brennan were the only ones who would have held the Washington state ballot access laws unconstitutional, in *Munro v Socialist Workers Party.* Also in 1986 he wrote the decision in *Tashjian v Republican Party of Connecticut,* the first decision protecting the right of a state political party to control its nomination process. And in 1989, he wrote *Eu v San Francisco County Democratic Central Committee,* which determined that a political party has a right to structure itself according to its own wishes. Last month, he and Justice Harry Blackmun were the only justices who would have struck down a California law which prohibits a political party for endorsing or opposing candidates for nonpartisan office (the majority refused to rule on the merits of the case).

CLARENCE THOMAS

Clarence Thomas, President Bush's nominee to fill the Supreme Court vacancy, has only been a judge since March, 1990, and has never had a case involving ballot access, candidacy, or political party rights.

VOTER REGISTRATION BILL SETBACK

On July 18, the U.S. Senate refused to shut off debate on S. 250, the bill to force the states to make it easier for people to register to vote. It takes 60 votes to shut off debate, but supporters of the bill could only obtain 57 votes. As a result, it is unlikely the bill will receive any more attention this year. There is no voter registration bill in the House yet. The House had been waiting to see what the Senate did, before acting.

SUPREME COURT & VOTING RIGHTS ACT

On June 20, the Supreme Court handed down two decisions interpreting the Voting Rights Act. They were *Houston Lawyers Association v Attorney General of Texas* and *Chisom v Roemer.* They hold that section 2 of the federal Voting Rights Act applies to judicial elections. Section 2 of the Act applies to the entire U.S. and outlaws any election procedure which results in an abridgement of the right of any citizen to vote on account of race.

The controversy arose because one sentence in section 2 says, "A violation of subsection (a) is established if...members of a class of citizens protected by subsection (a)...have less opportunity than other members of the electorate to participate in the political process and to elect representatives of their choice." The 5th circuit had ruled that "representatives" cannot mean judges, and therefore section 2 doesn't apply to judicial elections. But the Justice John Paul Stevens, writing for the Supreme Court, disagreed. Chief Justice William Rehnquist and Justices Antonin Scalia and Anthony Kennedy dissented.

The cases were sent back to the lower courts to determine whether Texas can continue to elect district judges at-large, even from counties with substantial ethnic minority populations; and whether Louisiana can continue to elect two at-large Justices of its Supreme Court from the New Orleans area, while other parts of the state elect Justices of the Supreme Court from single-member districts.

In the fall of 1991, the Supreme Court will hear arguments on another pair of Voting Rights Act cases, from Alabama, *Presley v Etowah County Commission,* and *Mack v Russell County Commission.* After Black county commissioners were elected for the first time in two counties, the majority on those commissions ended the practice of making each commissioner solely in charge of all county road repair in his or her own district. The newly-elected commissioners argue that the policy change should have been subject to clearance under the Voting Rights Act. The lower courts did not agree.

N. O. W. COMMISSION

The last hearing of the Commission for Responsive Democracy will be September 13-15 in Washington, D.C. Then the Commission will make a recommendation to the National Organization for Women, as to whether NOW should create a new party. NOW's new president, Patricia Ireland, a 45-year-old attorney, is believed to be even more favorable to the idea of forming a new party than the outgoing president, Molly Yard, has been.

SUPREME COURT ON CANDIDACY

1. On June 28, the Court refused to hear *Grossmont Union High School v Davies,* no. 90-1720, which deals directly with whether the right to be a candidate is a fundamental constitutional right. The issue was whether an agreement in which an individual promises not to run for office can be enforced. The 9th circuit had ruled that it cannot be enforced, and that decision will stand.

2. On June 20, 1991, the U.S. Supreme Court released an opinion in *Gregory v Ashcroft,* no. 90-50, over whether federal law banning age discrimination applies to state judges. Since the case was from Missouri, where all state judges are appointed by the Governor, rather than elected, the Supreme Court decision doesn't discuss the right to be a candidate.

DEBATE BILL GAINS CO-SPONSORS

HR 791, the "Democracy in Debates" Bill, gained two new co-sponsors in the last month, Peter Kostmayer of Pennsylvania and Eleanor Norton of D.C. The bill, if enacted, would give third party and independent presidential candidates a chance to debate the major party nominees.

