

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Taylor_Sharon_01_01_2015_00_01_02_CommentText.txt

=====

The internet MUST remain free from governmental interference. Nobody has the right to determine what other people post on any site.

Comments provided by :
Taylor, Sharon

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Heraldez__Alma__01_01_2015_00_36_49_CommentText.txt

=====

This is TOTALLY UNCONSTITUTIONAL!! Hands off our first amendment rights to freedom of speech!!
We are NOT a Communist country!! Leave the internet the way it is! !

Comments provided by :
Heraldez , Alma

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Miller_Dennis_01_01_2015_05_47_51_CommentText.txt

=====

I am totally against regulating the Internet in any way. This is a violation of our constitutional rights. With the corruption that exist in this obama regime the only people that will be regulated will be free thinking conservatives.

Comments provided by :
Miller, Dennis

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Warren_Barry_01_01_2015_09_15_34_CommentText.txt

=====

The United States and the U.S. Constitution ensures our free speech. This fundamental right is a crucial part of how our society operates and functions. Encroachment on this right is wrong and demonstrates how the current administration has a complete and anti-Constitutional approach to the people of the U.S. This must stop in order to maintain and encourage future generations' freedom.

Comments provided by :
Warren, Barry

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Henneman__Jeffrey__01_01_2015_09_38_17_CommentText.txt

=====

Why are you even thinking about controlling speech??????

Comments provided by :
Henneman , Jeffrey

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_McClure_Mary_01_01_2015_09_44_43_CommentText.txt

=====

I've become quite alarmed this past election "season" with the amount of money spent on my state's elections' candidates. Most of the time it is difficult to even hear/read the "sponsor" of the ad. Yes, this is a free country and one should support candidates of one's choice. BUT, we all should be free to discover who is behind the group paying for the ads.

It is really underhanded to slip in the this undisclosed clause into the funding bill.

Comments provided by :
McClure, Mary

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Eaglehouse_Ed_01_01_2015_10_29_28_CommentText.txt

=====

Political commentary presented in any media on the Internet should not be regulated. Americans' right to freedom of speech is still a valuable and necessary protection. I object to it being subjected to governmental interference.

Comments provided by :
Eaglehouse, Ed

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Mutchler_Sara_01_01_2015_12_53_29_CommentText.txt

=====

Our nation should not be regulating free speech in any form, including the Internet. Thus is not China, North Korea, or the U.K. We the people have the right to voice our opinion on any subject we chose without fear of government retribution.

Comments provided by :
Mutchler, Sara

=====

=====

The FEC is tasked with regulating money spent on elections, not political speech. Not monitoring the individual on the internet. Reversing the exemption for free postings online would have dangerous ramifications for constitutionally-guaranteed free speech. The FEC would have to unleash an army of regulators to police YouTube and other internet sites on a daily basis to look for potential violations, and subject them to inquiries simply because they posted opinions online. This will place an undue burden on small groups and individuals. These new regulations would be extremely costly for taxpayers and difficult to enforce.

Comments provided by :
Scott, Charles

=====

=====

First Amendment to the United States Constitution

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

Comments provided by :
Ball, Garrett

=====

=====

The United States of America is described as the land of the free.

Freedom of speech is one of the most basic freedoms that we as Americans enjoy. It is A FOUNDATIONAL FREEDOM that holds up many of the rights that make up the very essence of what it means to be an American.

When we are not free to say or express what we honestly feel, we are forced to become liars, pretending that we agree when we actually do not. It will not change, but will only frustrate the people.

If you, to whom we the people, have entrusted leadership roles in government, enact regulations such as these, you are no longer working for the good of our country, but toward its eventual demise.

A nation with limitations on the freedom of speech, is no better than the communist or socialist countries we accuse of mistreating their people.

Consider carefully what this regulation will do to the future of our great nation. Remember, any regulation you allow will eventually affect you and all of your loved ones too.

Without freedom of speech, there is social imprisonment. When the people are imprisoned in any way, there is no longer a free country. In a country that is no longer free, the people no longer count and there is oppression, which according to Merriam-Webster is defined as, "unjust or cruel exercise of authority or power." THIS IS DEFINITELY NOT WHAT AMERICA STANDS FOR, OR NEEDS.

THIS TYPE OF REGULATION IS NOT THE ANSWER TO ANY OF AMERICA'S PROBLEMS. IT WILL ONLY CAUSE THINGS TO GET WORSE.

Comments provided by :
Holzgrove, Shirley

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Munro_Toni_01_01_2015_18_21_32_CommentText.txt

=====

This is a violation of our constitutional right to free speech.

Comments provided by :
Munro, Toni

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Brown_Floyd_01_02_2015_06_53_17_CommentText.txt

=====

I do not want my Internet priviledges legislated by Congress.

Comments provided by :
Brown, Floyd

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Early_Dodie_01_02_2015_09_42_39_CommentText.txt

=====

I've grown up in one of the greatest countries in the world. My America is great because of the freedoms we have. Freedom of speech is very precious to me.

Comments provided by :
Early, Dodie

=====

=====

Transparency is vital for our Democracy to function fairly and equally for all citizens. When a particular candidate for office, or topic for legislative/regulatory consideration is being promoted by an individual or organization, disclosure of such interest and promotional activity is vital to assuring transparency. This is especially true when huge amounts of money are being spent to support such candidates and/or causes. It's no secret to anyone that money buys influence. It's only human nature to return favors, especially when such favors are monetary in nature. If we can't undo the Citizens United ruling, we should at least have complete disclosure on the money being spent behind the scenes.

Comments provided by :
Klein, Alan

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Walker_Lori_01_02_2015_15_19_13_CommentText.txt

=====

Freedom of speech is a Constitutionally protected right in the United States. Limiting our political speech on the Internet is against the Constitution. Any law or restriction the FEC tries to pass that limits the right of Constitutionally protected free speech must be fought.

If there is anything the FEC should be doing, it should be fighting voter ID fraud and fighting for voter ID requirements in EVERY state. That is the ONLY way everyone's vote is protected. Please keep the FEC's nose out of the Internet and continue to allow free political speech on the Internet. We are NOT Russia or China!

Comments provided by :
Walker, Lori

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Helin_Barry_01_02_2015_16_00_38_CommentText.txt

=====

I was a Marine.

Comments provided by :
Helin, Barry

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Matthews_Daniel_01_02_2015_16_06_52_CommentText.txt

=====

Stop the Federal Election Commission (FEC) from restricting individual freedom by regulating political or any other free speech on the Internet.

Keep the Internet free and keep America free!

Comments provided by :
Matthews, Daniel

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Bryans_Lorna_01_02_2015_16_06_55_CommentText.txt

=====

For 79 years I have led a life FREE from government intrusion. Upon hearing talk of shutting down FREE SPEECH on the internet, or any where else, I have to speak out. I do not want a communist government. My ancestors fought in all the wars for our freedom, now some left wing crazy wants to take that away. Look at Cuba, do we want to live like that?

Communism is the path many want for this country, I am not one of those people.

Comments provided by :
Bryans, Lorna

=====

=====

The Obama Administration is again overreaching, encroaching into Americans personal freedoms and this is the latest assault on the Bill of Rights, e.g. free speech/press. Internet outlets like YouTube and the broader Internet should be free from federal government control.

Under current FEC guidelines (from a unanimous, 6-0 decision in 2006), political advertising or commentary posted on YouTube is exempt from campaign reporting requirements. Free speech is worthy of protection, including protection of individual bloggers and online commentators. Any video an American post of their political commentary should not fall under the scrutiny of the federal government.

HANDS OFF the internet and HANDS OFF our precious, constitutionally-protected freedom of speech!

Comments provided by :
Smythe, Jane

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Bahling_Valerie_01_02_2015_16_41_06_CommentText.txt

=====

We cannot allow the internet to become prey to politics - by either party!

Comments provided by :
Bahling, Valerie

=====

=====

I oppose restriction of Internet postings of information, videos, opinions,blogs, etc. relating to elections, candidates, PACs, or political parties. The Internet should be regarded as a medium of speech just as the spoken or printed word, the freedom of which is protected by the first amendment of our Constitution. Restriction of unsolicited "speech" on the Internet as identified previously, by any means whether outright censorship or by burdensome reporting requirements is in violation of that Constitutional protection.

Thank you for your consideration of this comment.
M. Butterworth

Comments provided by :
Butterworth, Manning

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Crockett_Leon_01_02_2015_16_53_43_CommentText.txt

=====

I believe the Federal Government is already interfering in our private lives in unconstititutional fashion.
Free Speech should not be restricted on the Internet.

Comments provided by :
Crockett, Leon

=====

=====

What a level of arrogance! Obviously, the CBO (CONGRESSIONAL Budget Office) is motivated to mis-state reality to change opinion and gain support for more tax revenue as its highest priority. It is a further destruction of the foundation our society- LOGIC, which came from the GREEK CIVILIZATION (Plato, Socrates, Pythagoras), to claim a conclusion based on known falsities; and because of this is, is an insult to all those who are recipients of such information, but most insulting to those who know and understand the truth and facts, and have intelligence to destroy such feeble explanations. This having been said I could not agree more wholeheartedly with the Tea Party's position. We need to re-install honesty back to ALL government. I can certainly tell you this: my upbringing was not that of those who take the position of the CBO! Apparently, the CBO's position statement on budgetary tax cuts seems to be for another category of person in the electorate- the ignorant. Nevertheless, it is not surprising that the CBO's position is NOT supporting the theoretical antithesis of their claim-REAGANOMICS!

Comments provided by :
Mims, John

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_knight_bill_01_02_2015_17_00_05_CommentText.txt

=====

The first amendment guarantees our individual freedom of speech. Just because the internet allows, through technology, me to reach a multitude instead of dozens of people, does not give you grounds to regulate my speech.

If politicians are allowed to disseminate lies we're allowed to call them on it. Regulators like yourselves are bound by the Constitution. Leave my speech rights alone!

Comments provided by :
knight, bill

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Warner_kimberly_01_02_2015_17_13_34_CommentText.txt

=====

I believe in the freedom of speech and the internet should stay a place where political opinion can be voiced. The freedom of speech would be limited if the internet is not kept open.

Comments provided by :
Warner, kimberly

=====

=====

In my duties as a citizen with the civic duty of protecting the First Amendment rights for myself and for all Americans, I am writing to voice my objection to the proposed FEC review board to regulate videos posted on the internet. In fact, I object to the FEC or any other Federal agency attempting to regulate or control the internet in any respect whatsoever. Government regulation of the internet, while common in Communist countries, violates our First Amendment Rights firmly stated in our Constitution. Americans will never willingly give up any of the rights delineated in our Bill of Rights.

For this reason, I feel compelled to inform you that, If the Federal Election Commission's proposed rule change is made and implemented, I am committed to joining any class lawsuit that undoubtedly will result from such an unconstitutional action on the part of the FEC. I sincerely hope the American people do not have to fight such a battle with the FEC. If we do, I will join many other Americans in supporting that lawsuit all the way to the Supreme Court -- irregardless of the personal time and sacrifices involved.

Comments provided by :
Putnam, W. Joy

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Satler_Terry_01_02_2015_17_42_00_CommentText.txt

=====

It is incredibly important to keep the government out of messing with the internet. Any regulations that hamper we Americans' rights to freedom of speech MUST BE STOPPED IMMEDIATELY. This current administration; the most corrupt presidency in US history, along with it's lock-step Dem Communists and self-centered RINO's that have apparently ignored the tea party that won them the Senate, will top down our last vantage of free speech in a heartbeat if we don't find a way to stop them. With all our liberties and freedoms fast fleeing with this current administration, it is critical for all of us Americans to join hands and stop them in their wicked little tracks. VOTE THESE JERKS OUT OF OFFICE PLEASE!

Comments provided by :
Satler, Terry

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Stein_Loretta_01_02_2015_17_52_20_CommentText.txt

=====

The FEC has no business on the internet. I will not have my right to free speech violated!

Comments provided by :
Stein, Loretta

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Weaver_Lura_01_02_2015_17_57_14_CommentText.txt

=====

I wish to express my view that the Federal Government should not control
the internet. It's doing fine without you. It's the only really free
speech we have. When government gets involved in things, bad things happen.

Comments provided by :
Weaver, Lura

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Russell_H_R_01_02_2015_17_58_41_CommentText.txt

=====

Thank you for this opportunity to comment. Tax cuts are NOT a "loss" to the treasury. It is not your money. Earmarking is simply wrong. The CBO needs to get real and reflect real "main street" vice any other "street." Again, it is not your money. Thanks. R.

Comments provided by :
Russell, H R

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Clark_Jerry_01_02_2015_18_04_45_CommentText.txt

=====

HANDS OFF the internet and HANDS OFF our precious, constitutionally-protected freedom of speech.

Comments provided by :
Clark, Jerry

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_McCool_Melissa_01_02_2015_18_08_03_CommentText.txt

=====

Ann Ravel, keep your hands off the internet and the precious, constitutionally-protected freedom of speech this country has been blessed with! These six years of the Obama Administration overreach and encroachment into our personal freedoms needs to stop as it is the latest assault on our Bill of Rights!

Comments provided by :
McCool, Melissa

=====

=====

As a naturalized citizen, I can attest to how important freedom of speech is. This country is the leader in freedoms of all types for its citizens, do not take away what makes this country great, rather enhance it. Freedoms that we enjoy here are not available as freely in other nations. So keep in mind why people come to this country and why they become citizens of it. Do not make yourselves the antithesis of the freedoms inherent with this country's citizenship and stop trying to police our speech. After all you have your say and can counter what others say! Imagine if we did not have this freedom - what would you be doing right now ---- talking to a wall?? and making rules that cannot apply!!! Think about what rules you should be changing...certainly not freedom of speech - whether internet or otherwise...

Comments provided by :
Piraneo, Salvatore

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Zachary_Reid_B_01_02_2015_18_08_45_CommentText.txt

=====

There is a Constitution that all congress men and women and all Senators swear to uphold and defend.

Why am I asking for you to not restrict freedom of speech relative to federal elections.

It already is and you are our representatives.

Act like it.

Comments provided by :
Zachary, Reid B

=====

=====

There is not cost to posting on the Internet. The FEC was created to keep an eye on campaign costs. As private citizens use the Internet to express personal opinions, the FEC should have absolutely no authority to attempt to regulate what is posted on a free medium. Even the FCC has no authority to regulate the Internet, which is, in reality, simply a communications tool like a telephone.

Any attempt to regulate what is posted will be a direct violation of the First Amendment to the Constitution regarding every individuals right to free speech and expressing opinions.

Comments provided by :
Bennett, Walker

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Anderson_Emmett_01_02_2015_18_18_33_CommentText.txt

=====

keep internet and youtube free of all goverment. We have to much goverment running our lives. And do away with irs, go to flat tax.

Comments provided by :
Anderson, Emmett

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_DeVlugt_Karel_01_02_2015_18_19_24_CommentText.txt

=====

Stop encroachment into our personal freedoms! Free speech is WORTHY of protection. Stop trying to regulate free speech at internet outlets like YouTube. Further, the broader Internet should be free from federal government control as well.

