

HEARING HELD ON PENNY DEBATES BILL

HR 1753 FACES HOSTILITY FROM REPUBLICANS

On June 17, Congressman Al Swift, chairman of the House Elections Subcommittee, held all-day hearings on presidential debates. The hearings were prompted because two members of Congress, Timothy Penny of Minnesota and Edward Markey of Massachusetts, have introduced bills to regulate presidential debates. However, the hearing was held as a forum on the general issue of presidential debates, and many of the witnesses made no reference to the specific bills.

One of the bills, Penny's HR 1753, would not only require major party presidential candidates to debate each other, it would mandate that other presidential candidates who are on the general election ballot in at least 40 states and who have raised at least \$500,000 in small private contributions, must be invited into the debates.

Highlights of the hearing:

1. Republican Party officials and Republican members of Congress showed hostility to third party and independent candidates, whereas their Democratic counterparts avoided expressing any opinion on third parties and independents.
2. The debates negotiator for the 1992 Bush-Quayle campaign, Bobby Burchfield, revealed previously unknown information about the extent to which the Commission on Presidential Debates had no control over the decision to invite Ross Perot into all three presidential debates.
3. Several professors of Communications testified that third party and independent presidential candidates ought to be invited into primary season debates rather than general election debates.

Republican Hostility

Frank Fahrenkopf, former Republican Party national chairman and co-chairman of the Commission on Presidential Debates (the "non-partisan", tax-exempt organization which held the 1992 general election presidential debates), said that since "There were 300 candidates for president" last year, it would be impossible to ever include any of them in a debate.

The HR 1753 requirement that third party and independent candidates must appear on the ballot in at least 40 states, if applied retroactively 1900-1988, would have limited all general election debates to no more than 4 debating candidates. Fahrenkopf probably never read HR 1753; also, he left before witnesses on behalf of the bill spoke.

Republican Congressmen Pat Roberts of Kansas said, "What we are doing with mandates is tearing away at two-party control over the process...We'll get more leafy green vegetable types...We won't have the two parties to weed out candidates...We're going to have more Bernie Sanders than you can shake a stick at."

Roberts also claimed that Lyndon LaRouche would be in the debates (LaRouche has never been on the general election ballot in any election in even half the states). Republican Congressman Bob Livingston of Louisiana agreed, saying the Penny bill would create a "Tower of Babel" (Roberts, echoing this remark, referred to it as a "Tower of Babylon").

Democrats Non-Committal

Unlike the Republicans, Democrats hardly expressed themselves on third parties at all. None of the Democratic members of the Subcommittee, except chairman Al Swift, appeared at the hearing. Paul Kirk, the other co-chair of the Commission on Presidential Debates and former Democratic National Chairman, testified but didn't express any opinion about third party involvement in the debates, except to express concern about "one-issue" candidates.

Swift himself seems supportive of the idea that Congress should mandate general election presidential debates, and that there should be objective standards to determine which third party and independent candidates are invited.

Bush Negotiator Reveals New Details

Bobby Burchfield, who represented the Bush 1992 campaign in negotiations over the debates, testified that the Commission on Presidential Debates did not want Perot invited to debate. When both Bush and Clinton insisted on it, the Commission then said that it would only invite Perot into the first debate, with a decision about whether to invite him into the second and third debates to be made after the first debate. But Bush and Clinton vetoed this idea also. Perot, in fact, was invited into all three debates, even before the first one was held. The Commission completely gave in to Bush and Clinton's desires.

The Commission is tax-exempt under the IRS code. In order to defend its tax-exempt status, it must show that it is truly non-partisan, and also that it really is in charge of the debates. The Burchfield testimony undercuts the Commission's public stance.

Experts Want Third Parties In Primary Season Debates

Diane Carlin, an Associate Professor of Communications Studies at the University of Kansas, and a member of the Advisory Board of the Commission on Presidential Debates, felt that leading third party and independent candidates should debate during the primary season, not the general election season. Agreeing with her on this point were Kathleen Jamieson, Dean of the Annenberg School of Communications at the University of Pennsylvania, and Warren Decker, Director of the Debate team held in 1992 at George Mason University. (continued on page 2).

