

BALLOT ACCESS NEWS

San Francisco, California

April 27, 1992

Volume 8 Number 2

PEROT OBTAINS HUNDREDS OF THOUSANDS OF SIGNATURES IN A MONTH

Three-eighths of the needed signatures have been collected to qualify Ross Perot for the ballot in all states, even though petitioning didn't begin for him until mid-March (except that it began earlier in Tennessee). Perot supporters originally needed 800,000 valid signatures. The best estimate is that his supporters still need 500,000 valid signatures.

In some states, his petitioners expect to collect many more signatures than are required, even ten times as many as are required, to show support. The chart on page five shows "finished" for fifteen states. However, "finished" only means that if the petition were submitted, it would almost certainly have enough valid signatures. Many of the "finished" states are continuing to collect, just to make a public relations point. For instance, in Massachusetts, the Perot Committee wants to set a new record for the number of signatures in support of an independent (John Anderson set the old record in 1980 by turning in 140,000).

The fact that Perot will probably have no trouble getting the needed signatures, should not be taken to mean that ballot access requirements in the U.S. are not burdensome. If Perot were starting a new political party and attempting to run candidates for all open seats in Congress, his party would need almost 2,500,000 valid signatures, triple the burden that he needs merely as an independent presidential candidate. See page 4 for an account of how Perot supporters are handling various legal problems.

NEBRASKA PETITIONING VICTORY

On April 16, the Nebraska Supreme Court issued an order, blocking a law which makes it illegal for anyone to circulate an initiative petition outside one's home county. *State ex rel Stenberg v Beermann*, no. S-33-92009.

Until this year, Nebraska law required initiative petitions to be circulated by registered voters, but any voter was free to circulate the petition anywhere in the state. However, in February this year the legislature amended an old pending bill, LB 424, to provide that no one could circulate the petition outside the county of residence, and passed the bill. The Attorney General, who had already warned the bill was unconstitutional, filed a lawsuit to block the law.

The hearing on the merits will be May 11. The Attorney General charges that the law violates both federal and state constitutions. The Nebraska Constitution gives the legislature authority to pass laws to facilitate the initiative process, but no authority to inhibit it.

If the lawsuit succeeds in striking down the law, as expected, it may be possible to also overcome the Nebraska law which says that petitions for new parties cannot be circulated outside the circulator's home county.

KENTUCKY LEGALIZES PRES. WRITE-INS

On April 10, Senate Bill 221 was signed into law. Among other things, it ends the ban on write-in votes for president at the general election. Representative John Harper, a Republican, is responsible for this portion of the bill. It provides that write-in presidential candidates must file a slate of electors at least 10 days before the November election.

Kentucky had banned write-ins for president in 1982. There are now only three states which permit write-ins generally, yet ban them for president: Virginia, Nebraska, and South Carolina. In addition, Hawaii, Oklahoma, South Dakota and Nevada ban all write-ins. The U.S. Supreme Court will issue an opinion on the constitutionality of write-in bans during May or June.

COLORADO LIBERTARIAN CASE REFUSED

On April 20, the U.S. Supreme Court refused to hear the case brought by the Colorado Libertarian Party, over whether the party could nominate a non-member for public office. *Colorado Libertarian Party v Secretary of State*, no. 91-1285. The party's nominee for Governor in 1990, Robin Heid, had been disqualified because he was a registered Republican. Colorado lets fully-qualified political parties write their own rules on such matters, but denies this right to parties that haven't polled 10% of the vote for Governor.

The U.S. Supreme Court stated in 1986 that it would violate the First Amendment to tell a political party that it couldn't nominate a non-member. Nevertheless, the Colorado Supreme Court ruled against the party, and the U.S. Supreme Court wasn't interested enough in the issue to accept the party's appeal. On ten separate occasions, the Libertarian Party has asked the U.S. Supreme Court to hear a ballot access appeal, but that Court has never heard any of them, even though the Libertarian Party has been the nation's third-largest nationally-organized political party for sixteen years.

MISSOURI BILL ADVANCES

HB 1736, an omnibus election bill which contains ballot access improvements, passed the House on April 2 by a vote of 142-8 and passed the Senate Elections Committee on April 14 by 8-0. Activists are hoping the bill gets voted on in the Senate before the legislature adjourns.

The bill would lower the number of signatures from 1% of the last gubernatorial vote to a flat 10,000 signatures. It would also permit a party to circulate a petition before it had chosen its candidates, and would end the need to collect signatures in each congressional district.