Comments provided by :
DeVlugt, Karel

=====

=====

First of all I think Government has gotten to big. Government and the bureaucracy think that we the people are not smart enough to know when they have overstepped their position as elected officials but they are totally wrong in that approach. This is why I feel that the government is totally and fundamentally wrong in trying to take over control of the internet and force we the people to pay to use it. The internet is protected by our 1st amendment right, of freedom of speech. I am in favor of protecting this right and the use of the internet without government intervention. Keep our bill of rights and the constitution in tact and defeat any and all who try to destroy it no matter what.

Thank you

Comments provided by :
Varney, B James

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Flowers_Steve_01_02_2015_18_37_42_CommentText.txt

=====

What part of freedom of speech don't you understand? Please see the First Amendment of the Constitution to clarify it to yourself.

Comments provided by :
Flowers, Steve

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Powell_Cindi_01_02_2015_18_42_19_CommentText.txt

=====

No internet regulation. No limits on free speech on the internet.

Comments provided by :
Powell, Cindi

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Grant_Joan_01_02_2015_19_00_17_CommentText.txt

=====

I respectfully submit this comment AGAINST the proposed guidelines by the FEC to regulate political speech on the internet. This is definitely overreach by our government and unnecessary in its scope.

Comments provided by :
Grant, Joan

=====

=====

The internet was designed to be a free enterprise. Freedom of speech, freedom of expression, and freedom of thought and action being at the forefront of the internet. The internet polices itself as to what is and what is not allowed or tolerated within itself, and it certainly does not need the meddling of any government entity for any reason. And yes; that does include The United States of America, Russia, China, and any and all other countries on this planet. Furthermore; it does not need any government, state, or province trying to impose taxes, fees, rules, or regulations for its own monetary gain. Once again; the internet always was and always should be the bastion of freedom for one and all, and it needs no one else trying to say what is or is not done or said upon its sites...this is what freedom really is!

Comments provided by :
Gilardi, M.

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Ellis_III_Frank_01_02_2015_19_22_16_CommentText.txt

=====

I oppose any and all government restrictions or interference with the freedom of the internet system.

It is apparent to any and all of us that are paying attention that the government makes a huge mess of almost everything it interferes with and regulates. The government is out of control, and we are losing our American liberties as it grows larger and more powerful. It seems that the Congress cannot control the bureaucracies.

Thank you.

Comments provided by :
Ellis III, Frank

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Raineri_Maldonado_David_01_02_2015_19_43_00_CommentText.txt

=====

As a member of Tea Party Patriots, I ask you to keep the Internet free from controls. After all, it is a part of free speech, no matter what your vice chair thinks.

Comments provided by :
Raineri-Maldonado, David

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Mathews_Dick_01_02_2015_19_45_16_CommentText.txt

=====

The government has a bad reputation of regulations and regulating the internet is a very bad idea. Leave the internet alone. It is not broke, it does not need fixed with regulations on how it is run. Please back off this idea.

Comments provided by :
Mathews, Dick

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Dunsmore_Kerwin_01_02_2015_19_52_52_CommentText.txt

=====

I believe that the Federal Election Commission has NO legitimate role to play in Internet traffic. Any proposal to involve this Commission in Internet functions is anathema to the First Amendment to our Constitution.

I urge you to disregard this proposal in its entirety.

Thank you.

Comments provided by :
Dunsmore, Kerwin

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Lewis_Ken_01_02_2015_20_06_16_CommentText.txt

=====

Do not infringe on my free speech rights to discuss various subjects including politics on the internet. The internet is like our modern day coffee house where we once sat and spoke what was on our minds. Now people move around the country because of family and jobs. And this makes it hard for us to meet at the local coffee house. So in keeping up with modern technology we communicate with each other over the internet. As such we still have our rights to "free speech".

Comments provided by :
Lewis, Ken

=====

=====

The Supreme Court has determined that 'money is speech'. If we truly want a democracy where elections bring the people's voices to the governing process, we need to bring that 'speech' into the grasp of the people. Our voices need to be heard. Without this, we do not have a true democracy. For this to happen, the money that funds the election of our representatives and leaders needs to come from the people they are charged with representing. The election system must be either divorced from money, where access to the public airwaves is provided to the candidates at no cost so the public can be truly informed of their options; or the public must be given more control of the money that candidates use to get their messages out in campaigns. This can be achieved through transparency as well as a government subsidy so all individuals can contribute to the candidates they support. The system needs these changes.

Comments provided by :
Schimmelfing, Reed

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Rienstra_Julieta_01_02_2015_21_04_06_CommentText.txt

=====

Leave the internet alone.
It is working just fine and does
not need to be policed for political speech.

Comments provided by :
Rienstra, Julieta

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Wilson_JeriLynn_01_02_2015_21_17_24_CommentText.txt

=====

It is beyond the time to stop Government encroachment on our Civil Rights granted by the Constitution and Declaration of Independence. Treason at the upper levels needs to stop immediately. These people are drunk with power and have to be stopped before we see our great Nation fall any further into Communism / Socialism. Enough is enough!!

Comments provided by :
Wilson, JeriLynn

=====

=====

The Obama Administration is apparently attempting to limit the public's ability to post political positions on the Internet. This is a total violation of the American public's Right to Free Speech as guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution. This is absolutely unacceptable!

Might I remind those in authority that The Bill of Rights was passed by Congress on September 25, 1789 and ratified on December 15, 1791 and the First Amendment clearly states: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

Political blogs on the Internet are one method the American Public has to voice their concerns and publish comments about the operations and failures of the elected officials of the Government. This method meets the standard stated in the First Amendment: "to petition the Government for a redress of grievances." How dare the current administration issue any Presidential Edict, or other such tripe, that would prohibit or ban the execution of the American Public's RIGHT to Freedom of Speech?

As the Federal Election Commission you must carry out your responsibility and deny/overturn any attempt to restrict these Rights.

Marvin R. Stokes

Comments provided by :
Stokes, Marvin

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Miedema_Cory_01_02_2015_21_36_57_CommentText.txt

=====

I FEEL WE NEED TO KEEP ALL OF THE INTERNET FREE.

WE HAVE A RIGHT TO FREE SPEECH AND SHOULD ONLY NOT BE POSTING HARMFUL AND
EXPLICIT LANGUAGE.

BEST REGARDS,

MS. CORY MIEDEMA
NINE MILE FALLS, WA 99026

Comments provided by :
Miedema, Cory

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Currell_Don_01_02_2015_22_05_08_CommentText.txt

=====

With regards to the FEC regulating political comment made on the internet by anyone who has access to the internet would be wrong. It would be akin to stopping someone in the town square from espousing their personal views to anyone that would listen 100 years ago...LONG before the internet existed. The internet is the 'Town Square' of today. For someone to suggest that some entity oversee 'us' and what we say politically over the internet is censorship of our right to free speech.

Sincerely,
Don Currell

Comments provided by :
Currell, Don

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Neubauer_Ed_01_02_2015_22_06_17_CommentText.txt

=====

I believe that the Federal Election Commission has no authority over my expression of my options and/or beliefs relative to polititions or politics. I believe the Second Amendment to the United States Constitution grants the right to freely express my personal thoughts and ideas.
Ed Neubauer

Comments provided by :
Neubauer, Ed

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Billman_Joan_01_02_2015_22_20_08_CommentText.txt

=====

This government of ours has gotten too intrusive, especially over the past six years. This is supposed to be government of the people, by the people, and for the people, not ruled by those in Washington, D.C. The internet is our way of expressing free speech. Yet, now the government wants to control our free speech. Does anyone in Washington, D.C. read the Constitution? It is about time that they do. Hands off my internet!

Comments provided by :
Billman, Joan

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Dahn_Mary_01_02_2015_22_21_50_CommentText.txt

=====

The constitution of the US entitles each citizen to free of speech. This should include the internet. It is only through the free flow of information that citizens can make value judgements as to who to vote for. This information should not be censored by the people who want to filter information in order to be re-elected. Keep the internet free from federal control.

Comments provided by :

Dahn, Mary

=====

=====

I oppose the FEC's plans to remove First Amendment protections from the internet. I understand that the enacting of these regulations will result in the Federal Government's monitoring of online political communication every day. The Chairman of the FEC actually called these regulations "nothing short of a Chinese censorship Board."

The FEC is tasked with regulating money spent on elections, not political speech. Reversing the exemption for free postings online will have dangerous ramifications for constitutionally-guaranteed free speech. The FEC would have to unleash an army of regulators to police YouTube and other internet sites on a daily basis, to look for potential violations, and subject them to inquiries simply because they posted opinions online. This will place an undue burden on small groups and individuals. In addition, especially given our national debt and a stalled economy, these new regulations would be extremely costly for taxpayers and far too labor intensive to accurately enforce.

Comments provided by :
Muscari, Michael

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Larson_Sharon_01_02_2015_23_08_20_CommentText.txt

=====

Hello:

I object to REG 2014-01. The US Constitution guarantees my freedom of speech. This regulation takes away that freedom via internet use.

I ask you to withdraw this proposed regulation and leave the internet free of government interference. I look forward to the continued freedom of the internet.

Thank you.

Comments provided by :

Larson, Sharon

=====

=====

Writing a regulation proposing to police the internet for political speech is opening a can of worms that once opened will be impossible to close. There are at least two (2) major problems with it:

1) It will create another HUGE government bureaucracy; that is, of course, unless the FEC plans to work with the NSA to monitor every phone, camera, pc in the known universe. How many people is the FEC planning to hire to monitor YouTube for political content? How many to monitor Facebook (and in how many countries)? How many to monitor MySpace (yes, it still exists)? Yahoo? Google? How do you propose to monitor individuals' blogs? And those are just a few examples. Put in short, easily understandable words: What you propose will cost the taxpayers (remember, the people who pay your salaries?) mega-millions, and in the process do nothing but stifle freedom of speech--oh, that pesky First Amendment!

2) Right now what you propose to curtail is freedom of speech of people like myself: Constitutional Conservatives who otherwise have no voice, except the internet. However, the wheel does turn, and you who propose to stifle my speech may one day find others stifling yours. Because, when all is said and done, once you have made a regulation, it will be a very difficult thing to undo.

Comments provided by :
Jones, Jill

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Lanham_Donald_01_02_2015_23_23_29_CommentText.txt

=====

There is no reason for the Federal Government (FEC) to get involved in regulating the internet. It should be secure from intrusion covered under our 1st Amendment rights.

Comments provided by :
Lanham, Donald

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Snell_Larry_01_02_2015_23_29_07_CommentText.txt

=====

The US tradition of Free Speech must be actually FREE from encumbrance or regulation.

The FCC has NO scope in regulation of free speech, regardless of how it is published or communicated. While I disagree that the FCC has any role in the regulation of the internet, that can be discussed. However, I vociferously REFUSE to countenance that the FCC has ANY function in regulating my free speech ... ESPECIALLY in relation to discussing any election.

Please abandon this foolishness and adhere to the Constitution.
(i.e., stay out of my personal business and my freedom of speech.)
lls

Comments provided by :
Snell, Larry

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Pugh_Jerry_01_02_2015_23_58_09_CommentText.txt

=====

Our government should not be interfering with freedom of speech on the internet or any other way. Freedom is freedom and the Rule of Law is that established by the Constitution. Political speech is especially protected and it is especially important. And the voice of the people must not be interfered with by the government.

Comments provided by :
Pugh, Jerry

=====

=====

The FEC should be severely reduced to provide two functions; 1. Ensure that all citizens and only citizens have an opportunity to vote and protect that right, 2. Ensure all citizens are able to support their candidate(s) as much as they care to, without limits, as a protection of their First Amendment rights, any limits are an infringement of that right.

I oppose Rule 3014-01 for the above reasons.

Comments provided by :

Tucker, Greg

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Chavez_Alberto_01_03_2015_00_51_02_CommentText.txt

=====

FEC Chair Ann Ravel and your Obama administration friends, HANDS OFF the internet and HANDS OFF our precious, constitutionally-protected freedom of speech. Like everything your administration gets its hands on, this would be another disaster!

Comments provided by :
Chavez, Alberto

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Johnson_Jerry__01_03_2015_01_17_26_CommentText.txt

=====

The internet is so important to protect the Freedom of Speech rights

We have as individuals! Please keep over reaching Government away from
Internet freedoms!

Thank you!

Jerry Johnson

Comments provided by :
Johnson, Jerry

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_MARTE_DON_01_03_2015_04_41_32_CommentText.txt

=====

Hello, please keep a govt. hands off the net. What can the govt. do right? They can't balance a budget, VA scandal, IRS scandal, Benghazi scandal, rampant voter fraud, releasing terrorists from Gitmo bay without approval, supplying Syrian terrorists with arms that went to ISIS, etc. Why would any true American, want more intrusive govt. oversight? Why would a true American want govt. oversight on political comments, in violation of the 1st amendment? Get this worthless govt. out of wallet & out of my life. The government that governs best, governs least!!!!!!!!!!!!!! God bless America!

Comments provided by :
MARTE, DON

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Wilkes_Pat_01_03_2015_07_06_33_CommentText.txt

=====

Free speech is our most treasured right under the Bill of Rights. Political speech is the essence of what is protected by the Constitution.

Political commentary and advertising on the internet, including Facebook and YouTube, must be kept free of government regulation--and campaign reporting requirements.

We vigorously oppose the proposed FEC rule for political speech to be scrutinized.

Comments provided by :
Wilkes, Pat

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Meserve_Lisa_01_03_2015_07_28_27_CommentText.txt

=====

Every and all attempts by the Obama Administration, namely the Vice Chairman of the F.E.C. Ms. Ann Ravel, to restrict or limit my personal political views and opinions both on the internet or in blog posts is an encroachment into my personal freedom and is not up for GRABS now or anytime in the future.

Comments provided by :
Meserve, Lisa

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Schreiber_David_01_03_2015_07_27_43_CommentText.txt

=====

The internet and all of its parts does not need restricted relative to political speech. Freedom of Speech is a First Amendment Right established in the Bill of Rights which the government is obligated to uphold. If congress is directed by the public to change the Right then let the public address the issue through their representative. You office has NOT that right to make the changes.

Thank you

Comments provided by :
Schreiber, David

=====

=====

Infringing on our first amendment is totally unacceptable.the Internet is our one and only conduit to reaching the people to tell them the truth and give them the facts as to what is really going on in D.C. It is also essential in giving the citizens of the world a place to express their opinions and beliefs as to the conditions for which they are living. We can no longer count on the newspapers and three liberal networks (ABC,CBS, and NBC) to provide us with the truth.we must stop all attempts to by those who wish to impede our constitutional rights .

Comments provided by :
Moore, Thomas

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Collins_Tommy_01_03_2015_09_04_27_CommentText.txt

=====

Seeking information about the next scheduled meet in Ukiah.