DEBATES HEARING (continued from page one).

This attitude was apparently due to a feeling that third party and independent candidates ought to have some public exposure, but they aren't sufficiently important to enjoy the prestige of debating the major party nominees.

Carlin opposed the criterion of being on the ballot in 40 states and raising \$500,000, because she said third party and independent candidates would tailor their campaigns to meet these goals, and that would increase the number of candidates eligible to be invited. In fact, Carlin was against any change in the law; by contrast, Jamieson and Decker felt there should be some legal criteria to guarantee that debates are held and that there be objective standards to determine who should be invited.

TV Networks, Pollsters Also Testify

Representatives of the TV networks also testified. Hal Bruno of ABC said that common sense should dictate which, if any third party and independent candidates to invite into the debates. He said the criterion should be not whether the candidate can win, but whether the candidate can have an impact on the campaign.

Marty Plissner of CBS verified that the real decision-makers in the 1992 general election debates were the Bush and Clinton campaigns, not the Commission on Presidential Debates.

Pollster Andrew Kohut, head of Times-Mirror surveys, presented evidence that voters were much more satisfied with the 1992 general election presidential debates (the first such 3-candidate debates in the nation's history) than they were with the 1988 debates.

Supporters of HR 1753

Speaking in whole-hearted support of HR 1753 were (1) Congressman Tim Penny; (2) Art Block, attorney for the Fulani campaign and an expert on this issue; and (3) Stuart Reges, Director of the Libertarian Party. Penny stated that he had long been in favor of the idea that third party and independent presidential candidates should appear in debates with their major party opponents, even in the mid-80's, when he was virtually alone in his opinion. Block and Reges emphasized that the public is already paying for the debates (because the expenses of putting them on are tax-exempt, and because the treasury subsidizes the major party presidential campaigns), and that therefore it is logical for Congress to legislate guidelines to ensure that debates do occur and that they are truly non-partisan.

The Elections Subcommittee is having the written and oral testimony printed. It should be available in a month or two. *B.A.N.* will announce when it is available.

SUPREME COURT WON'T HEAR PO CASE

On June 21, the U.S. Supreme Court refused to hear *Longo v U.S. Postal Service*, no. 92-1610. This is the Connecticut case over whether the post office may keep petitioners off its sidewalks. The Second Circuit upheld the post office regulation. None of the other circuits has ruled on petitioning on post office sidewalks.

DELAWARE PETITIONING VICTORY

On June 18, the Delaware Elections Commission promised not to enforce Delaware law, which says that independent candidate petitions must show the Social Security Number of each signer. The concession was obtained because the Socialist Workers Party sued over this issue, and the state decided to yield before the issue reached the judge. *Warren v Harper*, no. 12744, Chancery Court, New Castle County.

Still pending in the case is another issue: is it constitutional for the state of Delaware to provide no means for a new party to appear on the ballot, unless the new party can persuade one-twentieth of 1% of the registered voters in the state, to list themselves as members of that party on their voter registration forms?

The Socialist Workers Party argues against this method, since registration records are open to the public and supporters of the party generally desire to keep their support for the party private. Delaware is the only state in which there is no method to get a new party on the ballot, except by enlisting a certain number of registered members.

FOLEY SUES TO OVERTURN TERM LIMITS

Thomas Foley, speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, filed a lawsuit on June 9 to overturn congressional term limits passed by the voters of Washington state last year. *Colony v Munro*, no. C93-770, U.S. District Court, Western Dist. The League of Women Voters of Washington state is a co-plaintiff with Foley. This is the first time any member of Congress has filed a lawsuit to overturn a term limitation law.

This lawsuit, which will probably end up in the U.S. Supreme Court, will force that Court to face its own past contradictions. In 1969 that Court had ruled that the U.S. Constitutional qualifications outlined in Article I (age, citizenship, residency) are the only qualifications for anyone to run for Congress. *Powell v McCormack*.