GOOD LOUISIANA BILL INTRODUCED

On April 6, Representative Sean Reilly introduced HB 754, to ease Louisiana ballot access law for third parties. Except for president, Louisiana bars political parties from the ballot unless they either (1) polled 5% of the presidential vote at the last election, or (2) persuade 5% of all Louisiana voters to enroll in the party.

This law is so difficult, no third party has complied with it, since George Wallace's vote qualified the American Party in 1968.

Louisiana already has tolerant laws for candidates of any political party to get on the ballot, but will not print a party label next to the candidate's name unless the party meets the 5% standard. HB 754 would provide that a political party could register itself and its officers with the Secretary of State, and then members of that group could have their party label on the ballot.

OTHER LEGISLATIVE NEWS

Arizona: SB 1118, which would ease procedures for independent candidates, is stalled in the House Judiciary Committee and will probably die. It would have ended the existing practice of requiring that the petition be completed within 10 days in September, from the ranks of voters who didn't vote in the primary.

California: AB 3793 was killed in the Assembly Elections Committee on April 7, even though it received 8 "Aye" votes and only 5 "No" votes. It would have made it possible for small, qualified parties to nominate candidates by write-in vote in their own primaries. Currently, only the Democratic and Republican Parties enjoy this right.

Bills need 10 votes in order to pass out of the Assembly Elections Committee. Six Republicans and two Democrats voted for the bill. All the "No" votes were cast by Democrats. No legislator criticized the bill at the hearing. The Libertarian Party had initiated the bill. The Green Party also supports the bill, and the two parties are hoping to persuade any legislator to amend the contents of AB 3793 into another bill. There is also a lawsuit pending in the 9th circuit on this subject, *Lightfoot v Eu*.

Connecticut: On March 23, a joint committee on election laws killed Bill 494, which would have provided that a political party which is qualified in just part of the state, doesn't lose its qualified status, just because all the districts in which it had been qualified get their boundaries changed. The Libertarian Party had initiated the bill, hoping to save its qualified status in the seven legislative districts where it had it.

Most states don't even provide that a party can be qualified in just certain congressional or legislative districts. Connecticut grants this status to parties which poll 1% or more of the vote for a district office. However, after every reapportionment, when the district boundaries are altered (no matter how slightly), district qualification is erased for these parties.

The Democratic and Republican Parties are not affected; they have automatic status in all districts because they polled over 20% of the vote for Governor. Another party in Connecticut, named "A Connecticut Party" also enjoys major status (this is the party which elected Lowell Weicker Governor in November 1990).

New York: Governor Mario Cuomo is threatening the State Senate with a veto of reapportionment, unless it passes one of the pending ballot access reform bills. In a few days the Senate may yield and pass one of several bills on this subject. These bills direct the courts to construe the ballot access laws liberally, so as not to let tiny technical flaws invalidate petitions. The bills would help candidates running in primaries, as well as candidates petitioning for a place on the general election ballot.

FEC TOLD TO INTERVENE IN REPUBLICAN DELEGATE PROCESS

On April 7, federal judge Charles R. Richey, a Nixon appointee in the District of Columbia, ruled in favor of the Freedom Republicans, a group of African-American members of the Republican Party, in their lawsuit against the Federal Election Commission. *Freedom Republicans v FEC*, no. 92-cv-153.

Freedom Republicans had charged that the national Republican Party delegate selection procedures, and procedures for selection of party officials, result in an exclusion of Blacks. (the only Black members of the Republican National Committee are from the Virgin Islands). Therefore, Freedom Republicans asked that the Federal Election Commission stop funding the Republican national conventions, since federal civil rights laws forbid the federal government from funding any "program or activity" which discriminates. Under federal legislation passed in 1975, political parties which polled at least 25% of the vote in the last presidential election receive government funding to pay for their national conventions.

Judge Richey ordered the FEC to issue rules to insure that the two major political parties comply with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act. The FEC obtained a new hearing before Judge Richey, set for April 29, to learn how fast the judge wants the rules issued, and whether the rules should apply only to delegate selection, or to party office as well. It is considered likely that the FEC will appeal the decision, after the final clarification. At this point, the Republican Party is not a party to the lawsuit.

