

A-G79 @B9CI G'H9LH'fl 97 : cfa ' - - Ł

This Committee responds to the FEC's August 10 invitation to participate in an Alternative Dispute Resolution process to discuss why the Committee should sacrifice its constitutionally protected rights to Free Speech and Free Association as follows: thanks, but no thanks. The Committee has no interest in indulging the Commission's continued efforts to weaponize government to silence political dissent and brow beat organizations opposing Hillary Clinton.

The Committee reminds the Commission that it has as yet produced not one single, solitary individual so earth-shatteringly stupid as to think a committee whose name is 'Stop Hillary PAC' is somehow an authorized committee of Hillary Clinton. Not a single befuddled soul nor recently re-animated corpse has been identified from what surely must be the legion of Clinton supporters as being so confused. The Committee simply has to ask: perhaps even Democratic primary voters aren't that stupid? And of course, the lack of any such confusion - outside the hallowed halls of 999 E Street - highlights the absurdity of the Commission's Constitutionally impermissible effort to interfere with the Committee's right to freely associate and speak in clear, unambiguous, unmistakable opposition to a candidate for federal office.

The Commission itself, in issuing Advisory Opinion 2015-04 on July 16, 2015, seems to have begun grasping this ineluctable principle: the prohibition on the use of a candidate's name by an unauthorized committee is the prevention of voter confusion. The Commission acknowledged explicitly that this confusion is significantly reduced when a candidate's name is used in a manner evincing clear opposition to that candidate. See also Special Fundraising Projects and Other Use of Candidate Names by Unauthorized Committees, 59 Fed. Reg. 17,267, 17,268 (Apr. 12, 1994).

Lastly, the Committee rejects the unmistakable threat made by the Commission to impose substantial monetary and resource burdens and potential civil and criminal penalties on the Committee and its personnel. There is no basis why the Commission, unable to settle a dispute concerning the name of a PAC, would need to audit the financial activity of that PAC as expressly threatened in the Commission's letter. Perhaps the Commission's resources would be better spent avoiding further violations of the Hatch Act by its staff.

(<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2692218/Another-recycled-hard-drive-Former-Lois-Lerner-deputy-prosecuted-fundraising-Democrats-job-FEC-destroyed-evidence.html>)