But in 1974, the Court upheld a California law which made it impossible for anyone to get on any ballot (primary or general) as a candidate for Congress, if that person had changed his or her registration during the 17 months before the election from being a party member, to being an independent voter. The 1974 decision, *Storer v Brown*, didn't explain why the 1969 decision's principles didn't control the 1974 case.

Washington state law allows anyone to run as a write-in candidate (except that primary losers can't run as write-in candidates in the general election), but prevents members of Congress who have already served 12 years in a particular house, from qualifying to be on any ballot.

GEORGIA RUN-OFF UPHELD

On June 14, the 11th circuit upheld Georgia law which provides that a run-off general election should be held if no candidate receives a majority of the vote at the regular November general election. *Public Citizen v Miller*, no. 93-8273.

NEVADA, OREGON GOOD BILLS GAIN

Nevada: On June 18, the State Senate unanimously passed SB 250. It makes many changes to the election code, including a substantial easing of ballot access for third party and independent candidates. The petition is lowered from 3% of the last vote cast, to 1%; and the vote requirement for a party to remain on is also lowered, from 3%, to 1%. Now the bill goes to the Assembly

Oregon: The Senate Elections Committee has decided to deregulate the Democratic and Republican Parties, and also to lower the number of signatures needed for a new party to get on the ballot, from 2.5% of the number of registered voters, to 1% of the last vote. These ideas are being amended into HB 2276, which is now in that Committee.

OTHER LEGISLATIVE NEWS

1. California: That part of SB 165 which would have eliminated the petition for candidates to get on the primary ballot, was defeated by the Assembly Elections Committee on June 14. Only 40 or 65 signatures are needed, as well as a fee or an additional petition.

2. Connecticut: HB 7002, which provided that Democrats and Republicans could run for office in primaries, even with no support at conventions of their own parties, was completely revised by the State Senate. The Senate deleted the provision for primary ballot access via petition, and now the bill simply lowers the threshold of support needed at a state convention, from 20% to 15%, before a candidate may run in a primary. In that form, the bill passed the legislature on June 8.

3. Louisiana: The legislature adjourned without hearing HB 1394, the bill to make it much easier for a party to appear on the ballot (for office other than president).

4. Maine: On June 14, LD 1432 was killed in the Senate Elections Committee, after the Democratic Senate Caucus took a stand against it. It would have let a small qualified party nominate candidates by convention, instead of primary. Representative John Michael, the bill's sponsor, plans to re-introduce it in the future.

Two other bills failed to advance, and will be taken up next year. They are LD 748, which would permit a party to be fully-qualified in just a single district, and LD 1198, which would permit a minor party to cross-endorse the nominee of a major party.

5. New Mexico: On March 12, 1993, the House passed a resolution unanimously, asking the Secretary of State to suggest tougher ballot access hurdles for minor parties, for the legislature's consideration next year. The resolution claimed the general election ballot is too crowded. In 1992, there was an average of 1.36 candidates on the ballot in N.M. House of Representatives election races!

6. Ohio: In September, the Secretary of State will unveil his proposed bill to permit the label "Independent" for independent candidates. Under current law there are no labels, a policy held unconstitutional last year.

PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY HEARING

On May 24, 1993, there was a hearing in the 11th circuit in *Duke v Cleland*, over Georgia's presidential primary law. The case was brought last year by David Duke, who was kept off the Republican presidential primary ballot. The law permits political parties to decide for themselves which presidential candidates should be on their ballot, and the Georgia Republican Party had refused to let Duke run. The judges who heard the case were Peter Fay, Joel Dubina, and Floyd Gibson. A decision is likely in a few months.

FLORIDA DEADLINE UPHELD

On June 14, federal Judge William Stafford upheld the July 15 deadline for presidential third party and independent candidate petitions, and the July 6 deadline for other petitions. *Taxpayers Party v Smith*, no. 92-40253.