POST OFFICE PETITIONING LOSS

On March 9, the U.S. Court of Appeals, 2nd circuit, refused to grant a rehearing *en banc* in *Longo v U.S. Postal Service*, no. 91-6141. The issue is whether the post office must let petitioning be carried out, on postal sidewalks, for candidates for public office. The U.S. District Court had struck down the post office ban (which only applies to candidate petitions, not initiative petitions) but the U.S. Court of Appeals reversed it and will not reconsider. The plaintiff hasn't decided yet whether to appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court.

3RD CIRCUIT UPHOLDS 9-DAY PERIOD

On April 14, the U.S. Court of Appeals, 3rd circuit, upheld an order of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court, allowing only 9 days for Democratic and Republican candidates to circulate petitions to get on primary ballots. *Valenti v Mitchel*, nos. 92-1262, 92-1264 & 92-1274. The vote was 3-0. The judges were William D. Hutchinson, Anthony Scirica, and Robert Cohen, all Reagan appointees.

Normally three weeks are permitted, but this year the Pennsylvania Supreme Court ordered that the period be shortened to 9 days so that the primary could be held on time, despite late reapportionment. Primary candidates for statewide office in Pennsylvania need 2,000 signatures; candidates for the U.S. House need 1,000 signatures; primary candidates for Delegate to the National Convention need 250.

Normally, when a late reapportionment or other unavoidable event shrinks the petitioning period, courts will order that the number of signatures be reduced proportionately to the amount of lost time. However, neither the State or federal courts seem to have even thought about that idea. They debated about lengthening the period, but decided not to, partly because it would have jeopardized holding the election on time, and partly because most of the candidate-plaintiffs were slow to use the existing time they had.

Pennsylvania election officials granted administrative relief to delegate candidates pledged to Lyndon LaRouche, before the court ruling, on the grounds that they were especially disadvantaged by the short time period. They couldn't begin circulating their petitions until they had obtained the signature of LaRouche, and since he is imprisoned in Minnesota, it was impossible to obtain his signature quickly. Therefore, the LaRouche delegate candidates were not part of the final court fight.

OTHER LAWSUIT NEWS

California: the Democratic Party filed a lawsuit on March 30 in State Superior Court, Sacramento County, against a California law which makes it illegal for political parties to express opinions about non-partisan candidates. *Sacramento County Democratic Central Committee v Lungren, et al*, no. 369951. On April 9, Judge James T. Ford ruled that the party had no standing to bring the case, since it couldn't show that it was being injured. Both the Attorney General of California and the District Attorney of Sacramento County stated in court that they would not enforce the ban on political party speech.

Another case, filed last year on the same issue in San Francisco (where the City Attorney is enforcing the ban) will soon get a court date. *LaRiva v Wang*, no. 935788.

Wisconsin: On April 1, the Labor-Farm Party of Wisconsin filed its appeal with the U.S. Supreme Court, asking that Court to hear its case against Wisconsin law which makes it impossible for a candidate to be nominated by more than one political party. *Swamp v Kennedy*.

Montana: On March 31, the U.S. Supreme Court issued an opinion in *U.S. Department of Commerce v Montana*, reversing the lower court and ruling that Montana should only have one member of the U.S. House. The unanimous opinion, by Justice John Paul Stevens, essentially is a shoulder-shrug which says that since no one particular method of allocating seats to the various states is perfectly fair, there is no reason to upset the formula which has been used by Congress since 1941. The result means that Washington state will keep its new House seat.

National: On April 6, Lenora Fulani filed her brief in the U.S. Court of Appeals, 2nd circuit, in *Fulani v Brady*, no. 92-6047, the case over whether the League of Women Voters should lose tax-exempt status because it didn't conduct the 1992 New Hampshire Democratic debate in an even-handed manner (it included all Democrats who qualified for matching funds except for Fulani).

The brief points out that the Treasury Department quickly revoked tax-exempt status for Rev. Jimmy Swaggert's church, after it endorsed Pat Robertson in the 1988 Republican primaries. Yet the Treasury Department has shown no interest in even thinking about revoking the League's status.

Ohio: there will be a hearing on June 18 in *Rosen v Brown*, no. 90-4100, the case over whether the state of Ohio must let independent candidates have some partisan label (such as "Independent") on the ballot. Currently, Republican and Democratic nominees get their party label on the ballot, but no one else ever does. The hearing is in the 6th circuit. The case was won in the lower court and the state is appealing.