Comments provided by :
Collins, Tommy

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Burleson_Mickey_01_03_2015_09_51_22_CommentText.txt

=====

Government needs to stay out of our businesses and stay out of our homes.....

Comments provided by :
Burleson, Mickey

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Meier_Donald_01_03_2015_09_56_09_CommentText.txt

=====

HANDS OFF the internet and HANDS OFF our precious, constitutionally-protected freedom of speech. I and my fellow patriots find it repugnant to our first amendment rights for the FEC to be on the internet and censoring our political speech. Stay the hell off of the internet.

Donald Meier

Comments provided by :
Meier, Donald

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Gignac_David_01_03_2015_10_21_08_CommentText.txt

=====

Will you people stop trying to corrupt the internet for your political gain.
Not only is this a FIRST AMENDMENT issue, the internet and www are practically
the only things that work well in this country.

Comments provided by :
Gignac, David

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Edgreen_MaryJane_01_03_2015_11_12_41_CommentText.txt

=====

RE: Regulation of political speech on the internet

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing in OPPOSITION to administration's regulatory control over comments of individuals on internet platforms. This proposal is a limitation of freedom of speech. As such, it is a violation of freedom of speech which is a natural right of every individual. Furthermore, it is protected by the US Constitution's Bill of Rights.

Amendment I, as ratified, effective December 15, 1791:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

That this limitation/control is even being contemplated is outrageous!!

Its implementation would translate to overstepping the bounds of Constitutional law.

To me, it sounds like an attempt to resurrect the likes of the Hitler regime.

Let's not even go there, please!

I encourage you to move on from this unconstitutional consideration, and apply your efforts to matters vital to the positive functioning of our country.

MaryJane Edgreen

Comments provided by :
Edgreen, MaryJane

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_White_Larry__01_03_2015_11_25_00_CommentText.txt

=====

Preserve free political speech on the internet. Protect us from FEC and other government intrusion.

Comments provided by :
White, Larry

=====

=====

I believe as the Republicans take control of the senate, today!

- #1 uphold our Constitution, that is what this country was built on.
- #2 Impeach Obama and bring him up on criminal charges!
- #3 repeal Obamacare.
- #4 Pass HR1275, and protect Social Security and Medicare.
- #4 Pass the Checks and Balance bill, by Rand Paul
- #5 create a Federal Bill, you Kill a cop or federal agent, one sentence, death!
- #6 limit term of senate and Congress #12 years.

that should keep them busy for the next four years, if they did not make something simple complicated it would be a lot easier. Also half of the executive orders that the crook, dictator, king, has signed, make them Null and Void.

Comments provided by :
Ironside, Anna

=====

=====

The Internet was meant and should always be free of any monetary charges, especially from our greedy power hungry overly-bureaucratic government offices and officials. Get your dirty-sticky-fingers and greedy minds off OUR Internet. It belongs to We The People. Again, the government of the USA already has too many sticky fingers and bureaucracies which interferes with our freedom and daily life. Keep the Internet free of illegal taxes, fees, surcharges and any other name for charging for the use for OUR Internet. Government keep out or you're fired by means of being voted out, permanently. People do get the word around on who not to vote for and why. For once and for all time, keep yourselves away from that train of thought. It has always been extremely unpopular! We know it and you know it! Keep out!

Comments provided by :
Keller, Nell

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Clay_Margaret_01_03_2015_11_53_21_CommentText.txt

=====

The FEC does not need to be involved in reading our emails or telling us what we can say or not say.
That would in turn be taking away our First Amendment rights which would have serious ramifications.

Comments provided by :
Clay, Margaret

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

It's recently come to my attention that you are considering ways to increase the FEC's regulation of political speech online. The government already regulates the messages I am able to see and hear on television, radio and other public forums - including the paid placements on the internet. These regulations already do plenty to dissuade potential participants in a robust debate over our nation's future. Doing any more to regulate what can appear on blogs, social media, video platforms and other places online is simply overkill-not to mention it insults the intelligence of every American who knows full well that many political actors have their own agenda. My freedom of speech means I should be able to address the audiences I choose with the message I want to convey-and others should be able to do so with the heavy hand of the government involved. I'll choose which messages I consider worthy and persuasive-the FEC need not do it for me.

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope you'll exhibit restraint before doing anything that would chill political speech on the most democratized platform we have available to us.

Comments provided by :
Driscoll, Daniel

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Meekins_Frank_01_03_2015_11_58_35_CommentText.txt

=====

Regulating speech online doesn't just endanger our First Amendment rights- it insults the intelligence of Americans. We can decide what speech we find persuasive-the government shouldn't hold our hand and do it for us!

Comments provided by :
Meekins, Frank

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_russell_stephen_01_03_2015_12_00_34_CommentText.txt

=====

Cancel FEC internet speech involvement, we dont need this
Dont rob US of our first amendment rights online.
ID those provoking Hate speech Yes vs the rest.
Do your job

Comments provided by :
russell, stephen

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

It's recently come to my attention that you are considering ways to increase the FEC's regulation of political speech online. The government already regulates the messages I am able to see and hear on television, radio and other public forums - including the paid placements on the internet. These regulations already do plenty to dissuade potential participants in a robust debate over our nation's future. Doing any more to regulate what can appear on blogs, social media, video platforms and other places online is simply overkill-not to mention it insults the intelligence of every American who knows full well that many political actors have their own agenda. My freedom of speech means I should be able to address the audiences I choose with the message I want to convey-and others should be able to do so without the heavy hand of the government involved. I'll choose which messages I consider worthy and persuasive-the FEC need not do it for me.

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope you'll exhibit restraint before doing anything that would chill political speech on the most democratized platform we have available to us.

Sincerely
Herald Stockton

Comments provided by :
Stockton, Herald

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Schears_Mark_01_03_2015_12_01_58_CommentText.txt

=====

There is no reason for the government to restrict the free speech of its people.

Liberals are destroying this great country, and it is my right(Note: Unions never had rights, only bargaining issues that government allowed them to have, and it is perfectly legal to remove them) to be able to say what I need to say against the liberals.

Government is already too large, we need to scale back the Government as well as government programs that do nothing but prepare Americans for a lifestyle that is not productive.

Comments provided by :
Schears, Mark

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Baum_Kerry_01_03_2015_12_03_10_CommentText.txt

=====

The FEC doesn't need to find more ways for government to control our political debates or discourage us from sharing our opinions.

Regulating the internet is an unacceptable burden on our freedom of speech.

Regulating speech online doesn't just endanger our First Amendment rights- it insults the intelligence of Americans. We can decide what speech we find persuasive-the government shouldn't hold our hand and do it for us!

The government already regulates the messages I am able to see and hear on television, radio and other public forums - including the paid placements on the internet. These regulations already do plenty to dissuade potential participants in a robust debate over our nation's future. Doing any more to regulate what can appear on blogs, social media, video platforms and other places online is simply overkill-not to mention it insults the intelligence of every American who knows full well that many political actors have their own agenda. My freedom of speech means I should be able to address the audiences I choose with the message I want to convey-and others should be able to do so without the heavy hand of the government involved. I'll choose which messages I consider worthy and persuasive-the FEC need not do it for me.

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope you'll exhibit restraint before doing anything that would chill political speech on the most democratized platform we have available to us.

Comments provided by :
Baum, Kerry

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Myers_Michael_01_03_2015_12_04_13_CommentText.txt

=====

What the FEC is proposing is a direct violation of every United States Citizens right to free speech. They must be reined in as there cannot be any restrictions placed on the Citizens of the United States to express their opinion on matters of a political nature that moves them.

Comments provided by :
Myers, Michael

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Saar_James_01_03_2015_12_04_49_CommentText.txt

=====

Regulating speech online doesn't just endanger our First Amendment rights- it insults the intelligence of Americans. We can decide what speech we find persuasive-the government shouldn't hold our hand and do it for us!

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope you'll exhibit restraint before doing anything that would chill political speech on the most democratized platform we have available to us.

Comments provided by :
Saar, James

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Fiddes_Gordon_01_03_2015_12_06_23_CommentText.txt

=====

I oppose regulation of political speech. Further restrictions of political speech, especially on blogs, Facebook, and You Tube should not be instituted.

Comments provided by :
Fiddes, Gordon

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Kwiatkowski_Andrew_01_03_2015_12_06_16_CommentText.txt

=====

We do not need the Government interfering in matters of speech and communication. The people can determine what is or is not appropriate!

Comments provided by :
Kwiatkowski, Andrew

=====

=====

Regulating speech online doesn't just endanger our First Amendment rights- it insults the intelligence of Americans. We can decide what speech we find persuasive-the government shouldn't hold our hand and do it for us!

The government already regulates the messages I am able to see and hear on television, radio and other public forums - including the paid placements on the internet. These regulations already do plenty to dissuade potential participants in a robust debate over our nation's future. Doing any more to regulate what can appear on blogs, social media, video platforms and other places online is simply overkill-not to mention it insults the intelligence of every American who knows full well that many political actors have their own agenda. My freedom of speech means I should be able to address the audiences I choose with the message I want to convey-and others should be able to do so with the heavy hand of the government involved. I'll choose which messages I consider worthy and persuasive-the FEC need not do it for me.

PLEASE REMEMBER I AM NOT TALKING ABOUT PORNOGRAPHY OR CRIMINAL TYPE BLOGS, WHICH OF COURSE SHOULD BE PROHIBITED.

Thank you for your consideration.

Dr. Bartzatt

Comments provided by :
Bartzatt, Ron

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Rigger_Ira_01_03_2015_12_09_09_CommentText.txt

=====

The proposed regulation amounts to censoring speech and is exactly the opposite of the constitutionally granted right! The correct way to bring about the change you want is through a constitutional amendment.

Comments provided by :
Rigger, Ira

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

It's recently come to my attention that you are considering ways to increase the FEC's regulation of political speech online. The government already regulates the messages I am able to see and hear on television, radio and other public forums - including the paid placements on the internet. These regulations already do plenty to dissuade potential participants in a robust debate over our nation's future. Doing any more to regulate what can appear on blogs, social media, video platforms and other places online is simply overkill-not to mention it insults the intelligence of every American who knows full well that many political actors have their own agenda. My freedom of speech means I should be able to address the audiences I choose with the message I want to convey-and others should be able to do so with the heavy hand of the government involved. I'll choose which messages I consider worthy and persuasive-the FEC need not do it for me.

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope you'll exhibit restraint before doing anything that would chill political speech on the most democratized platform we have available to us.

Comments provided by :
Bradley, Lawson

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Owens_Tony_01_03_2015_12_13_09_CommentText.txt

=====

This is not needed or wanted. We, as people residing in the USA have a right to have an opinion and to share that opinion if we wish. Weather it is paid or unpaid, we have that right given to us by our forefathers. Suppression is not a good thing for anyone. This should not happen and this is my opinion.

Comments provided by :
Owens, Tony

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Dunham_Robert_01_03_2015_12_12_50_CommentText.txt

=====

Banning political comment is the antithesis of The Constitution and should lead to arrest, trial, and execution for treason of all those postulating and implementing the idea.

Comments provided by :
Dunham, Robert

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

Do not regulate political speech on the internet. To do so would be an unacceptable infringement on freedom of speech.

It's recently come to my attention that you are considering ways to increase the FEC's regulation of political speech online. The government already regulates the messages I am able to see and hear on television, radio and other public forums - including the paid placements on the internet. These regulations already do plenty to dissuade potential participants in a robust debate over our nation's future. Doing any more to regulate what can appear on blogs, social media, video platforms and other places online is simply overkill-not to mention it insults the intelligence of every American who knows full well that many political actors have their own agenda. My freedom of speech means I should be able to address the audiences I choose with the message I want to convey-and others should be able to do so with the heavy hand of the government involved. I'll choose which messages I consider worthy and persuasive-the FEC need not do it for me.

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope you'll exhibit restraint before doing anything that would chill political speech on the most democratized platform we have available to us.

Comments provided by :
BEHAR, ALLAN

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Pinto_John_01_03_2015_12_16_53_CommentText.txt

=====

Free speech is the bedrock of our freedoms. Please do not try to curb it. The purpose of the First Amendment is to protect unpopular speech. One is entitled to say anything. Another does not have to listen to it. It is not the purview of government to regulate what we can say.

Comments provided by :
Pinto, John

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Lichterman_Ervin_01_03_2015_12_17_19_CommentText.txt

=====

Limit the government power.e

Comments provided by :
Lichterman, Ervin

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_weatherford_james_01_03_2015_12_17_54_CommentText.txt

=====

reg-2014-01 does not bode well for free speech

Comments provided by :
weatherford, james

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

It's recently come to my attention that you are considering ways to increase the FEC's regulation of political speech online. The government already regulates the messages I am able to see and hear on television, radio and other public forums-including the paid placements on the internet. These regulations already do plenty to dissuade potential participants in a robust debate over our nation's future. Doing any more to regulate what can appear on blogs, social media, video platforms and other places online is simply overkill -not to mention it insults the intelligence of every American who knows full well that many political actors have their own agenda. My freedom of speech means I should be able to address the audiences I choose with the message I want to convey-and others should be able to do so, without the heavy hand of government involved. I'll choose which messages I consider worthy and persuasive-the FEC need not do it for me.

Thank you for your consideration, I hope you'll exhibit restraint before doing anything that would chill political speech on the most democratized platform we have available to us.

Comments provided by :
Niffenegger, Randall

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

It has come to my attention that you are considering ways to increase the FEC's regulation of political speech online.

The government already regulates the messages I am able to see and hear on television, radio and other public forums - including the paid placements on the internet. These regulations already do plenty to dissuade potential participants in a robust debate over our nation's future. Doing any more to regulate what can appear on blogs, social media, video platforms and other places online is simply overkill-not to mention it insults the intelligence of every American who knows full well that many political actors have their own agenda.

My freedom of speech means I should be able to address the audiences I choose with the message I want to convey-and others should be able to do so without government involvement. I'll prefer to choose which messages I consider worthy and persuasive-the FEC need not do it for me.

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope you'll exhibit restraint before doing anything that would chill political speech on the most democratized platform I have available to me.

Comments provided by :
Barker, Penny

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

It's recently come to my attention that you are considering ways to increase the FEC's regulation of political speech online. The government already regulates the messages I am able to see and hear on television, radio and other public forums - including the paid placements on the internet. These regulations already do plenty to dissuade potential participants in a robust debate over our nation's future. Doing any more to regulate what can appear on blogs, social media, video platforms and other places online is simply overkill-not to mention it insults the intelligence of every American who knows full well that many political actors have their own agenda. My freedom of speech means I should be able to address the audiences I choose with the message I want to convey-and others should be able to do so with the heavy hand of the government involved. I'll choose which messages I consider worthy and persuasive-the FEC need not do it for me.

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope you'll exhibit restraint before doing anything that would chill political speech on the most democratized platform we have available to us.