REPUBLICANS FIGHT RESTRICTION

The Republican Party is attempting to get the U.S. Court of Appeals, D.C. circuit, to rule that it is unconstitutional for the federal government to limit the amount of money a national political party can donate to its own candidates for Congress. *Federal Election Commission v National Republican Senatorial Committee,* no. 91-5176. Federal campaign laws do not permit a national political party to donate more than $17,500 to any one of its Senate candidates. The party argues that such limits undermine the very function and purpose of political parties, and that a political party should not be treated as just another interest group, in matters of campaign finance. The party lost this case in the U.S. District Court on April 9, in a cursory ruling by Judge Gerhard Gesell which is reported at 761 F Supp 813.

COURT SAVES CALIFORNIA REPUBLICAN

On June 21, a California Superior Court ordered that B. T. Collins, the front-running candidate in a special election for the legislature, be put on the ballot. *Kecher v Eu,* no. 367174, and *Collins v Eu,* no. 367128. Collins, a Republican, had been removed from the ballot because elections officials had ruled that he had 36 valid signatures (40 are required). However, the judge ruled that there were really enough valid signatures, by finding that one signature should be counted even though it was filed in the wrong county, that a second should be counted because the voter had moved only a few days after signing, and that a third and fourth should be counted even though the circulator did not sign the petition which contained those signatures, since the circulator testified that she would have signed it if she had been able to get into the county courthouse (the door was locked at 5 p.m. and she didn't appear until 5:09 p.m. on the day the petitions were due).

COLORADO SUPREME COURT HEARING

On June 25, the Colorado Supreme Court heard arguments in *Colorado Libertarian Party v Secretary of State,* no. 90SA382. The issue is whether the U.S. Constitution protects a political party's right to nominate a non-member. In this case, the original Libertarian Party candidate for Governor last year, Robyn Heid, was a registered Republican, and under state law he was kept off the ballot. But the U.S. Supreme Court said in 1986 in *Tashjian v Republican Party of Connecticut* that it would be unconstitutional for any state to tell a political party that it may not nominate a non-member for public office.

The lower state court in Colorado had refused to grant any relief to the Libertarian Party, and had not explained its reasoning.

The attorney for the state of Colorado argued that the Libertarian Party isn't really a political party. It is true that the Libertarian Party has never been a qualified party in Colorado. No third party has met the definition of "party" in Colorado since 1914, because the Colorado definition of "party" is an one whose candidate for Governor polled at least 10% of the vote in the last election; this is a very stringent standard. Colorado is one of only six states in which no third party has held the status of "political party", or which held automatic ballot status, since before 1968 (the others are Florida, New Jersey, Rhode Island, South Dakota and West Virginia).

If the state of Colorado can deny rights to a political party because that organization can't meet the state's definition of "Political Party", then there are no constitutional protections for small political parties. Unfortunately, the Colorado Supreme Court has a dismal record in cases involving third parties. In 1987 it ruled unanimously against the Prohibition Party on the issue of whether a party must submit a separate petition for each of its statewide candidates, and in 1986 it ruled unanimously against the Socialist Party and said only Democrats and Republicans are entitled to serve as precinct election officials. A ruling in the current case is expected in a few months.

TWO NEW ARIZONA LAWSUITS FILED

Two lawsuits were recently filed against Arizona laws which discriminate against independent candidates or third political parties:

1. The Arizona Libertarian Party sued over the state's policy of giving free lists of registered voters to qualified parties, but not to unqualified parties. *Goetzke v Boyd,* no. 280289, Superior Court, Pima County. There will be a hearing on July 22 at 1:30 p.m.

2. Ernest Hancock, who attempted to qualify as an independent candidate for the legislature last year, sued over Arizona's requirement that independent candidate petitions must be completed within 10 days. *Hancock v Symington,* U.S. District Court, no. 91-1081-PHX. The case was assigned to Judge Carl Muecke, a Johnson appointee with a mixed record on ballot access.

INITIATIVE CURBS DEFEATED

Two bills which would have made it more difficult to get initiatives on the ballot were recently defeated.