CONTRADICTORY RULINGS

Two states which provide that the number of signatures on ballot access petitions is a percentage of the current number of registered voters, recently interpreted their laws in different ways. In Oregon, new parties need a petition signed by 2.5% of the number of registered voters, and North Carolina, independents need 2% of that number.

In North Carolina, the Board of Elections ruled that the number of registered voters on which the percentage should be based, is the number in last year's tally. The Board felt it would be unfair to use the May 1992 tally, since petitioners at this time wouldn't know how many signatures they need, since that number isn't known yet.

However, the Oregon Secretary of State made the opposite ruling. He ruled that the registration tally to be used, is the most recent one, at the time the petition is submitted. This means that a new party which submits a petition in May 1992 will need 2.5% of the number of registered voters as of May, whereas a party that doesn't submit the petition til August, will need 2.5% of the number of registered voters as of August. The difference could be as much as 3,000 signatures. The Oregon interpretation requires a party to circulate a petition during a time at which it doesn't know how many signatures it will need.

PEROT LEGAL STRATEGY

Supporters of Ross Perot are taking extra precautions to guarantee that their ballot access will not be jeopardized:

1. California: the Secretary of State has ruled that presidential elector candidates for an independent presidential candidate, may be members of qualified parties. Although independent presidential candidates in California generally must have been registered outside of the qualified parties for 13 months prior to the general election, this law is being interpreted (as it has in the past) to exclude presidential electors candidates.

Nevertheless, the Perot Committee has decided to run only candidates for presidential elector who have not been registered members of any qualified party, for the 13-month period. This decision has caused a one-week delay in getting started (the legal starting date is April 24, but the drive will not begin til early May).

2. Connecticut: Perot originally let his petitioners know that he prefers to run as an independent candidate, not the candidate of a new party. However, in Connecticut, the Secretary of State ruled that no one may use the term "Independent", since there has been a qualified party in certain districts called the "Independent Party". Rather than fight this ruling, Perot supporters have created a new party, called "Americans for Perot". Assuming Perot runs in November and polls more than 1% of the vote, a qualified party under that name will come into existence and will be entitled to run a presidential candidate in 1996 with no further petitioning.

3. Oregon: The law provides that no one may be an independent candidate who has been a member of a qualified political party for the previous six months. Perot is a registered voter in Texas. Texas is one of the states in which voters do not show a party affiliation on their voter registration records. Therefore, no one can claim that Perot is a registered member of a qualified party, and he is safe from this Oregon law.

However, Perot hasn't yet chosen a vice-presidential candidate. The person he eventually chooses (assuming he runs) may be a registered member of a qualified party during the recent past. In order to avoid any legal problems in Oregon for the future vice-presidential candidate, Perot supporters in Oregon are creating a new political party, to be called the "Independent Initiative Party". New parties in Oregon face no restrictions on whom they can nominate.

New York: *U.S. News & World Report* of April 20 reported that some national Republican Party leaders are trying to persuade the New York Republican Party to "ensnare" his petitioners in "red tape and legal technicalities". *Newsday* of April 17 reported this, but stated that the national Bush re-election committee is opposed to any such tactics to keep Perot off the ballot.

Nevertheless, Perot petitioners in New York have announced that they will obtain 100,000 signatures (to meet the requirement of 20,000) to make it far more difficult for anyone to challenge his petitions.

Maryland, North Carolina: These two states are both in the 4th circuit, which ruled in 1990 in *Cromer v State of South Carolina* that it is unconstitutional for a state to make it more difficult for an independent candidate to get on the ballot, than for a third party candidate. Both states do, in fact, make it more difficult for an independent presidential candidate to get on the ballot, than for a third party presidential candidate. Maryland requires an independent to get 6 times as many signatures as a third party presidential candidate, and North Carolina requires 1.5 times as many signatures for an independent as for a third party.

Nevertheless, Perot petitioners in Maryland and North Carolina plan to fulfill the requirements of the law, rather than suing and taking even a remote chance that the lawsuit might not succeed.

CONGRESSIONAL TERM LIMITS

There are likely to be initiatives on the ballot in at least eight states this November, for term limits for members of the U.S. House. In order to get around the principle that the states cannot add to the qualifications for an individual to hold congressional office, some of the initiatives provide that incumbents who have already served a certain number of terms, may run again...but only as write-in candidates.

Term limit initiatives are already certified for the ballot in Michigan, South Dakota, and Wyoming, and are considered extremely likely to qualify in California, Florida, Ohio, Arizona and Oregon. There is a good chance that such initiatives will qualify in other states as well.