Comments provided by :
Marburger, Thomas

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Wilson_Richard_01_03_2015_12_19_38_CommentText.txt

=====

This is an unacceptable burden on our freedom of speech. Regulating speech online doesn't just endanger our First Amendment rights- it insults the intelligence of Americans. We can decide what speech we find persuasive-the government shouldn't hold our hand and do it for us!

Comments provided by :
Wilson, Richard

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Miles_Max_01_03_2015_12_30_03_CommentText.txt

=====

Impeach this traitor Obama now! and stop all amnesty now!

Comments provided by :
Miles, Max

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Cantley_Lester_01_03_2015_12_31_19_CommentText.txt

=====

We do not need the FEC to do anything that limits free speech.
There are a lot of us arm chair activist that comment on political stuff.
Please do nothing that limits our right to comment.
We have free speech rights, leave this as it is.

Thanks
Lester

Comments provided by :
Cantley, Lester

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Ratliff_Judy_01_03_2015_12_32_31_CommentText.txt

=====

Keep your Communist nose out of our business. There are better things to worry about more than whether or not Obama and company get their little feelings hurt.

Comments provided by :
Ratliff, Judy

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Bowen_Sarah_01_03_2015_12_33_31_CommentText.txt

=====

Follow the constitution. Leave our freedom of speech alone.

Comments provided by :
Bowen, Sarah

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

It's recently come to my attention that you are considering ways to increase the FEC's regulation of political speech online. The government already regulates the messages I am able to see and hear on television, radio and other public forums - including the paid placements on the internet. These regulations already do plenty to dissuade potential participants in a robust debate over our nation's future. Doing any more to regulate what can appear on blogs, social media, video platforms and other places online is simply overkill-not to mention it insults the intelligence of every American who knows full well that many political actors have their own agenda. My freedom of speech means I should be able to address the audiences I choose with the message I want to convey-and others should be able to do so with the heavy hand of the government involved. I'll choose which messages I consider worthy and persuasive-the FEC need not do it for me.

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope you'll exhibit restraint before doing anything that would chill political speech on the most democratized platform we have available to us.

Comments provided by :
Mattison Jr, John

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

The right of free speech, especially that of free "political" speech is enshrined in the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States. I am, therefore concerned that the FEC is considering ways to further increase the FEC's power to regulate political speech online. The federal government has already over-stepped its bounds in regulating the messages I am able to see and hear on television, radio and other public forums. The FEC already regulates the paid placement of political advertisements on the Internet. Such regulation suppresses a robust debate over our nation's future as it is. Increasing government meddling with the sacred American right to voice his opinions in the public square is a very very BAD idea, I don't care whether you are on the political left or the hard right. Regulating what can appear on blogs, social media, video platforms and other places online is a clear violation of the First Amendment. The Internet IS the modern public square. We have the right to assemble there, to speak there and to worship there if we wish and no politician has the right to take those sacred rights from us in order to protect his or her cushy job in government "service". If you wish to "serve" do so by protecting the citizens you represent. We can decide for ourselves what we believe. We are not a stupid people. We realize that there are liars in the public square. You do not need to point them out to us. There are frauds and phonies out there raising their voices and demanding our attention. Leave us be. We know who to turn our backs on without our nannies in government having to tell us what is worthy and what is not.

As a citizen I should be able to say what I wish so long as I do not harm others or suppress the speech of others. Remember this. Just because a majority of opinions being expressed in the public square disagree with your own, does not mean that those opinions are wrong or need to be suppressed. Sometimes, you simply lose the debate.

Placing increased power to regulate speech on the Internet in the hands of the FEC, is not only dangerous, but also hands the Commission the kind of power to suppress that almost inevitably expands to suppress economic activity and screw up whole economies. The Internet is the last bastion of free market capitalism we have left. We tamper with that at our peril. Like the market for goods and services, the market of ideas and beliefs has made America strong for almost a quarter of a millenium. We do well to continue to protect what has made us strong.

Thank you for your consideration. The Internet is the the most democratized marketplace we have in this rapidly changing world. It is given to you to protect that marketplace for the free exchange of goods, services and ideas. You are not called to shape that marketplace to your own ideas of what is fair and just and right, only to keep it open and free. Let us decide what we want to listen to and who we want to ignore. We are grownups. Please do not arrogantly treat us like dim-witted children. In doing so you insult all Americans.

Respectfully,

Tom King

Comments provided by :
King, Thomas

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_maley_terry_01_03_2015_12_43_47_CommentText.txt

=====

The first amendment is meant for all and not to be regulated during a election campaign.

Comments provided by :
maley, terry

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

It's recently come to my attention that you are considering ways to increase the FEC's regulation of political speech online. The government already regulates the messages I am able to see and hear on television, radio and other public forums - including the paid placements on the internet. These regulations already do plenty to dissuade potential participants in a robust debate over our nation's future. Doing any more to regulate what can appear on blogs, social media, video platforms and other places online is simply overkill-not to mention it insults the intelligence of every American who knows full well that many political actors have their own agenda. My freedom of speech means I should be able to address the audiences I choose with the message I want to convey-and others should be able to do so with the heavy hand of the government involved. I'll choose which messages I consider worthy and persuasive-the FEC need not do it for me.

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope you'll exhibit restraint before doing anything that would chill political speech on the most democratized platform we have available to us. Please, enough is enough... no more regulations on our freedom of speech!

Respectfully,
Douglas Barron

Comments provided by :
Barron, Douglas

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

I understand that you are considering ways to increase the FEC's regulation of political speech online.

The government already regulates what I'm able to see and hear on television, radio and other public forums - including the paid placements on the internet. These regulations already do plenty to dissuade potential participants in a robust debate over our nation's future. Doing any more to regulate what can appear on blogs, social media, video platforms and other places online is simply overkill-not to mention it insults the intelligence of every American who knows full well that many political actors have their own agenda.

My freedom of speech means I should be able to address the audiences I choose with the message I want to convey-and others should be able to do so without the heavy hand of the government involved. I don't need the FEC to decide which messages I should consider worthy and persuasive.

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope you'll exhibit restraint before doing anything that would chill political speech on the most democratized platform we have available to us.

Paul & Marci Cardon

Comments provided by :
Cardon, Paul

=====

=====

I'm not in favor of ANY form government regulation of 1st Amendment rights. As a US Marine in the 60's, I didn't like flag burning, hippie protests, dope, calling cops "pigs" or other types of disgusting behavior as practiced by many. That being said, I would much rather have my ears and eyes assaulted than not to be allowed to speak or type or electronically transmit my thoughts and prayers in any method I choose. So sad that so many in government decide to pick and choose which constitutional rights to uphold, to uphold with only those they agree with. Shame on them!! If restrictions on the internet are enforced, You will be joining the ranks of those that choose to pick and choose parts of the constitution they agree, so shame on you!

R/S

Tom Butler Manitowish Waters, Wi 54545

Comments provided by :

Butler, Tom

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

It's recently come to my attention that you are considering ways to increase the FEC's regulation of political speech online. The government already regulates the messages I am able to see and hear on television, radio and other public forums - including the paid placements on the internet. These regulations already do plenty to dissuade potential participants in a robust debate over our nation's future. Doing any more to regulate what can appear on blogs, social media, video platforms and other places online is simply overkill-not to mention it insults the intelligence of every American who knows full well that many political actors have their own agenda. My freedom of speech means I should be able to address the audiences I choose with the message I want to convey-and others should be able to do so with the heavy hand of the government involved. I'll choose which messages I consider worthy and persuasive-the FEC need not do it for me.

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope you'll exhibit restraint before doing anything that would chill political speech on the most democratized platform we have available to us.

Comments provided by :
Bergen, John

=====

=====

Please do not censure our political speech on the internet or television, etc.

Do you not realize that our forefathers fought for freedom of speech
and freedom of ideas different from the government's??

What are we becoming?? a police state!!! I certainly hope not.

Everyone on the FEC would do well to read BONHOEFFER. This is a very
slippery slope you are on. Please listen to the people and their rights
instead of trying to push your own political agendas down our throats!!!

Comments provided by :

Eubanks, Jean

=====

=====

Free speech is protected by the Constitution of the United States. All attempts to limit free speech should be considered treasonous and should be punished to the full extent of the law.

The basic tenants of the "rule of law" require that for a law to be valid it must favor no one person or group over another AND it must be permanent. Temporary laws can easily be seen to favor one person or group over another based on the passage of time.

Perhaps the most flagrant abuse of the "rule of law" is the employment of various levels of taxation over time. To prevent such "time based" favoritism, it is important that as few regulations as possible be applied to any new technology and that no taxes be assessed. Such new taxes almost always are revised as time goes by, in direct opposition to the "rule of law".

Our Maker knows only too well that we have invented enough methods to legally steal from those who have exhibited courage and worked hard to benefit those who exhibit only fear and laziness.

Comments provided by :
Bergman, Lynn

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Geyer_Kevin_01_03_2015_12_48_20_CommentText.txt

=====

We need to muzzle the government, not the citizens.

Comments provided by :
Geyer, Kevin

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

It's recently come to my attention that you are considering ways to increase the FEC's regulation of political speech online. The government already regulates the messages I am able to see and hear on television, radio and other public forums - including the paid placements on the internet. These regulations already do plenty to dissuade potential participants in a robust debate over our nation's future. Doing any more to regulate what can appear on blogs, social media, video platforms and other places online is simply overkill-not to mention it insults the intelligence of every American who knows full well that many political actors have their own agenda. My freedom of speech means I should be able to address the audiences I choose with the message I want to convey-and others should be able to do so with the heavy hand of the government involved. I'll choose which messages I consider worthy and persuasive-the FEC need not do it for me.

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope you'll exhibit restraint before doing anything that would chill political speech on the most democratized platform we have available to us.

Sincerely,

Carole Watson

Comments provided by :
Watson, Carole

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

It's recently come to my attention that you are considering ways to increase the FEC's regulation of political speech online. The government already regulates the messages I am able to see and hear on television, radio and other public forums - including the paid placements on the internet. These regulations already do plenty to dissuade potential participants in a robust debate over our nation's future. Doing any more to regulate what can appear on blogs, social media, video platforms and other places online is simply overkill-not to mention it insults the intelligence of every American who knows full well that many political actors have their own agenda. My freedom of speech means I should be able to address the audiences I choose with the message I want to convey-and others should be able to do so with the heavy hand of the government involved. I'll choose which messages I consider worthy and persuasive-the FEC need not do it for me.

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope you'll exhibit restraint before doing anything that would chill political speech on the most democratized platform we have available to us.

Comments provided by :
Theune, Julie

=====

=====

Historically we have been a nation whose government system acknowledges

God given human rights including the right to say what we want without
hindrance from government.

Government should continue to respect this boundary and not violate the
citizen free speech.

Tyrants must be resisted in every generation.

Do not restrict individual freedom by regulating
political speech on the internet.

Respect your proper boundary. Claudia Ledbetter

Comments provided by :
ledbetter, claudia

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Dixon_Lisa_01_03_2015_12_52_22_CommentText.txt

=====

No more limits on freedom of speech.

Comments provided by :
Dixon, Lisa

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

It has come to my attention that you are looking into ways of regulating on-line, free political speech. You already do that for television and radio forums, which are commercial forums. I do not need nor want you to do that for public forums.

FEC regulation of private-citizen, political communication simply unnecessary and potentially harmful. Federal agencies like the IRS and EPA have recently been in the news for abusing their authority and harming private citizens. The potential for abusing this new power is great, and it would be for nothing, as there is no need to regulate private political discussions.

I trust my fellow citizens to make informed decisions about the consumption of political opinion much more than I trust bureaucrats to curtail their power voluntarily. Furthermore, it is extremely insulting to imply that an informed citizenry is incapable of judging for itself the merit of online posts.

Thank you for considering my comments. I trust that you will exercise restraint before doing anything to curtail free, public discourse. Remember that such a sword could easily be turned against your political interests if a different political party ascends to power.

Michael Diaz, Elk Grove Village, IL

Comments provided by :
Diaz, Michael

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

It's recently come to my attention that you are considering ways to increase the FEC's regulation of political speech online.

The government already regulates the messages I am able to see and hear on television, radio and other public forums - including paid placements on the internet. These regulations already do plenty to dissuade potential participants in a robust debate over our nation's future. Doing any more to regulate what can appear on blogs, social media, video platforms and other places online is simply overkill - not to mention that it insults the intelligence of every American who knows full well that many political actors have their own agenda.

My freedom of speech means I should be able to address the audiences I choose with the message I want to convey - and others should be able to do so without the heavy hand of the government being involved. I'll choose which messages I consider worthy and persuasive - the FEC should NOT do it for me.

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope you'll exhibit restraint before doing anything that would chill political speech on the most democratized platform we have available to us.

Sincerely,

Kenneth & Dolores McDermott

Comments provided by :
McDermott, Kenneth

=====

=====

It's recently come to my attention that you are considering ways to increase the FEC's regulation of political speech online. The government already regulates the messages I am able to see and hear on television, radio and other public forums - including the paid placements on the internet. These regulations already do plenty to dissuade potential participants in a robust debate over our nation's future. Doing any more to regulate what can appear on blogs, social media, video platforms and other places online is simply overkill-not to mention it insults the intelligence of every American who knows full well that many political actors have their own agenda. My freedom of speech means I should be able to address the audiences I choose with the message I want to convey-and others should be able to do so with the heavy hand of the government involved. I'll choose which messages I consider worthy and persuasive-the FEC need not do it for me.

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope you'll exhibit restraint before doing anything that would chill political speech on the most democratized platform we have available to us.

Comments provided by :
Gray, Jane

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_ray_r_01_03_2015_13_08_14_CommentText.txt

=====

Do not infringe upon our protected political speech.

Comments provided by :
ray, r

=====

=====

"Congress shall make no law...or abridging the freedom of speech...." This is extremely clear as to the intent. In particular, this is aimed at political speech. Thus, this attempt (REG 2014-01) at limiting another means of communication is an affront to the liberty that Americans are guaranteed in this area. A constant throughout history is that allowing government power to control anything results in the abuse of that power to the detriment of the people. This regulation is another attempt by a ruling or political class to usurp liberty and freedom from the people. It needs to be relegated to the ash heap of history.

Comments provided by :
howell, ralph

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Smith_Andy_01_03_2015_13_11_43_CommentText.txt

=====

Free speech means free speech

Comments provided by :
Smith, Andy

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Johnson_M_01_03_2015_13_13_03_CommentText.txt

=====

The FEC needs to stay out of the INTERNET political free speech business. What business is it of the "Federal Election Commission" what shows up on the INTERNET? This is a very obvious attempt to stifle free speech.

Comments provided by :
Johnson, M

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Lehtrecker_Sr_Richard_01_03_2015_13_13_24_CommentText.txt

=====

Why does this President insist upon acting against the Constitution when he professes to be a constitutional educator and past attorney?

Comments provided by :
Lehtrecker Sr, Richard

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Ray_David_01_03_2015_13_14_10_CommentText.txt

=====

I understand that you are considering a ruling to control political speech on the internet. I am strongly against any such action. Freedom of speech is very important in a free country which we are, and it is not acceptable to trample on this freedom.