Since the Florida third party presidential candidate petition must carry the name of the presidential candidate, and since this petition requires over 60,000 valid signatures (the second highest number of any state), the Florida law effectively forces third parties to choose their presidential candidates months before the major parties do. Thus, under the 1983 U.S. Supreme Court decision *Anderson v Celebrezze*, the law should have been struck down.

Judge Stafford said that Florida must impose a July 15 deadline, because elections officials are too busy getting ready for the primary election during August. He ignored the problem that the deadline deprived many Florida voters of the right to vote for the candidate of their choice last year (Andre Marrou and Ross Perot were the only third party or independent presidential candidates who qualified in Florida). The U.S. Supreme Court has ruled several times that administrative convenience is no excuse to deprive anyone of his or her constitutional rights. Plaintiffs will appeal.

COURT WON'T HEAR ILLINOIS CASE

On June 21, the U.S. Supreme Court declined to hear a challenge to Illinois state law which dictates that new parties must run a complete slate of candidates. *Norman v Reed II*, no. 92-1739. The Harold Washington Party of Chicago had won the last segment of its ballot access case, but it wasn't satisfied with the victory, because the Illinois Supreme Court avoided ruling on the constitutionality of the full-slate requirement.

BALLOT ACCESS NEWS (ISSN 10436898) is published by Richard Winger, Field Representative of the Coalition for Free and Open Elections, \$7 per year, thirteen times per year, every 4 weeks, at Bx 470296, San Francisco CA 94147. Second class postage paid at San Francisco CA. © 1993 by Richard Winger. Permission is freely granted for reprinting *Ballot Access News*, with attribution. PRODIGY address: BBJK79A.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to *Ballot Access News* at Bx 470296, San Francisco Ca 94147-0296.

PARTY FREE SPEECH TO BE SETTLED

Finally, the question of whether California's ban on political party endorsements in non-partisan elections violates the First Amendment, may be heard by a court. On June 21, the State Court of Appeals, 3rd district, issued an alternative writ of mandate in *Del Junco v Democratic Party of California*, no. 3-cvCO16017, which almost certainly means that the First Amendment issue will be judged by that Court.

The California Constitution, since 1986, has contained a provision making it illegal for a party to endorse, oppose or support a candidate for county or city office. No other state restricts political party speech in this manner.

The *Del Junco* case was filed by the Republican Party state chairman, to stop the state Democratic Party from endorsing Michael Woo, one of the two candidates in the Los Angeles mayoral run-off. On June 1, the Superior Court in Sacramento County did enjoin the Democratic Party from endorsing Woo and from contributing to his campaign (which didn't stop the national Democratic Party from sending him a contribution; the state law can't reach national parties). The State Court of Appeals on June 2 refused to disturb the injunction, but will now take up the merits of the California law.

JUDGE RUTH GINSBURG

Judge Ruth Bader Ginsburg, President Clinton's nominee for the U.S. Supreme Court, has never had a case involving ballot access or political party rights. This is not unusual for a judge on the D.C. Circuit., since the constitutionality of state laws is never before that Court.

Judge Stephen Breyer of Massachusetts, who sits on the First Circuit, was almost chosen for the U.S. Supreme Court. He ruled unfavorably in one ballot access case last year, *Libertarian Party of Maine v Diamond*. When the U.S. District Court Judge denied relief in 1992 (thus keeping almost all nominees of the Maine Libertarian Party off the ballot), the party asked the First Circuit for injunctive relief. Breyer is one of the three judges who denied any such relief.

NEW PARTY NOMINATES

The New Party, founded two years ago, has never before run any candidates in a partisan election, although it has endorsed candidates of other parties. Now it has announced that it will enter the New York city mayoral election this fall. It plans to nominate David Dinkins, who is also expected to be the Democratic nominee. New York law permits candidates to be nominated by more than one party. The party label will be "New Coalition".