LIBERTARIAN RECORD-SETTERS

Libertarian Party candidates for the U.S. Senate will appear on the November 1992 ballot in South Dakota and Georgia. This will be the first third party candidate for U.S. Senate on the South Dakota ballot since 1932, and the first one on the Georgia ballot since 1942.

MATCHING FUNDS

On April 4, the Treasury mailed checks in the following amounts to these candidates: George Bush \$666,877; Pat Buchanan \$1,043,306; Bill Clinton \$1,112,938; Paul Tsongas \$347,647; Jerry Brown \$306,798; Bob Kerrey \$357,738; Tom Harkin \$185,721; Lenora Fulani \$143,693. Matching payments are made once per month.

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. © 1992 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 PRESIDENTIAL PETITIONING

STATE	REQUIRED	PEROT	MARROU	FULANI	PHILLIPS	GRITZ	(GREEN)	DUE
Alabama	5,000	*finished	already on	2,700	0	*200	0	Aug 31
Alaska	2,035	*finished	*4,000	*500	*500	seek nom	already on	Aug 24
Arizona	10,555	can't start	already on	*19,500	0	*9,000	*19,000	Sep 18
Arkansas	0	0	0	*already on	*already on	0	0	Sep 15
California	134,781	*0	already on	seek nom	seek nom	0	already on	Aug 7
Colorado	5,000	0	2,000	*2,500	0	*825	0	Aug 4
Connecticut	14,620	*10,000	*1,600	700	0	*300	0	Aug 14
Delaware	(reg.) 144	*finished	already on	75	*80	10	0	Jul 15
D.C.	(es) 3,100	can't start	can't start	can't start	can't start	can't start	can't start	Aug 18
Florida	60,312	*70,000	*55,000	200	500	*22,000	0	Jul 15
Georgia	26,955	*10,000	already on	0	0	*1,000	0	Jul 14
Hawaii	4,177	*600	already on	0	0	*600	*finished	Sep 4
Idaho	4,090	*2,000	already on	0	500	*2,000	350	Aug 25
Illinois	25,000	can't start	can't start	in court	can't start	can't start	can't start	Aug 3
Indiana	29,890	*0	finished	*12,000	200	2,700	0	Jul 15
Iowa	1,000	*finished	*630	*200	0	*700	0	Aug 14
Kansas	5,000	*5,000	already on	0	0	0	0	Aug 4
Kentucky	5,000	*finished	7,700	*100	*500	*200	0	Aug 27
Louisiana	0	0	approx 150	0	0	0	0	Sep 1
Maine	4,000	*5,500	already on	*2,700	*2,600	0	0	Jun 2
Maryland	10,000	*40,000	already on	*110	*1,300	1,200	0	Aug 3
Massachsts.	10,000	*finished	*3,100	*4,600	already on	0	0	Jul 28
Michigan	25,646	*finished	already on	*200	seek nom	*1,000	0	Jul 16
Minnesota	2,000	can't start	can't start	can't start	can't start	can't start	can't start	Sep 15
Mississippi	1,000	*finished	already on	260	already on	400	0	Sep 4
Missouri	20,860	*10,000	*4,000	0	0	*250	*3,000	Aug 3
Montana	9,531	*10,000	already on	0	0	*1,100	0	Jul 29
Nebraska	2,500	can't start	already on	0	0	0	0	Aug 25
Nevada	9,392	*6,000	already on	*1,250	*6,500	*1,300	*1,000	June 10
New Hamp.	3,000	*2,500	already on	*3,500	0	0	0	Aug 5
New Jersey	800	*finished	*450	0	*400	50	0	Jul 27
New Mexico	2,069	*12,000	already on	already on	0	50	0	Sep 8
New York	20,000	can't start	can't start	can't start	seek nom	can't start	can't start	Aug 18
North Carolina	43,601	*32,000	*finished	*3,200	500	0	0	Jun 26
North Dakota	4,000	*finished	0	0	0	0	0	Sep 4
Ohio	5,000	*finished	*1,000	*600	*1,000	*500	0	Aug 20
Oklahoma	35,132	*28,000	*20,000	2,200	0	0	0	July 15
Oregon	(att) 1,000	0	already on	*7,700	0	2,500	*9,500	Aug 25
Penn.	37,216	0	*1,000	*10,500	0	0	0	Aug 1
Rhode Isl.	1,000	can't start	can't start	can't start	can't start	can't start	can't start	Sep 4
South Carolina	10,000	*7,000	already on	already on	seek nom	seek nom	0	Aug 1
South Dakota	2,568	*2,000	already on	*150	0	0	0	Aug 4
Tennessee	25	already on	0	finished	0	*10	(pty)*1,000	Aug 20
Texas	38,900	*finished	already on	0	0	*2,000	0	May 11
Utah	300	*finished	already on	*already on	finished	already on	0	Sep 1
Vermont	1,000	*finished	already on	already on	0	0	0	Sep 17
Virginia	13,920	*finished	*500	0	0	0	0	Aug 21
Washington	200	can't start	can't start	can't start	can't start	can't start	can't start	Jul 25
West Va.	6,534	*8,000	*6,000	0	0	*825	0	Aug 1
Wisconsin	2,000	can't start	already on	can't start	can't start	(pty) *500	can't start	Sep 1
Wyoming	8,000	*6,500	already on	0	0	*500	0	Aug 24