Comments provided by :
Ray, David

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

It's recently come to my attention that you are considering ways to increase the FEC's regulation of political speech online. The government already regulates the messages I am able to see and hear on television, radio and other public forums - including the paid placements on the internet. These regulations already do plenty to dissuade potential participants in a robust debate over our nation's future. Doing any more to regulate what can appear on blogs, social media, video platforms and other places online is simply overkill-not to mention it insults the intelligence of every American who knows full well that many political actors have their own agenda. My freedom of speech means I should be able to address the audiences I choose with the message I want to convey-and others should be able to do so with the heavy hand of the government involved. I'll choose which messages I consider worthy and persuasive-the FEC need not do it for me.

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope you'll exhibit restraint before doing anything that would chill political speech on the most democratized platform we have available to us.

Comments provided by :
Steinschneider, Douglas

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Bartholomew_Jean_01_03_2015_13_15_06_CommentText.txt

=====

The FEC doesn't need to find more ways for government to control our political debates or discourage us from sharing our opinions. But they want to go even further and explore ways to have even more oversight over what we can say and when.

Regulating speech online doesn't just endanger our First Amendment rights- it insults the intelligence of Americans. We can decide what speech we find persuasive-the government shouldn't hold our hand and do it for us!

Comments provided by :
Bartholomew, Jean

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Connor_Roger_01_03_2015_13_17_08_CommentText.txt

=====

It has come to my attention that the FEC would seek to regulate and therefore limit the freedom of speech on the Internet and specifically YouTube.

The freedom to express political opinions, even ones radically differing from the main stream opinions is one of the essential guarantees of the First Amendment.

Contrary to popular liberal opinion, the Internet does NOT need nor should it have any regulation of what is expressed as political opinion, no matter who perceives it as outrageous, vile, obnoxious, hateful, or offensive.

Currently, the internet is the most cost effective way that a minority opinion has of reaching a wide audience. This has shown to be effective in the political arena in other countries, as well as our own.

All attempts at interfering with the freedom of speech on the Internet MUST be blocked.

A copy of this comment will be sent to both Senators Burr and Tillis of North Carolina.

Comments provided by :
Connor, Roger

=====

=====

Really?? You want to become the thought police and control or limit what we think and say?
What's next? Ask Congress for the funds to hire government paid snitches in every apartment building in America to inform on anyone with politically incorrect thoughts?
We don't live in the "Soviet Union". Please try to remember this.
Do not add more regulations and restrictions to our lives. If you have a problem or think that a wrong ahs been committed file a lawsuit and take it to court and get a ruling. This way both views will be aired fairly and impartially in public and the result will have the rule of law behind it.
I stand against your proposed rule "REG 2014-01 Earmarking, Affiliation, Joint Fundraising, Disclosure, and Other Issues (McCutcheon)" and urge you to drop it. Leave our freedoms alone!

Comments provided by :
Dickinson, Peter

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

It's recently come to my attention that you are considering ways to increase the FEC's regulation of political speech online. The government already regulates the messages I am able to see and hear on television, radio and other public forums - including the paid placements on the internet. These regulations already do plenty to dissuade potential participants in a robust debate over our nation's future. Doing any more to regulate what can appear on blogs, social media, video platforms and other places online is simply overkill-not to mention it insults the intelligence of every American who knows full well that many political actors have their own agenda. My freedom of speech means I should be able to address the audiences I choose with the message I want to convey-and others should be able to do so with the heavy hand of the government involved. I'll choose which messages I consider worthy and persuasive-the FEC need not do it for me.

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope you'll exhibit restraint before doing anything that would chill political speech on the most democratized platform we have available to us.

Comments provided by :
Orrill, Eric

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_avola_kenneth_01_03_2015_13_19_04_CommentText.txt

=====

Free speech is a part of a FREE country. If my free speech is being systematically dismantled I will NOT
comply and revolt with vengeance!
do not tread on me!

Comments provided by :
avola, kenneth

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Allen_Lynn_01_03_2015_13_22_46_CommentText.txt

=====

We have the right to free speech Please do not take away our freedom of free speech.

Comments provided by :
Allen, Lynn

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

It's recently come to my attention that you are considering ways to increase the FEC regulation of political speech online. The government already regulates the messages I am able to see and hear on television, radio and other public forums - including the paid placements on the internet. These regulations already do plenty to dissuade potential participants in a robust debate over our nation's future. Doing any more to regulate what can appear on blogs, social media, video platforms and other places online is simply overkill-not to mention it insults the intelligence of every American who knows full well that many political actors have their own agenda. My freedom of speech means I should be able to address the audiences I choose with the message I want to convey-and others should be able to do so with the heavy hand of the government involved. I'll choose which messages I consider worthy and persuasive-the FEC need not do it for me.

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope you'll exhibit restraint before doing anything that would chill political speech on the most democratized platform we have available to us.

Comments provided by :
Putnam, William

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Santora_AI_01_03_2015_13_33_41_CommentText.txt

=====

nono

Comments provided by :
Santora, AI

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Cunningham_Joseph_01_03_2015_13_39_37_CommentText.txt

=====

The internet is the last source of free flowing information. That should remain that way since it works well without government interference and control. The government has no need to interfere with a system that serves its intended purpose. We do not need or want to lose any more personal freedoms to an overreaching and superfluous government bureaucracy.

Comments provided by :
Cunningham, Joseph

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Wagner_John_01_03_2015_13_40_12_CommentText.txt

=====

First, I want you to know that I've lived through WWII, so I know firsthand the methodology of Nazi tyranny that you propose in regulating (controlling) the speech on the internet of free people.

Before considering further such a tyrannous plan, I strongly suggest you review your history of our country and learn the resolve of a free people.

Comments provided by :
Wagner, John

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Price_Ang_01_03_2015_13_39_41_CommentText.txt

=====

The FEC doesn't need to find more ways for government to control our political debates or discourage us from sharing our opinions. Regulating speech online doesn't just endanger our First Amendment rights- it insults the intelligence of Americans.

Do not attempt to regulate my right to discuss politics on the internet.

Comments provided by :

Price, Ang

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Hall_Bruce_01_03_2015_13_41_07_CommentText.txt

=====

To the Federal Election Commission (and ALL other Government Agencies)

I will do and say as I please.

My ancestors DID NOT fight for freedom against the King of England and created the USA for nothing.

Government agencies and those who work for those agencies are EMPLOYED by THE PEOPLE. If you continue to try and circumvent our freedoms, we will reduce the number of jobs in the government and you will be on the streets begging for money.

We will continue to elect officials that WILL keep you in your place and keep you quiet to only do your job and not interfere with the freedoms that the citizens of the USA are entitled to.

Comments provided by :

Hall, Bruce

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_GIGLIO_Larry_01_03_2015_13_44_27_CommentText.txt

=====

Hello. Whatever the commission does, we have under authority of God, the freedom to speak and peacefully assemble to share our thoughts and ideas. We are inventors of necessity. If they ruin our internet, we will build our own- better.

Comments provided by :
GIGLIO, Larry

=====

=====

Commissioners,

It's recently come to my attention that you are considering ways to increase the FEC's regulation of political speech online. The government already regulates the messages I am able to see and hear on television, radio and other public forums - including the paid placements on the internet. These regulations already do plenty to dissuade potential participants in a robust debate over our nation's future. Doing any more to regulate what can appear on blogs, social media, video platforms and other places online is simply overkill-not to mention it insults the intelligence of every American who knows full well that many political actors have their own agenda. My freedom of speech means I should be able to address the audiences I choose with the message I want to convey-and others should be able to do so without the heavy hand of the government involved. I'll choose which messages I consider worthy and persuasive-the FEC need not do it for me. That's not freedom nor is it American in the classic sense.

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope you'll exhibit restraint before doing anything that would chill political speech on the most democratized platform we have available to us.

Comments provided by :
McGuire, Diana

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Hilgeman_James_01_03_2015_13_51_52_CommentText.txt

=====

Hands off freedom of speech, period!

Comments provided by :
Hilgeman, James

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

It's recently come to my attention that you are considering ways to increase the FEC's regulation of political speech online. The government already regulates the messages I am able to see and hear on television, radio and other public forums - including the paid placements on the internet. These regulations already do plenty to dissuade potential participants in a robust debate over our nation's future. Doing any more to regulate what can appear on blogs, social media, video platforms and other places online is simply overkill-not to mention it insults the intelligence of every American who knows full well that many political actors have their own agenda. My freedom of speech means I should be able to address the audiences I choose with the message I want to convey-and others should be able to do so with the heavy hand of the government involved. I'll choose which messages I consider worthy and persuasive-the FEC need not do it for me.

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope you'll exhibit restraint before doing anything that would chill political speech on the most democratized platform we have available to us.

Comments provided by :
Mounce, Danny

=====

=====

It's recently come to my attention that you are considering ways to increase the FEC's regulation of political speech online. The government already regulates the messages I am able to see and hear on television, radio and other public forums - including the paid placements on the internet. These regulations already do plenty to dissuade potential participants in a robust debate over our nation's future. Doing any more to regulate what can appear on blogs, social media, video platforms and other places online is simply overkill-not to mention it insults the intelligence of every American who knows full well that many political actors have their own agenda. My freedom of speech means I should be able to address the audiences I choose with the message I want to convey-and others should be able to do so with the heavy hand of the government involved. I'll choose which messages I consider worthy and persuasive-the FEC need not do it for me.

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope you'll exhibit restraint before doing anything that would chill political speech on the most democratized platform we have available to us.

Comments provided by :
Haynes, William

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Janczak_Susan_01_03_2015_14_00_22_CommentText.txt

=====

The FEC doesn't need to find more ways for government to control our political debates or discourage us from sharing our opinions.

Comments provided by :
Janczak, Susan

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Meisner_Bertrum_01_03_2015_14_01_07_CommentText.txt

=====

I am tired of the government's attempts at censorship of free speech. Any attempt at such a thing is unconstitutional and controlling internet political speech is censorship. This is not what America is about nor was it a principle the founding fathers every wanted it to be. Any elected official who votes for this is not a Constitution advocate and should be kicked out of office for breach of office. Every one of them signed and oath of office promising to uphold the Constitution, how does this do that?

Comments provided by :
Meisner, Bertrum

=====

=====

I for one enjoy the freedom currently available to all Americans on the internet. I make regular posts to my personal Facebook page, "like" the comments of others and add my own comments or "share" my comments with my friends.

I believe in the FIRST AMENDMENT of the U.S. Constitution which states:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

One paragraph says a whole lot. Even though the FEC is technically not Congress, you are authorized and operate under Congressional oversight and rules established by Congress. The President and Congress all take an oath to protect and defend the Constitution. I can only assume that all federal employees take the same oath of allegiance to protect and defend Constitutional principles.

It is not in America's interests for the FEC to become a police agency that censors free speech in America, appointed bureaucrats that decide for all Americans what is acceptable and what is not acceptable "speech." Americans are intelligent enough to "like" the speech with which they agree, and intelligent enough to "challenge" speech with which they disagree.

The FEC was not created to restrict the freedoms already granted to Americans by the U. S. Constitution. Americans expect that you will grant to ordinary citizens the same rights afforded to the press.

Protect freedom. Don't become a police agency that restricts freedom.

Comments provided by :
Kufeldt, Shirley

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_MacMaster_Mary_01_03_2015_14_03_35_CommentText.txt

=====

We do not want the Federal Election Commission tampering with our 1st Amendment right to Free Speech through regulation of anything from political blogs and websites, news aggregators, social media and video content and "all other Internet-based forums for political discussion and debate."

This would be a complete violation and usurpation of the U.S. Constitution's 1st Amendment protections.

It is an insult not only to the intelligence of the American people to discern and decipher for themselves ... but, is also a most despotic attempt to chill the ardor of our 1st Amendment rights and protections.

Comments provided by :
MacMaster, Mary

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Marino_Dave_01_03_2015_14_07_04_CommentText.txt

=====

The FEC has no business regulating political speech on the internet. Please respect the first amendment, thanks.

Comments provided by :
Marino, Dave

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_St_Peter_Beverly_01_03_2015_14_07_31_CommentText.txt

=====

Dear Commissioners,

I just heard that the FEC is considering ways to regulate political speech online. The government already regulates messages we are allowed to see and hear on TV and radio and including paid placements on the internet. If the FEC regulates any more our Freedom of Speech rights will be severely damaged. We are perfectly capable of discerning worthwhile messages ourselves. Thank you.

Comments provided by :
St Peter, Beverly

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_MINDERHOUT_PATRIC_01_03_2015_14_07_42_CommentText.txt

=====

Leave 1st amendment alone. I am an active member of your community.

Comments provided by :
MINDERHOUT, PATRIC

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Kornblum_Steve_01_03_2015_14_09_51_CommentText.txt

=====

Back off already! The American people are already subject to too much regulation! Don't try to regulate protected speech on the internet. It's a First Amendment thing, y'all.

Comments provided by :
Kornblum, Steve

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

It's recently come to my attention that you are considering ways to increase the FEC's regulation of political speech online. The government already regulates the messages I am able to see and hear on television, radio and other public forums - including the paid placements on the internet. These regulations already do plenty to dissuade potential participants in a robust debate over our nation's future. Doing any more to regulate what can appear on blogs, social media, video platforms and other places online is simply overkill-not to mention it insults the intelligence of every American who knows full well that many political actors have their own agenda. My freedom of speech means I should be able to address the audiences I choose with the message I want to convey-and others should be able to do so with the heavy hand of the government involved. I'll choose which messages I consider worthy and persuasive-the FEC need not do it for me.

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope you'll exhibit restraint before doing anything that would chill political speech on the most democratized platform we have available to us.

Comments provided by :
Kornblum, Steve

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Dodson_William_01_03_2015_14_14_17_CommentText.txt

=====

Apparently the FEC is considering ways to increase regulation of political speech online. I feel this would be an encroachment on first amendment rights of the citizens of this country. I am particularly alarmed because of the recent examples of abuse of power by such agencies as the IRS and others. I feel this move would give more openings for similar types of abuse by the FEC

I strongly oppose any attempts at regulation of free speech on the internet. In the event you proceed with this ill-considered action, I plan to support any attempt to overturn it in the courts as an assault on freedom of speech.

Sincerely,

William Dodson

Comments provided by :
Dodson, William

=====

=====

Perhaps in your zealous and rabidly fanatical endeavor to suppress the opinions of those who disagree with you and your fellow bureaucrats, you may have overlooked the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

Please allow me to refresh your memory.

The text of that amendment reads as follows:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

You will note the reference to ". . . abridging the freedom of speech" in the text. You will further note that the U.S. Constitution is the Supreme Law of the Land taking precedence over any other law, rule, regulation or other decree issued by any commission, board, panel, agency, committee, bureau or task fore.