1. California: On July 16, California State Senator Frank Hill deleted a provision from his SB 661 which would have outlawed the practice of paying initiative circulators per signature.

2. Oregon: Last month, the Oregon legislature adjourned with no Senate action on HJR 41, a proposed state constitutional amendment which would have required that initiative petitions obtain approximately 13,300 signatures from each congressional district in the state (the old requirement for initiatives didn't specify where in the state the signatures could be obtained). Earlier, HJR had passed the House, but the Senate didn't take it up.

OTHER LEGISLATIVE NEWS

Alabama: Two bills which improve ballot access, H 780 and H 822, face no known opposition, but time is running out for them to be enacted. The legislature adjourns at the end of July. The two bills, sponsored by the Secretary of State, would improve the filing deadline for new party petitions, and would lower the number of votes needed for a party to retain status.

Arizona: On July 1, the Governor signed SB 1390, which authorizes postcard voter registration forms and which does away with deputy registrars. This will make it easier for a new political party to qualify for permanent status in Arizona. The law has always said that a party may maintain status if the number of voters who register into it equals at least 1% of the total state registration. No third party has ever been able to meet this hurdle, partly because of the difficulties of getting voters registered. But with postcard registration, a registration drive will be much easier. It goes into effect on January 1, 1992.

California: AB 177 was signed into law on July 9. It deletes parts of the election code which tell political parties when and where to hold their meetings.

AB 1820, the bill which moves the presidential primary from June to March, passed the Assembly on July 17. It has been amended to cover all offices, not just president.

Rhode Island: Senate Bill 365 was signed into law on June 16. It changes the deadline for third party and independent candidate petitions from July to September.

OHIO BALLOT LABELS

Last year, a U.S. District Court ruled that it is unconstitutional for Ohio to refuse to let independent candidates have any partisan label on the November ballot (such as the word "Independent"). The state appealed, but has repeatedly asked for more time in which to file its brief. The state on July 19 again obtained an extension of time in which to file its opening brief, its seventh extension. The delay is because Ohio's legislature can't decide whether to give in and let independents have the word "Independent" on the ballot next to their names, or whether to appeal.

PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION

At the 1991 annual meeting of the American Political Science Association in Washington, D.C., on August 29-September 1, there will be a panel, "Proportional Representation as a Strategy for Inclusion", sponsored by the APSA Section on Representation and Electoral Systems. Panelists are Douglas Amy on "Improving Representation for Women and Minorities: Is Proportional Representation the Key?"; Robert . Kolesar on "Proportional Representation in Cincinnati: From 'Good Government' to the Politics of Inclusion", and Ronald Busch on "The Influence of PR on the Representation of Religious and Ethnic Minorities".

For more information, contact the American Political Science Association at 1527 New Hampshire Ave. NW, Washington, D.C. 20036, (202) 483-2512.

PBS DROPS PLANS TO DISCRIMINATE

On July 1, the Public Broadcasting Service dropped a proposal to give the Democratic and Republican Parties (but no other parties) several hours of free time during presidential election years. The idea, first proposed last year by the John and Mary R. Markle Foundation, was called "The Voters Channel". The *New York Times* said the plan was dropped because of disagreements between PBS and the Foundation over financing and content. However, it is also possible that the idea was dropped because of doubts that it would conform to the federal Equal Time Rule, which still exists, even though it has many loopholes.

PROHIBITION PARTY NOMINATES

The first national political convention has already been held. On June 25, the Prohibition Party met in Minneapolis and nominated Earl F. Dodge for president, and George Ormsby for vice-president. The party ran the same ticket in 1988, when it was on the ballot in 4 states and polled 8,007 votes. The party has run a presidential campaign in every election since 1872. Dodge lives in Colorado and is a full-time employee of the party. Ormsby lives in Pennsylvania and is national president of the Good Templars, a fraternal organization opposed to beverage alcohol which was formed after the Civil War.

CALIFORNIA DEMOCRATS

The California Democratic Party decided on June 23 not to adopt the proposal to choose some of the party's national convention delegates by caucus. Instead, the party will choose them as it customarily does, by primary.

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.