N.A.S.S. HEARINGS CANCELLED

The National Association of Secretaries of State, and the Harwood Group, have decided not to hold any more public hearings about U.S. elections. Anyone who wishes to submit written comments may still do so. The address is Harwood, 4915 St. Elmo St. #402, Bethesda Md 20814.

HR 1755 GAINS TWO MORE CO-SPONSORS

In the last few weeks, Congressmen Kweisi Mfume of Maryland and Major Owens of New York have become co-sponsors of HR 1755, the Penny ballot access bill.

Remember, any reader who sends *B.A.N.* a copy of a letter from his or her own member of Congress, commenting on HR 1582, receives a 3-month free extension of his or her subscription. These letters are useful to Congressman Tim Penny's office and to lobbyists for the bill.

U.S. DENIES TREATY ALLEGATION

On June 1, the U.S. Department of State wrote a letter to Bob Waldrop, stating: "We appreciate your interest in the issue of political pluralism and in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE)."

"We assure you that compliance with all CSCE agreements including those you cited from the Copenhagen meeting are of the utmost concern to the Federal government. The United States has signed all the CSCE documents in good faith and we believe that the U.S., in fact, is in compliance with the provisions of the Copenhagen document described in your letter."

The Copenhagen document, signed by President Bush in 1990, guarantees that all the signatory nations will guarantee equal treatment of political parties before the law. The U.S. shamelessly violates this principle. Bob Waldrop, founder of "The Democracy Project" (see page 6 for the address) has been circulating information about the most discriminatory federal and state laws to European embassies. If even one other nation which signed the accord requests information from the U.S. about this issue, the U.S. must respond in detail. The Ukrainian embassy has already acknowledged Waldrop's material and has sent it on its government in Kiev.

WASHINGTON STATE HITS INITIATIVES

On May 7, Washington state Governor Mike Lowry signed HB 1645, which makes it illegal for initiative proponents to pay people by the signature, to circulate an initiative petition. The only other state with a law making it illegal to pay petitioners by the signature is New York. The Washington law forces initiative proponents to pay circulators by the hour or day.

It is likely that some group will sue to overturn the law. In 1988, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that states may not completely ban the practice of paying people to circulate an initiative petition, but left open the question of whether states may ban any particular method of payment.

CLINTON ANGERS P.R. SUPPORTERS

According to the June 14, 1993 issue of *The New Yorker*, President Clinton said that proportional representation is "antidemocratic and very difficult to defend". Clinton said this to defend his action in withdrawing Lani Guinier's nomination to be Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights.