You will further note that the same U.S. Constitution grants the power to make law to Congress and Congress alone - not the Federal Election Commission, nor any other Federal agency. Your Commission was created to aid in the PROTECTION of our rights - not to aid in the VIOLATION of them.

Accordingly, I urge you in the strongest possible terms to consider the consequences of violating our freedom of speech with new rules further regulating political speech on the internet. Our right to free political speech preempts your regulatory mandate.

Comments provided by :
Ricketts, James

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

It's recently come to my attention that you are considering ways to increase the FEC's regulation of political speech online. The government already regulates the messages I am able to see and hear on television, radio and other public forums - including the paid placements on the internet. These regulations already do plenty to dissuade potential participants in a robust debate over our nation's future. Doing any more to regulate what can appear on blogs, social media, video platforms and other places online is simply overkill-not to mention it insults the intelligence of every American who knows full well that many political actors have their own agenda. My freedom of speech means I should be able to address the audiences I choose with the message I want to convey-and others should be able to do so with the heavy hand of the government involved. I'll choose which messages I consider worthy and persuasive-the FEC need not do it for me.

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope you'll exhibit restraint before doing anything that would chill political speech on the most democratized platform we have available to us.

Comments provided by :
Ricketts, Linda

=====

=====

The proposed FEC regulation to control internet political speech is an affront to liberty. The founders drafted the First Amendment prohibition against government infringement on speech and the press with precisely political speech in mind.

How it can escape the Commission that this proposal is a blatant violation of that Constitutional protection is astonishing.

I vociferously oppose adoption of any such regulation, and predict - based on my own Constitutional scholarship in Law School - that should the commission prove foolish enough to adopt the measure, that it will be unambiguously and forcefully struck down as an unconstitutional infringement of free speech by the Federal Courts, and ultimately the Supreme Court.

Comments provided by :
Chance, Roger

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Bennett_Randy_01_03_2015_14_22_00_CommentText.txt

=====

The Free speech we are able to use on the internet is a freedom that should go unencumbered.
Please do not change or regulate the internet

Comments provided by :
Bennett, Randy

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Swim_David_01_03_2015_14_23_03_CommentText.txt

=====

Nothing could be more clear to the mentally competent citizen than this attempt to silence that which they can not control, they want to ban it!

The government is now involved in almost 95% of our lives to the point of choking! The original Patriots of this country didn't even have this level of usurpation in their lives like we do today.

Unfortunately, Americans have been the frog in the slow, increasingly warmer and warmer pot until we're cooked! Some think that we're already cooked, but I disagree and consider the fact that anyone who is in favor of "controlling" the Internet, is on the par of leaders in North Korea.

What do you fear? Why do you want to be in charge of what is allowed and what is not allowed? What right do you have over any citizen in the USA? How in the world do you consider yourself either smarter, holier, more educated, or fair than the rest of America? You are lost in yourself!

Put an end to this foolishness right now! You'll never be able to regulate the Internet. It's gone too far, around the world. If you really want the Internet regulated - move to China and North Korea, you'll have an entire group of "leaders" who agree with this move.

As for America - spend some honest time, as our Federal Government, doing what you intended to do - keep our country safe. That's it! All of your other meddling in the lives of Americans is an intrusion that is shameful!

Comments provided by :
Swim, David

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

It's recently come to my attention that you are considering ways to increase the FEC's regulation of political speech online. The government already regulates the messages I am able to see and hear on television, radio and other public forums - including the paid placements on the internet. These regulations already do plenty to dissuade potential participants in a robust debate over our nation's future. Doing any more to regulate what can appear on blogs, social media, video platforms and other places online is simply overkill-not to mention it insults the intelligence of every American who knows full well that many political actors have their own agenda. My freedom of speech means I should be able to address the audiences I choose with the message I want to convey-and others should be able to do so with the heavy hand of the government involved. I'll choose which messages I consider worthy and persuasive-the FEC need not do it for me.

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope you'll exhibit restraint before doing anything that would chill political speech on the most democratized platform we have available to us.

Best Regards,

Bruce Yeager

Comments provided by :
Yeager, Bruce

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Schweikert_Anne_01_03_2015_14_33_21_CommentText.txt

=====

JUST STOP!!! God sees what you are doing. He will not be mocked. STOP IT!!!

Comments provided by :
Schweikert, Anne

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

It's recently come to my attention that you are considering ways to increase the FEC's regulation of political speech online. The government already regulates the messages I am able to see and hear on television, radio and other public forums - including the paid placements on the internet. These regulations already do plenty to dissuade potential participants in a robust debate over our nation's future. Doing any more to regulate what can appear on blogs, social media, video platforms and other places online is simply overkill-not to mention it insults the intelligence of every American who knows full well that many political actors have their own agenda. My freedom of speech means I should be able to address the audiences I choose with the message I want to convey-and others should be able to do so with the heavy hand of the government involved. I'll choose which messages I consider worthy and persuasive-the FEC need not do it for me.

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope you'll exhibit restraint before doing anything that would chill political speech on the most democratized platform we have available to us.

Comments provided by :
Smith, David

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

It's recently come to my attention that you are considering ways to increase the FEC's regulation of political speech online. The government already regulates the messages I am able to see and hear on television, radio and other public forums - including the paid placements on the internet. These regulations already do plenty to dissuade potential participants in a robust debate over our nation's future. Doing any more to regulate what can appear on blogs, social media, video platforms and other places online is simply overkill-not to mention it insults the intelligence of every American who knows full well that many political actors have their own agenda. My freedom of speech means I should be able to address the audiences I choose with the message I want to convey-and others should be able to do so with the heavy hand of the government involved. I'll choose which messages I consider worthy and persuasive-the FEC need not do it for me.

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope you'll exhibit restraint before doing anything that would chill political speech on the most democratized platform we have available to us.

Comments provided by :
Coplen, Randall

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

It's recently come to my attention that you are considering ways to increase the FEC's regulation of political speech online. The government already regulates the messages I am able to see and hear on television, radio and other public forums - including the paid placements on the internet. These regulations already do plenty to dissuade potential participants in a robust debate over our nation's future. Doing any more to regulate what can appear on blogs, social media, video platforms and other places online is simply overkill-not to mention it insults the intelligence of every American who knows full well that many political actors have their own agenda. My freedom of speech means I should be able to address the audiences I choose with the message I want to convey-and others should be able to do so with the heavy hand of the government involved. I'll choose which messages I consider worthy and persuasive-the FEC need not do it for me.

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope you'll exhibit restraint before doing anything that would chill political speech on the most democratized platform we have available to us.

Comments provided by :
Davis, Shawn

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Suter_Brian_01_03_2015_14_45_46_CommentText.txt

=====

I have read that the Federal Election Commission is considering regulating political speech on the internet. The internet must remain open, free and unrestricted as per the 1st Amendment to our Constitution. The internet is just another form of an open & free speech medium and cannot possibly be in need of regulation as anyone can simply ignore any site they do not agree with it's content. Consequently do not enact any part of REG 2014-01. Thank you for your time.

Comments provided by :
Suter, Brian

=====

=====

Excess concentration of wealth, income, disposable income for investment, leisure to pursue political endeavors, and other advantages already "jaundice" political discourse with "info-pollution". Exceedingly high limits to "dark" contributions from unidentified individuals, corporations, and other organizations further exacerbate this imbalance. Our political system already operates with the expectation of balance achieved via sequences of compromises; currently, this expectation lends credence to positions with no merit regarding the business of government. We require our system to limit contributions, particularly of money, but possibly also of unsubstantiated claims and outright deception per se, both in the electoral and legislative processes (that is, both for voting and lobbying).

The "law of averages" is expected to wash out inane influences of diverse types; however, under-subscribed (primary) elections and excessive media spending allow unrepresentative positions to take hold. Our system is intended to elicit the broadest possible support and participation from a competent electorate in the business of government. Disenfranchisement of diverse voices undermines the effectiveness of our system in contending with the complexity of this 21st century. In all too many ways, issues currently undermining our government hark back to a seemingly simpler time reminiscent of the Colonial period of our history. Our Founding Fathers evolved our system of government with these principles in mind, albeit from the largely agricultural economy of their day, rather than the industrial economy of the 20th century, or the information economy of the present day. We need flexible and versatile forward-looking mechanisms of governance resolving the voices of a great many independent participants across a multitude of interdependent issues.

Thank you for your attention.

Comments provided by :
Falk, Raymond

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Kirkwood_Clayton_01_03_2015_14_51_04_CommentText.txt

=====

I believe everyone will benefit from keeping the Internet free, free access, without levels, and without government interference. It is not the government's to muck with. It doesn't belong to the government. Business will react with increased capacity and speed as part of their desire to make more money. This is how it has happened so far. We have increased speed and capacity which hasn't been forced by government diktats. So it should continue.

Clayton Kirkwood

Comments provided by :
Kirkwood, Clayton

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

It's recently come to my attention that you are considering ways to increase the FEC's regulation of political speech online. The government already regulates the messages I am able to see and hear on television, radio and other public forums - including the paid placements on the internet. These regulations already do plenty to dissuade potential participants in a robust debate over our nation's future. Doing any more to regulate what can appear on blogs, social media, video platforms and other places online is simply overkill-not to mention it insults the intelligence of every American who knows full well that many political actors have their own agenda. My freedom of speech means I should be able to address the audiences I choose with the message I want to convey-and others should be able to do so with the heavy hand of the government involved. I'll choose which messages I consider worthy and persuasive-the FEC need not do it for me.

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope you'll exhibit restraint before doing anything that would chill political speech on the most democratized platform we have available to us.

Comments provided by :
Kendter Jr., Lee A

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Berends_Todd_01_03_2015_15_04_18_CommentText.txt

=====

The government needs to stop infringing on The Constational Rights of The American People. Stop the FCC regulation of Freedom of Speech.

Comments provided by :
Berends, Todd

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

It's recently come to my attention that you are considering ways to increase the FEC's regulation of political speech online. The government already regulates the messages I am able to see and hear on television, radio and other public forums - including the paid placements on the internet. These regulations already do plenty to dissuade potential participants in a robust debate over our nation's future. Doing any more to regulate what can appear on blogs, social media, video platforms and other places online is simply overkill-not to mention it insults the intelligence of every American who knows full well that many political actors have their own agenda. My freedom of speech means I should be able to address the audiences I choose with the message I want to convey-and others should be able to do so with the heavy hand of the government involved. I'll choose which messages I consider worthy and persuasive-the FEC need not do it for me.

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope you'll exhibit restraint before doing anything that would chill political speech on the most democratized platform we have available to us.

Comments provided by :
Peracchio, Dennis

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Moore_Jeff_01_03_2015_15_13_12_CommentText.txt

=====

Keep your stinking hands off the Internet. Censoring political comments on the Internet (or any other medium) is a violation of MY 1st Amendment rights. I will vehemently oppose ANY efforts on your part to censor political speech especially on the Internet!

Stick to regulating PAID-FOR political advertising. You already do a piss poor job of that, we don't need or want you screwing with FREE SPEECH on the Internet!

Comments provided by :
Moore, Jeff

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

It's recently come to my attention that you are considering ways to increase the FEC's regulation of political speech online. The government already regulates the messages I am able to see and hear on television, radio and other public forums - including the paid placements on the internet. These regulations already do plenty to dissuade potential participants in a robust debate over our nation's future. Doing any more to regulate what can appear on blogs, social media, video platforms and other places online is simply overkill-not to mention it insults the intelligence of every American who knows full well that many political actors have their own agenda. My freedom of speech means I should be able to address the audiences I choose with the message I want to convey-and others should be able to do so with the heavy hand of the government involved. I'll choose which messages I consider worthy and persuasive-the FEC need not do it for me.

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope you'll exhibit restraint before doing anything that would chill political speech on the most democratized platform we have available to us.

Sincerely,
Douglas McVickar

Comments provided by :
McVickar, Douglas

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

It's recently come to my attention that you are considering ways to increase the FEC's regulation of political speech online. The government already regulates the messages I am able to see and hear on television, radio and other public forums - including the paid placements on the internet. These regulations already do plenty to dissuade potential participants in a robust debate over our nation's future. Doing any more to regulate what can appear on blogs, social media, video platforms and other places online is simply overkill-not to mention it insults the intelligence of every American who knows full well that many political actors have their own agenda. My freedom of speech means I should be able to address the audiences I choose with the message I want to convey-and others should be able to do so with the heavy hand of the government involved. I'll choose which messages I consider worthy and persuasive-the FEC need not do it for me.

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope you'll exhibit restraint before doing anything that would chill political speech on the most democratized platform we have available to us.

Comments provided by :
Berkeley, Raymond

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

It's recently come to my attention that you are considering ways to increase the FEC's regulation of political speech online. The government already regulates the messages I am able to see and hear on television, radio and other public forums - including the paid placements on the internet. These regulations already do plenty to dissuade potential participants in a robust debate over our nation's future. Doing any more to regulate what can appear on blogs, social media, video platforms and other places online is simply overkill-not to mention it insults the intelligence of every American who knows full well that many political actors have their own agenda. My freedom of speech means I should be able to address the audiences I choose with the message I want to convey-and others should be able to do so with the heavy hand of the government involved. I'll choose which messages I consider worthy and persuasive-the FEC need not do it for me.

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope you'll exhibit restraint before doing anything that would chill political speech on the most democratized platform we have available to us.

Comments provided by :
Miller, Jeffrey

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

It's recently come to my attention that you are considering ways to increase the FEC's regulation of political speech online. The government already regulates the messages I am able to see and hear on television, radio and other public forums - including the paid placements on the internet. These regulations already do plenty to dissuade potential participants in a robust debate over our nation's future. Doing any more to regulate what can appear on blogs, social media, video platforms and other places online is simply overkill-not to mention it insults the intelligence of every American who knows full well that many political actors have their own agenda. My freedom of speech means I should be able to address the audiences I choose with the message I want to convey-and others should be able to do so with the heavy hand of the government involved. I'll choose which messages I consider worthy and persuasive-the FEC need not do it for me.

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope you'll exhibit restraint before doing anything that would chill political speech on the most democratized platform we have available to us.

Comments provided by :
Clingerman, Stephen

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Peterson_Larry_01_03_2015_15_28_11_CommentText.txt

=====

Your attempt to quash the Free Speech of Americans is unconscionable. Our right to free speech covers every aspect of a free people's life, and that includes the Internet. To my knowledge no one, and that includes the President of the United States, has any authority to step on or trample down our God-given right to free speech, or any other of our God-given rights for that matter.

Comments provided by :
Peterson, Larry

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Schafranka_David_01_03_2015_15_28_52_CommentText.txt

=====

I do not want the FEC regulating Free Speech on the Internet.

Regulating speech online doesn't just endanger our First Amendment rights- it insults the intelligence of Americans. We can decide what speech we find persuasive.