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	1,200	0	already on	0	Aug 25	Aug 25
Arizona	21,109	10,555	*14,000	800	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	*30,000	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	*1,600	Aug 4	Aug 4
Hawaii	4,534	4,177	already on	0	*3,100	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	*450	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	*56,000	*600	0	0	in doubt	Jun 26
North Dakota	7,000	4,000	0	0	0	0	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	*8,000	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	–	*Sep. 4
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	*organizing	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	*11,000	0	0	0	May 1	Aug 25

LIBT is Libertarian; NAP is New Alliance; POP is Populist. Other qualified national parties are American in S.C., Prohibition in N. M., Soc. Workers in N. M, and Workers World in Mich. 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. * entry has changed since the last issue. The Pacific Party in Oregon has 2,000; the Partie Party in Michigan has 2,000. The Oregon entry in the "Green" column is called the "Environmental Party".

ARIZONA GREEN PARTY

The Green Party of Arizona expects to run a candidate for the special election for Congress, 2nd district, to be held September 24. The candidate, Bill Christi, plans to qualify under the independent method, and will circulate his petition August 13-23. If Christi gets on the ballot, he will be the first Green Party congressional candidate on the ballot anywhere in the U.S.

ALASKA INDEPENDENCE PARTY GROWS

As of July 1, the Alaska Independence Party has 5,646 registrants, or 2.1% of the total registration in the state. This makes the party the biggest third party in the nation, measuring parties by their share of a state's registration. The Alaska Independence Party is the party which won the 1990 gubernatorial election, by running former Governor Walter Hickel. The other third party which won a gubernatorial election in 1990, A Connecticut Party, won't know its registration until November 1991.

U.S. TAXPAYERS PARTY

The U.S.Taxpayers Party, formed by Howard Phillips of the Conservative Caucus, has launched its first petition campaign, in Pennsylvania for the special U.S. Senate election which will probably be held on November 5, 1991. The party's candidate, Dr. Jack Perry, needs 41,305 signatures by September 1. It is not known how many signatures have already been collected.

NEW JERSEY LABOR GOES INDEPENDENT

The Communications Workers of America, a union which represents 38,000 New Jersey state employees, is running fifteen candidates for the legislature this year as independents. New Jersey is one of four states which elects most or all of its state legislature this year. The Union is angry with the Democratic Governor and Legislature for reducing the state workforce, cancelling its pay raise this year, and cuttings its medical benefits.

[ ] **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.

ELECTION RETURNS

1. In April 1991, the three members of the Madison, Wisconsin city council who are members of the Labor-Farm Party were all re-elected. All were in two-way races with Democrats, although the elections are non-partisan. Joseph Szwaja polled 63.9% in the 5th district, Bert Zipperer polled 60.0% in the 6th district, and Andy Heidt polled 58.9% in the 9th district.

2. On June 4, Ernest Walker, a Libertarian, was elected to the Sparks, Nevada city council. He polled 55.2% in a two-person race. Although the race was non-partisan, he was well known that as a Libertarian.

3. On May 21, Denver, Colorado held a non-partisan election to elect two Election Commissioners. There were ten candidates, including two Libertarians, Doug Anderson, who polled 18.4%, and Mike Zink, who polled 14.7%. Although this is a good showing, Libertarians were disappointed because Doug Anderson was an incumbent and the Anderson-Zink team had spent more money than any of their opponents. The winners were the only two women in the race, one a Democrat, the other a Republican.

4. On May 21, Morgantown, West Virginia elected a city council. Socialist Workers Party candidate Clare Fraenzel polled 19.6% in a two-person race in the 5th ward; SWP candidate Dick McBride polled 4.2% in a five-person race in the 6th ward. The election was non-partisan.

5. On May 14, California held special legislative elections in three districts. The Libertarian Party was the only third party to contest any of the seats. In the First Senate District, in the northeastern corner of the state, Gary Dusseljee polled 2.3% of the vote. The last time a Libertarian ran for this seat, in 1984, the party showing was 2.1%. In the 35th Senate District, in Orange County, Eric Sprik polled 5.7% of the vote. No Libertarian had ever run for this seat in the past. In the 26th Assembly District, in Stockton, Debra DeZarn polled 2.5% of the vote. She had run for the same seat in 1990 and had polled 2.8% then.

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 _____