1994 PETITIONING

STATE	REQUIREMENTS		SIGNATURES COLLECTED				DEADLINES	
	FULL PARTY	CAND.	LIBT	PEROT	GREEN	NEW AL	PARTY	CAND.
Alabama	12,157	12,157	700	0	0	0	Sep 9	Sep 9
Alaska	no procedure	2,586	0	0	already on	0	-	Aug 22
Ariz. (est)	(reg) 13,500	(es) 7,000	5,298	0	1,764	276	May 21	Jun 30
Arkansas	20,890	10,000	0	already on	0	0	Jan 4	May 1
California	(reg) 78,992	151,015	already on	100	already on	0	Jan 4	Aug 12
Colorado	no procedure	1,000	can't start	can't start	can't start	can't start	-	Aug 2
Connecticut	no procedure	15,008	can't start	already on	can't start	can't start	-	Aug 12
Delaware	(reg.) 150	(es) 3,000	already on	already on	0	already on	Aug 20	Jul 15
D.C.	no procedure	(es) 2,600	can't start	can't start	can't start	can't start	-	Aug 31
Florida	196,255	196,255	can't start	(reg.) *250	can't start	can't start	Jul 19	Jul 19
Georgia	31,771	31,771	already on	0	0	0	Jul 12	Jul 12
Hawaii	4,645	unpredictable	already on	0	already on	0	Apr 20	Jul 19
Idaho	9,643	1,000	already on	0	350	0	Aug 31	Jun 24
Illinois	no procedure	25,000	can't start	can't start	can't start	can't start	-	Aug 8
Indiana	no procedure	29,909	*11,000	0	0	*20,000	-	Jul 15
Iowa	no procedure	1,500	0	0	0	0	-	Aug 19
Kansas	15,661	5,000	already on	*100	0	0	Apr 11	Aug 2
Kentucky	no procedure	5,000	0	0	0	0	-	Sep 1
Louisiana	(reg) 110,000	0	approx 150	already on	38	0	Jun 30	Jul 29
Maine	26,139	4,000	*can't start	can't start	can't start	can't start	Dec 15,91	Jun 7
Maryland	(es) 76,000	(es) 66,000	*1,350	6,000	0	0	Aug 1	Aug 1
Massachsts.	(reg) 33,000	10,000	can't start	already on	can't start	can't start	Jul 1	Aug 2
Michigan	25,646	25,646	*500	0	0	0	Jul 21	Jul 21
Minnesota	117,790	2,000	can't start	can't start	can't start	can't start	ap. May 1	Jul 19
Mississippi	just be org.	1,000	already on	0	0	0	ap. Apr 1	Apr 8
Missouri	no procedure	20,860	already on	0	0	0	-	Aug 1
Montana	9,473	9,473	already on	0	0	0	Mar 17	Jun 6
Nebraska	5,834	2,000	0	0	0	0	Aug 1	Aug 30
Nevada	14,759	15,402	0	0	1,200	0	unknown	unknown
New Hamp.	no procedure	3,000	already on	0	0	0	-	Aug 10
New Jersey	no procedure	800	0	0	0	0	-	Apr 14
New Mexico	2,850	17,100	800	0	already on	0	Jul 12	Jul 12
New York	no procedure	15,000	can't start	can't start	can't start	can't start	-	Aug 23
North Carolina	51,904	(es) 70,000	lawsuit	0	0	6,000	Jul 14	Jun 24
North Dakota	7,000	1,000	0	0	0	0	Apr 15	Sep 9
Ohio	49,399	5,000	0	0	0	0	Jan 6	May 3
Oklahoma	69,518	0	0	0	0	0	May 31	Jul 13
Oregon	(es) 37,000	(att.) 1,000	already on	already on	15,000	already on	Aug 30	Aug 30
Penn.	no procedure	(es) 28,000	already on	already on	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	-	Jul 21
South Carolina	10,000	10,000	already on	0	0	already on	May 8	Aug 1
South Dakota	6,419	2,568	already on	0	0	0	Apr 5	Aug 2
Tennessee	19,759	25	0	0	1,000	0	ap. May 1	May 19
Texas	38,900	38,900	already on	can't start	can't start	can't start	May 22	May 12
Utah	500	300	already on	0	0	0	Mar 15	Mar 17
Vermont	just be org.	1,000	already on	0	0	already on	Sep 22	Sep 22
Virginia	no procedure	(es) 15,500	can't start	can't start	can't start	can't start	-	Jun 14
Washington	no procedure	unpredictable	can't start	can't start	can't start	can't start	-	Jul 23
West Va.	no procedure	4,044	0	0	0	0	-	May 9
Wisconsin	10,000	2,000	already on	can't start	can't start	can't start	Jun 1	Jul 12
Wyoming	8,000	9,849	0	0	0	0	May 1	Aug 29

LIBT = Libertarian; NEW AL = New Alliance; PEROT = a party created by his campaign. Other qual. national parties: Natural Law in N.M. & Vt, U.S. Taxpayers in Cal., Miss., N.M. & S.C, and Wkrs. World in Mich. "FULL PARTY REQ." means a procedure by which a new party can qualify before it nominates its candidates; not every state has such a procedure. *Populist Party has 1,500 signatures in Ga. Grassroots Party has 200 signatures in Az. * means entry has changed since last issue. The Patriot & Lib't. Parties are "qualified" in Pennsylvania, yet they must still petition. Az. data is as of April; July data in next issue.