Sincerely for Civil Rights,

Comments provided by :
Schafranka, David

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

It's recently come to my attention that you are considering ways to increase the FEC's regulation of political speech online. The government already regulates the messages I am able to see and hear on television, radio and other public forums - including the paid placements on the internet. These regulations already do plenty to dissuade potential participants in a robust debate over our nation's future. Doing any more to regulate what can appear on blogs, social media, video platforms and other places online is simply overkill-not to mention it insults the intelligence of every American who knows full well that many political actors have their own agenda. My freedom of speech means I should be able to address the audiences I choose with the message I want to convey-and others should be able to do so with the heavy hand of the government involved. I'll choose which messages I consider worthy and persuasive-the FEC need not do it for me.

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope you'll exhibit restraint before doing anything that would chill political speech on the most democratized platform we have available to us.

Signed,
Rebekah Cuyler

Comments provided by :
Cuyler, Rebekah

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Clark_Tonya_01_03_2015_15_49_23_CommentText.txt

=====

FEC,

More regulations by this out of control government that come against our freedoms are totally wrong!

Comments provided by :

Clark, Tonya

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

It's recently come to my attention that you are considering ways to increase the FEC's regulation of political speech online. The government already regulates the messages I am able to see and hear on television, radio and other public forums - including the paid placements on the internet. These regulations already do plenty to dissuade potential participants in a robust debate over our nation's future. Doing any more to regulate what can appear on blogs, social media, video platforms and other places online is simply overkill-not to mention it insults the intelligence of every American who knows full well that many political actors have their own agenda. My freedom of speech means I should be able to address the audiences I choose with the message I want to convey-and others should be able to do so with the heavy hand of the government involved. I'll choose which messages I consider worthy and persuasive-the FEC need not do it for me.

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope you'll exhibit restraint before doing anything that would chill political speech on the most democratized platform we have available to us.

Comments provided by :
Cameron, Bruce

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Stagg_Gary_01_03_2015_16_07_44_CommentText.txt

=====

The FEC doesn't need to find more ways for government to control our political debates or discourage us from sharing our opinions.

These actions are nothing but an attack on our First Amendment rights.

Regulating speech online doesn't just endanger our First Amendment rights- it insults the intelligence of Americans. We can decide what speech we find persuasive. The government shouldn't hold our hand and do it for us!

Comments provided by :
Stagg, Gary

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Philbrook_Lisa_01_03_2015_16_08_09_CommentText.txt

=====

I understand that the new chair of the FEC is considering ways to regulate political speech on the internet. I would encourage her NOT to do so, as that is an overreach of power and severe limit on free speech.

Comments provided by :
Philbrook, Lisa

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

It's recently come to my attention that you are considering ways to increase the FEC's regulation of political speech online. The government already regulates the messages I am able to see and hear on television, radio and other public forums - including the paid placements on the internet. These regulations already do plenty to dissuade potential participants in a robust debate over our nation's future. Doing any more to regulate what can appear on blogs, social media, video platforms and other places online is simply overkill-not to mention it insults the intelligence of every American who knows full well that many political actors have their own agenda. My freedom of speech means I should be able to address the audiences I choose with the message I want to convey-and others should be able to do so without the heavy hand of the government involved. I'll choose which messages I consider worthy and persuasive-the FEC need not do it for me.

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope you'll exhibit restraint before doing anything that would chill political speech on the most democratized platform we have available to us.

Comments provided by :
Kotyuk, Gerald

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Mueller_David_01_03_2015_16_14_46_CommentText.txt

=====

Enough of this nonsense. Everyone should comment as they wish. Nobody needs big brother government deciding what should or shouldn't be said.

Thanks,
Dave

Comments provided by :
Mueller, David

=====

=====

I am opposed to the Federal Election Commission regulating political comments on the internet. There is already too much abuse of our First Amendment right to free speech. Political blogs and websites, news aggregators, social media and video content and "all other Internet-based forums for political discussion and debate" should not be regulated, as it will infringe on our protected rights to share ideas.

According to the First Amendment, our rights to free speech, press, assembly, religion, and airing our grievances before the government "SHALL NOT BE INFRINGED". Regulating the aforementioned would be an infringement of our rights.

Comments provided by :
Hill, Anne

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Piper_Charles_01_03_2015_16_26_04_CommentText.txt

=====

Passing this measure would violate my first amendment rights. Please do not pass.

Comments provided by :
Piper, Charles

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

It's recently come to my attention that you are considering ways to increase the FEC's regulation of political speech online. The government already regulates the messages I am able to see and hear on television, radio and other public forums - including the paid placements on the internet. These regulations already do plenty to dissuade potential citizen participation in a robust debate over our nation's future. Doing any more to regulate what can appear on blogs, social media, video platforms and other places online is simply overkill-not to mention it insults the intelligence of every American who knows full well that many political actors and federal agencies have their own agenda. My CONSTITUTIONALLY protected FREEDOM OF SPEECH means I should be able to address the audiences I choose with the message I want to convey-and others should be able to do so WITHOUT the heavy hand of the government involved. I'll choose which messages I consider worthy and persuasive-the FEC need not do it for me nor deny me my RIGHTS.

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope and expect that you'll exhibit great restraint before doing anything that would chill political speech and infringe upon any of our CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS on the most democratized platform we have available to all American citizens.

Comments provided by :
Lewen, Steve

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_williams_charles_01_03_2015_16_42_42_CommentText.txt

=====

Freedom of speech is a precious right that government will always try to abridge. If they cannot censor what they don't like, they will regulate it in the name of the down-trodden. REGULATION is censorship.

That is why regulation must be approached with the greatest of trepidation.

The Internet must be kept free, especially in the realm of political debate. We do not need a referee in the form of the FCC.

Stand Down!

Don't tread on our rights. This is an order!

Comments provided by :
williams, charles

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

It has come to my attention that you are trying to increase the FEC's regulation of political speech online.

The government already regulates the messages I am able to see and hear on television, radio and other public forums - including the paid placements on the internet. These regulations already do plenty to dissuade potential participants in a robust debate over our nation's future. Doing any more to regulate what can appear on blogs, social media, video platforms and other places online is overkill-not to mention it insults the intelligence of every American who knows full well that many political actors have their own agenda.

My freedom of speech means I should be able to address the audiences I choose with the message I want to convey-and others should be able to do so with the heavy hand of the government involved. I'll choose which messages I consider worthy and persuasive-the FEC need not do it for me.

It is important that you do not do anything that would chill political speech on the most democratized platform we have available to us.

Comments provided by :
Shwayder, Mark

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Sintzenich_Henry_01_03_2015_16_44_14_CommentText.txt

=====

No more rules. Political speech is a First Amendment right not, something for the FEC to interfere with!

Comments provided by :
Sintzenich, Henry

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Mayes_Sharon_01_03_2015_16_51_47_CommentText.txt

=====

Keep the FEC out of our Internet. The ONLY speech that should be regulated is any speech which proposes or suggests any action to do illegal activities. This would include demonstration in an illegal manner , such as inciting to riot. Anything else is protected as free speech and should not be limited for individuals.

Comments provided by :
Mayes, Sharon

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Havlicek_John_01_03_2015_16_55_27_CommentText.txt

=====

Our democracy is currently sold and bought like any other commodity. With recent court rulings, speech itself has become a commodity. We must take steps to protect the integrity of our elections. This is an important first (and only a first) step.

Comments provided by :
Havlicek, John

=====

=====

The right to have a political discourse with friends, family, co-workers or acquaintances is something this country has long enjoyed

The FEC has no business in trying to stifle the rights of private citizens to express those views either in person by speaking or by forum on the internet.

The very foundation of this great Country is a citizen's ability to discuss things of importance to them.

The Federal Government should busy itself with true issues such as border control, terroristic threats and the economy.

Comments provided by :
Johnson, Michelle

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

It's recently come to my attention that you are considering ways to increase the FEC's regulation of political speech online. The government already regulates the messages I am able to see and hear on television, radio and other public forums - including the paid placements on the internet. These regulations already do plenty to dissuade potential participants in a robust debate over our nation's future. Doing any more to regulate what can appear on blogs, social media, video platforms and other places online is simply overkill-not to mention it insults the intelligence of every American who knows full well that many political actors have their own agenda. My freedom of speech means I should be able to address the audiences I choose with the message I want to convey-and others should be able to do so with the heavy hand of the government involved. I'll choose which messages I consider worthy and persuasive-the FEC need not do it for me.

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope you'll exhibit restraint before doing anything that would chill political speech on the most democratized platform we have available to us.

Comments provided by :
Lynch, Donald

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

It's recently come to my attention that you are considering ways to increase the FEC's regulation of political speech online. The government already regulates the messages I am able to see and hear on television, radio and other public forums - including the paid placements on the internet. These regulations already do plenty to dissuade potential participants in a robust debate over our nation's future. Doing any more to regulate what can appear on blogs, social media, video platforms and other places online is simply overkill-not to mention it insults the intelligence of every American who knows full well that many political actors have their own agenda. My freedom of speech means I should be able to address the audiences I choose with the message I want to convey-and others should be able to do so with the heavy hand of the government involved. I'll choose which messages I consider worthy and persuasive-the FEC need not do it for me.

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope you'll exhibit restraint before doing anything that would chill political speech on the most democratized platform we have available to us.

Comments provided by :
gebhart, nick

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Fritz_Gretchen_01_03_2015_17_42_25_CommentText.txt

=====

With regard to your consideration of ways to increase the FEC's regulation of political speech online, I must vehemently object.

The government already regulates the messages I am able to see and hear on television, radio and other public forums - including the paid placements on the internet. Doing any more to regulate what can appear on blogs, social media, video platforms and other places online is infringing the people's First Amendment rights. My freedom of speech means I should be able to address the audiences I choose with the message I want to convey-and others should be able to do so without the heavy hand of the government involved. I'll choose which messages I consider worthy and persuasive-the FEC need not do it for me.

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope you'll exhibit restraint before doing anything that would chill political speech on the most democratized platform we currently have available to us.

Comments provided by :
Fritz, Gretchen

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Noble_Tom_01_03_2015_17_45_07_CommentText.txt

=====

There is already enough government regulation on the internet.

Comments provided by :
Noble, Tom

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_steed_brenda_01_03_2015_18_42_52_CommentText.txt

=====

Leave us alone....

Comments provided by :
steed, brenda

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Schafer_Merl_01_03_2015_18_44_19_CommentText.txt

=====

The FEC needs to reread the First Amendment. It is not the government's job to curtail our freedoms but to protect them. Keep your hands off the internet.

Comments provided by :
Schafer, Merl

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

It's recently come to my attention that you are considering ways to increase the FEC's regulation of political speech online. The government already regulates the messages I am able to see and hear on television, radio and other public forums - including the paid placements on the internet. These regulations already do plenty to dissuade potential participants in a robust debate over our nation's future. Doing any more to regulate what can appear on blogs, social media, video platforms and other places online is simply overkill-not to mention it insults the intelligence of every American who knows full well that many political actors have their own agenda. My freedom of speech means I should be able to address the audiences I choose with the message I want to convey-and others should be able to do so with the heavy hand of the government involved. I'll choose which messages I consider worthy and persuasive-the FEC need not do it for me.

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope you'll exhibit restraint before doing anything that would chill political speech on the most democratized platform we have available to us.

Our First Amendment Rights are a critical part of our country and society...please keep them intact!

Sincerely,

Ned Hedrick

Comments provided by :
Hedrick, Ned

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

It's recently come to my attention that you are considering ways to increase the FEC's regulation of political speech online. This is a direct affront to my Constitutional rights and protections. The government already regulates the messages I am able to see and hear on television, radio and other public forums - including the paid placements on the internet. These regulations already do plenty to dissuade potential participants in a robust debate over our nation's future. Doing any more to regulate what can appear on blogs, social media, video platforms and other places online is simply overkill-not to mention it insults the intelligence of every American who knows full well that many political actors have their own agenda. My freedom of speech means I should be able to address the audiences I choose with the message I want to convey-and others should be able to do so with the heavy hand of the government involved. I'll choose which messages I consider worthy and persuasive-the FEC need not do it for me.

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope you'll exhibit restraint before doing anything that would chill political speech on the most democratized platform we have available to us.

Comments provided by :
Mastriani, Dennis

=====

=====

CONCERNING REG 2014-01 BY THE FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION:

I ABSOLUTELY DEMAND THAT YOU KEEP YOUR HANDS OFF OUR INTERNET COMMUNICATIONS WITH EACH OTHER AS CONCERNED AMERICANS. YOU WILL NOT SHUT DOWN FREE SPEECH ON THE INTERNET.

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE HAVE BEEN DISENFRANCHISED BY THE REGULAR MEDIA WHO REFUSE TO REPORT OR WITHHOLD INFORMATION ON THIS PRESENT ADMINISTRATION. NOT TO SPEAK OF TWISTING THE TRUTH AND DISPENSING OUTRIGHT PROPAGANDA IN SUPPORT OF THE ADMINISTRATION.

YOU ARE WHOLLY AND COMPLETELY IN THE WRONG TO MUZZLE US AS AMERICAN CITIZENS!! STOP THIS UNCONSTITUTIONAL SHUT DOWN ON FREE SPEECH NOW!! WE, THE PEOPLE, WILL NOT ALLOW THIS ACTION AGAINST FREE SPEECH DURING THE ELECTION PROCESSES! HOW DARE YOU SIDE WITH THIS ADMINISTRATION AND ANY POLITICAL PARTY EVER!

BARBARA RIPLEY
SALEM OREGON
JAN 3, 2015

Comments provided by :
Ripley, Barbara

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

It's recently come to my attention that you are considering ways to increase the FEC's regulation of political speech online. The government already regulates the messages I am able to see and hear on television, radio and other public forums - including the paid placements on the internet. These regulations already do plenty to dissuade potential participants in a robust debate over our nation's future. Doing any more to regulate what can appear on blogs, social media, video platforms and other places online is simply overkill-not to mention it insults the intelligence of every American who knows full well that many political actors have their own agenda. My freedom of speech means I should be able to address the audiences I choose with the message I want to convey-and others should be able to do so with the heavy hand of the government involved. I'll choose which messages I consider worthy and persuasive-the FEC need not do it for me.

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope you'll exhibit restraint before doing anything that would chill political speech on the most democratized platform we have available to us.

Sincerely,
Roy Kaufmann

Comments provided by :
Kaufmann, Roy

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

It's recently come to my attention that you are considering ways to increase the FEC's regulation of political speech online. The government already regulates the messages I am able to see and hear on television, radio and other public forums - including the paid placements on the internet. These regulations already do plenty to dissuade potential participants in a robust debate over our nation's future. Doing any more to regulate what can appear on blogs, social media, video platforms and other places online is simply overkill-not to mention it insults the intelligence of every American who knows full well that many political actors have their own agenda. My freedom of speech means I should be able to address the audiences I choose with the message I want to convey-and others should be able to do so with the heavy hand of the government involved. I'll choose which messages I consider worthy and persuasive-the FEC need not do it for me.

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope you'll exhibit restraint before doing anything that would chill political speech on the most democratized platform we have available to us.