Other qual. nat. parties: Amer. in SC, Ut; Proh. in NM; Soc. Wkr in NM; Wkr. World in Mich., NM. * entry changed since last issue. Ron Daniels has 2,000 in Pa. The Socialist Party has 200 in Utah, 100 in Iowa, 50 in NJ. The Workers League has 12,500 in Mich., 900 in NJ. The Prohi. Party has 200 in Colo. The "Req" column shows the easier of the two methods, party or independent. The "Due" column is the Indp. deadline. "Seek nom" means a qualified third party in that state may nominate the candidate. "GREEN" column includes the Pacific Party. "Finished" doesn't necessarily mean the drive isn't still proceeding!

FIRST CALIFORNIA GREEN SHOWING

On April 7, a special election to fill a vacant State Senate seat was held in Los Angeles, California. In accordance with California election law for special partisan elections, there is no closed primary. Instead, all candidates' names are printed on a single ballot, and all voters vote on that ballot, regardless of how the voter is registered.

There were four Democrats, three Republicans, one Peace & Freedom Party candidate, one Libertarian, and one Green candidate on the ballot. Since no one got as much as 50% of the vote, there will be a run-off on June 2 between the highest vote-getter from each of the five parties.

The Green Party candidate, Glenn Trujillo Bailey, received 3.5% of the vote; the Libertarian, John Vernon, received 2.4%; the Peace & Freedom candidate, Gary Preston Kast, received 1.2%. This was the first partisan election in California at which a Green candidate appeared on the ballot.

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. **CENTER FOR A NEW DEMOCRACY**, a tax-exempt project which fights laws that make it impossible for two different parties to nominate the same candidate. 1180 Observatory Rd., Madison Wi 3706.
- 3. **COFOE**, the Coalition for Free and Open Elections. Dues of \$11 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.

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.

4. **COALITION TO END THE PERMANENT CONGRESS**, works for reforms to make congressional elections more competitive; has a platform which includes easier ballot access for independent and minor party candidates. Bx 7309, North Kansas City, Mo. 64116, tel. (800) 279-0622.

5. **COMMITTEE FOR PARTY RENEWAL**, a group of political scientists and party leaders who believe that strong political parties are needed for popular control of government. \$10 per year. Write Gerry Pomper, Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers, Wood Lawn, Nielson Campus, New Brunswick NJ 08901. The Committee filed a brief in support of fairer ballot access laws with the Supreme Court in 1991 in *Norman v Reed*.

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

6. **RAINBOW LOBBY**, organized in 1985, initiated the Penny "Democracy in Debates" bill in Congress and maintains a lobbying office at 1660 L St., N.W., Suite 204, Washington, D.C. 20036, tel. (202) 457-0700. It also works on other issues relating to free elections. It is trying to find a new sponsor for the bill to outlaw restrictive ballot access laws in federal elections.

VOTER REGISTRATION GROUPS

- 1. **HUMAN SERVE** lobbies for laws that provide for registering people to vote whenever they apply for government services, such as drivers' licenses and social services. 622 W. 113th St., #410, New York NY 10025, tel. (212) 854-4053.
- 2. **PROJECT VOTE!** shares the same goal, but brings lawsuits to accomplish this end. 1424 16th St., NW, Washington DC 20036, tel. (202) 328-1500.

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 **COFOE**. Enclosed is \$_____
(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 _____