CONGRESSIONAL ELECTION RESULTS

On June 8, there was a special election for Congress in California's 17th district (Monterey area). The results were: Democrat 53.7%, Republican 40.9%, American Independent 1.6%, Green 1.3%, Libertarian 1.0%, independents (two) .9% and .4%. Total "Other": 5.3%.

The results in the same district in November 1992 were: Democrat 72.0%, Republican 23.7%, Peace & Freedom 2.3%, Libertarian 1.9%. Total "Other": 4.2%.

POPULIST PARTY OF UTAH DISBANDS

The Populist Party of Utah, the only state unit of that party which got enough votes in the 1992 election to retain its place on the ballot, has dissolved itself and asked the state to take it off the ballot. The Utah party had been composed of Bo Gritz supporters, and since Gritz is no longer interested in the party (even though he was its presidential candidate), neither are his Utah supporters.

BALLOT ACCESS GROUPS

- 1. ACLU, American Civil Liberties Union, has been for fair ballot access since 1940, when it recommended that requirements be no greater than of one-tenth of 1%. 132 W. 43rd St., New York NY 10036, tel. (212) 944-9800.
2. CENTER FOR A NEW DEMOCRACY works to permit different parties to nominate the same candidate. 1324 Drake St, Madison Wi 53715, tel. (608) 256-1968.
3. COFOE, Coalition for Free and Open Elections. Dues of \$11 entitles one to membership with no expiration date; this also includes a year subscription to B.A.N. (or a one-year renewal). See the coupon below.
4. COALITION TO END THE PERMANENT CONGRESS, favors more competitive elections; has a platform which includes easier ballot access. Bx 7309, N. Kansas City, Mo. 64116, tel. (800) 737-0014.

5. COMMITTEE FOR PARTY RENEWAL,

scholars and party activists who believe that strong parties are needed for popular control of government. \$10 per year. Write Dr. Gerry Pomper, Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers, Woodlawn, Nielson Campus, New Brunswick NJ 08901, tel. (908) 932-9384.

6. THE DEMOCRACY PROJECT,

is gathering documentation that the U.S. is in violation of an international agreement it signed in 1990, pledging not to discriminate for or against political parties. The Project will then disseminate this information to the governments of other nations which signed the agreement. Bx 526175, Salt Lake City Ut 84152, (801) 582-3318.

7. FOUNDATION FOR FREE CAMPAIGNS & ELECTIONS,

Funds lawsuits which attack bad ballot access laws. Donations to it are tax-deductible. 7404 Estaban Dr., Springfield VA 22151, tel. (703) 569-6782.

8. ROSS-GREEN ASSOCIATES,

organized in 1985, initiated the Penny ballot access bill (HR 1755) and the Penny debates bill (HR 1753) and has a lobbying office at 1010 Vermont, #811, Washington, DC 20036, (202) 638-4858.

PROPORTIONAL REP. GROUPS

1. THE CENTER FOR VOTING AND DEMOCRACY,

formerly Citizens for Proportional Representation, promotes all types of proportional representation. 6905 5th St., NW #200, Washington DC 20012, (202) 882-7378. Dues are \$20.

The Center will hold its national convention in Washington, D.C., July 17-18.

2. VOTER is working to get an initiative on the

California ballot, to provide that the lower house of the legislature be elected by proportional representation. Write C. T. Weber, 9616 Caminto Tizona, San Diego Ca 92126.

[] RENEWALS: If this block is marked, your subscription is about to expire. Please renew. Sorry, no envelope is enclosed. Use the coupon below.

SECOND CLASS PAID AT SAN FRANCISCO CA

[] I want to receive BALLOT ACCESS NEWS. I enclose \$7.00 for 1 year (overseas: \$12) Make check out to "Ballot Access News".

To receive it by First Class Mail, enclose \$9.00

[] I want to join the Coalition for Free & Open Elections. (includes one-year subscription to this newsletter, or one-year renewal). Make check out to "COFOE". Minimum dues are \$11.

Name
Address
City State Zip