Ira Paul

Comments provided by :
Paul, Ira

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

It's recently come to my attention that you are considering ways to increase the FEC's regulation of political speech online. The government already regulates the messages I am able to see and hear on television, radio and other public forums - including the paid placements on the internet. These regulations already do plenty to dissuade potential participants in a robust debate over our nation's future. Doing any more to regulate what can appear on blogs, social media, video platforms and other places online is simply overkill-not to mention it insults the intelligence of every American who knows full well that many political actors have their own agenda. My freedom of speech means I should be able to address the audiences I choose with the message I want to convey-and others should be able to do so with the heavy hand of the government involved. I'll choose which messages I consider worthy and persuasive-the FEC need not do it for me.

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope you'll exhibit restraint before doing anything that would chill political speech on the most democratized platform we have available to us.

Very truly yours,

Edward J. Babyak

Comments provided by :
Babyak, Edward

=====

=====

Quit trying to chill political speech that you don't like! These actions are nothing but an attack on our First Amendment rights.

Quit tamping down on political speech on the internet. You want to go even further and explore ways to have even more oversight over what we can say and when. This is off-limits! You don't need to find more ways for government to control our political debates or discourage us from sharing our opinions.

Yet your commission's stupid idiotic new Democratic chair (and probably a BIG Obama fan) has hinted that she's looking to do a major investigation into whether and how to regulate anything from political blogs and websites, news aggregators, social media and video content and "all other Internet-based forums for political discussion and debate."

This is an unacceptable burden on our freedom of speech.

P.S. You as a commission need to be defunded and gotten rid of - there is no need for you to exist as a political entity any longer - good riddance - to you, the Democrats, Harry Reid, Pelosi, Biden, and the Dictator-in-Chief - Obama!

Comments provided by :
Stanford, Herman

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_trickey_charles_01_03_2015_19_42_55_CommentText.txt

=====

The federal government and the federal election committee should stay out of imposing restrictions on American's rights to comment freely on the internet about anything they so choose, including but not limited to politics! Feds, keep your hands off our rights accorded to us by the Constitution!

Comments provided by :
trickey, charles

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

It's recently come to my attention that you are considering ways to increase the FEC's regulation of political speech online. The government already regulates the messages I am able to see and hear on television, radio and other public forums - including the paid placements on the internet. These regulations already do plenty to dissuade potential participants in a robust debate over our nation's future. Doing any more to regulate what can appear on blogs, social media, video platforms and other places online is simply overkill-not to mention it insults the intelligence of every American who knows full well that many political actors have their own agenda. My freedom of speech means I should be able to address the audiences I choose with the message I want to convey-and others should be able to do so with the heavy hand of the government involved. I'll choose which messages I consider worthy and persuasive-the FEC need not do it for me.

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope you'll exhibit restraint before doing anything that would chill political speech on the most democratized platform we have available to us.

Comments provided by :
Myers, Gerry

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_griffin_daniel_01_03_2015_20_04_55_CommentText.txt

=====

the CONSTITUTION guarantees freedom of speech, the effort to restrict that is only being attempted to squealch the minority opinions that are not being represented by current commercial media. don't do it

Comments provided by :
griffin, daniel

=====

=====

To Whom It May Concern,

It has come to my attention that you are considering additional government monitoring/regulation of political speech on the internet. Recall that it was political speech that the King was much-inclined to hush in the Colonies. The result of that nasty, kingly habit was the provision in our First Amendment forbidding Congress from abridging the freedom of speech. Surely the Founders did not intend that the bureaucracy should do what Congress could not!

Political speech is already regulated beyond that which is allowed in the First Amendment. It is frightening to think that now we intend to regulate speech even further.

Please, at least this one time, resist the temptation to further regulate a free people. There is already so little in our lives that is untouched by regulation.

Sincerely,

Ronald Zahn

Comments provided by :
Zahn, Ronald

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_LaMont_Stephen_01_03_2015_20_12_15_CommentText.txt

=====

How long before you ban books or other publications?

Free speech includes all media and method of communication
so I'm not quite sure what type of American could possibly
think about controlling content unless it may be harmful to children.

Free and open debate is not a privilege it is a right!

Keep your hands off that which is not yours to touch.

Comments provided by :
LaMont, Stephen

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_kostin_john_01_03_2015_20_13_26_CommentText.txt

=====

as a tax paying citizen I am very concerned about further restrictions to be placed on the internet system. Did you not learn from the IRS, treasury ,DOD , VA and other scandals including being called "stupid" TO ESTABLISH OBAMA-care,aren't enough illegal/ignorant regulations being DRAFTED BY "IGNORANT" government /Americans. Leave it alone;you don't want your name assoc. with 'IGNORNANT'

Comments provided by :
kostin, john

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Easter_Suzanne_01_03_2015_20_12_56_CommentText.txt

=====

Please do not enact regs that restrict our freedom of speech, which of course includes political speech. Our rights in this country are meant to be very strong, not weak. Ultimately we the people need and want less regulation, not more.

Comments provided by :
Easter, Suzanne

=====

=====

In RE: Statement ? Encouraging Public Comment on the Commission's Treatment of Online Political Activity." FEC.gov, 2014-10-29.

These are not new questions, notwithstanding the new technologies by which comment is shared or expressed. In this letter, I request to testify at the Commission's February 11, 2015 hearing.

Caesar, "the government" can only interfere with real freedom, they cannot give it or take it away. If they do distort or interfere with true freedom, they steal from or tarnish their own legitimacy. When people sense their currency is debased (information in this case), they seamlessly shift to another medium of exchange.

"Character matters. Acting on principle matters. The sound bite and the slogan do not matter. They belong to a vocabulary of the herd, and human beings deserve better. Real freedom demands an ability to think, and a great deal of modern life seems deliberately designed to discourage that."

[____space____]

Charles J. Chaput in "Render Unto Caesar"

ISBN 978-038552228-1

[____space____]

Vice Chair Ravel has exceeded her remit in asserting a right to more regulatory control of "the Internet and other emerging technologies?." In assuming that she and her colleagues are either qualified to, or in a position to judge fairly which speech conforms to their particular worldview, her stated agenda is at cross purposes with a free exchange of ideas.

[____space____]

Claims of objectivity and appeals to "expert status" fall aside under the timeless clarity of "Quis custodiet ipsos custodes?" Truly that is the heart of the matter: while the Commission claims to be protecting us from some unspecified evil, the plain facts of the matter are more appropriately stated as "Who will guard the guardians themselves?"

[____space____]

Without multiple open fora ensuring a free exchange of ideas, who will protect citizens from the Commission's potential for abusing their power? Unless the restraint is documented in both law and in practice, who will guarantee our Constitutional right to express ideas which differ from those of our neighbor?

[____space____]

Among President Reagan's most famous quotes: "The nine most terrifying words in the English language are: I'm from the government and I'm here to help."

[____space____]

As responsible citizens we are able to discern for ourselves which information we deem credible as well as having varied sources for that information to compare and contrast the congruence of the facts presented to us. We already have laws on the books prohibiting slander, threats, etc; so any FEC attempt to filter factual information and reasoned commentary takes on the appearance of grasping for power by those thus proven unfit to serve by that very grasping.

[____space____]

I urge the Vice Chair and her colleagues to refrain from this ill-considered exercise and instead work to restore American leadership in the marketplace of ideas.

Very respectfully,

Matthew E. Weilert

Comments provided by :

Weilert, Matthew

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_MacWilliams_Dennis_01_03_2015_21_06_28_CommentText.txt

=====

Pleeze follow through reg-2014-01

The American people derive nothing less...

Comments provided by :
MacWilliams, Dennis

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

It's recently come to my attention that you are considering ways to increase the FEC's regulation of political speech online. The government already regulates the messages I am able to see and hear on television, radio and other public forums - including the paid placements on the internet. These regulations already do plenty to dissuade potential participants in a robust debate over our nation's future. Doing any more to regulate what can appear on blogs, social media, video platforms and other places online is simply overkill-not to mention it insults the intelligence of every American who knows full well that many political actors have their own agenda. My freedom of speech means I should be able to address the audiences I choose with the message I want to convey-and others should be able to do so with the heavy hand of the government involved. I'll choose which messages I consider worthy and persuasive-the FEC need not do it for me.

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope you'll exhibit restraint before doing anything that would chill political speech on the most democratized platform we have available to us.

Comments provided by :
Rogers, Carolyn

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

It's recently come to my attention that you are considering ways to increase the FEC's regulation of political speech online. The government already regulates the messages I am able to see and hear on television, radio and other public forums - including the paid placements on the internet. These regulations already do plenty to dissuade potential participants in a robust debate over our nation's future. Doing any more to regulate what can appear on blogs, social media, video platforms and other places online is simply overkill-not to mention it insults the intelligence of every American who knows full well that many political actors have their own agenda. My freedom of speech means I should be able to address the audiences I choose with the message I want to convey-and others should be able to do so with the heavy hand of the government involved. I'll choose which messages I consider worthy and persuasive-the FEC need not do it for me.

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope you'll exhibit restraint before doing anything that would chill political speech on the most democratized platform we have available to us.

Comments provided by :
Rogers, Matt

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_West_Sean_01_03_2015_21_28_13_CommentText.txt

=====

Regulating speech online endangers our First Amendment rights.

This is a freedom loving country and some agencies are beginning to act more like this is a communist country.

Brave men and women throughout our history have died for our freedoms and it sounds like the FEC is ready to toss that out the window.

Comments provided by :
West, Sean

=====

=====

Dear Ms. Ravel,

I wish to register my opinion that the FEC should NOT regulate political speech on the Internet. This would be another over-reach of the federal government into our First Amendment rights. Your plan to do this makes

me wonder just what you are so afraid of? If ideas that differ from your own are allowed to be freely expressed, that is a GOOD thing because it proves we are not living under the tyranny of a dictatorship where only

one form of thought is acceptable. You may be comfortable with this, but many of us find it repressive and the opposite of what this country is all about!

Sincerely, Patricia Dunn

Comments provided by :

Dunn, Patricia

=====

=====

Please keep your bureaucratic agency energy and money from further divesting human beings of their rights to COMPLETELY FREE SPEECH, otherwise someday you will most likely find yourselves victims of your own creation when others take control of the monster that you designed for them. Stand for free speech, even if others' speech is difficult, annoying and contrary to your own preferences and beliefs or otherwise you will lose your own freedoms and those of your children, and most likely grandchildren and beyond. However, if all you care about is your own life in the coming months or couple of years, you probably haven't even read this far, but if you have, perhaps out of morbid curiosity, then I regretfully suspect that nothing I say with these limited words will be persuasive enough to change your mind, so in the future, when you are suffering from the mechanisms you set in motion today, hopefully we will have a common understanding and can come together to try and undo mistakes of the past. Remember, preventative health care, auto maintenance etc., is always less expensive than repairs after a lot of damage has already been done.

Respectfully,

a no one in rural Utah.

Comments provided by :
Starks, Shaye

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

It's recently come to my attention that you are considering ways to increase the FEC's regulation of political speech online. The government already regulates the messages I am able to see and hear on television, radio and other public forums - including the paid placements on the internet. These regulations already do plenty to dissuade potential participants in a robust debate over our nation's future. Doing any more to regulate what can appear on blogs, social media, video platforms and other places online is simply overkill-not to mention it insults the intelligence of every American who knows full well that many political actors have their own agenda. My freedom of speech means I should be able to address the audiences I choose with the message I want to convey-and others should be able to do so with the heavy hand of the government involved. I'll choose which messages I consider worthy and persuasive-the FEC need not do it for me.

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope you'll exhibit restraint before doing anything that would chill political speech on the most democratized platform we have available to us.

Comments provided by :
Perry, Jeff

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

It's recently come to my attention that you are considering ways to increase the FEC's regulation of political speech online. The government already regulates the messages I am able to see and hear on television, radio and other public forums - including the paid placements on the internet. These regulations already do plenty to dissuade potential participants in a robust debate over our nation's future. Doing any more to regulate what can appear on blogs, social media, video platforms and other places online is simply overkill-not to mention it insults the intelligence of every American who knows full well that many political actors have their own agenda. My freedom of speech means I should be able to address the audiences I choose with the message I want to convey-and others should be able to do so with the heavy hand of the government involved. I'll choose which messages I consider worthy and persuasive-the FEC need not do it for me.

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope you'll exhibit restraint before doing anything that would chill political speech on the most democratized platform we have available to us.

Comments provided by :
Chapman, Steven

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

It's recently come to my attention that you are considering ways to increase the FEC's regulation of political speech online. The government already regulates the messages I am able to see and hear on television, radio and other public forums - including the paid placements on the internet. These regulations already do plenty to dissuade potential participants in a robust debate over our nation's future. Doing any more to regulate what can appear on blogs, social media, video platforms and other places online is simply overkill-not to mention it insults the intelligence of every American who knows full well that many political actors have their own agenda. My freedom of speech means I should be able to address the audiences I choose with the message I want to convey-and others should be able to do so with the heavy hand of the government involved. I'll choose which messages I consider worthy and persuasive-the FEC need not do it for me.

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope you'll exhibit restraint before doing anything that would chill political speech on the most democratized platform we have available to us.

Lisa Overdorp

Comments provided by :
Overdorp, Lisa

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

It's recently come to my attention that you are considering ways to increase the FEC's regulation of political speech online.

The government already regulates the messages I am able to see and hear on television, radio and other public forums - including the paid placements on the internet. Doing any more to regulate what can appear on blogs, social media, video platforms and other places online is simply overkill as every American knows full well that many political actors have their own agenda.

My freedom of speech means I should be able to address the audiences I choose with the message I want to convey-and others should be able to do so without the heavy hand of the government involved. I'll choose which messages I consider worthy and persuasive-the FEC need not do it for me.

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope you'll exhibit restraint before doing anything that would chill political speech on the most democratized platform we have available to us.

Comments provided by :
Carstensen, Lance

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_settle_Raymond_01_03_2015_23_51_24_CommentText.txt

=====

The action you are proposing would be an unconstitutional restriction on free speech and I oppose it. Do not impose restrictions on our political speech.

Comments provided by :
settle, Raymond

=====

=====

No person or entity should attempt to restrict or regulate speech especially political free speech. The First Amendment to the Constitution guarantees Freedom Of Speech. The FCC (or any other government agency) has no business regulating the internet for the purpose of regulating free speech. What is so hard to understand about the term "free speech?" It is the keystone of all our freedoms and must never be regulated. This about says it all, "I do not approve with what you say but I will defend to the death your right to say it."

Comments provided by :
Morris, David

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

It's recently come to my attention that you are considering ways to increase the FEC's regulation of political speech online. The government already regulates the messages I am able to see and hear on television, radio and other public forums - including the paid placements on the internet. These regulations already do plenty to dissuade potential participants in a robust debate over our nation's future. Doing any more to regulate what can appear on blogs, social media, video platforms and other places online is simply overkill-not to mention it insults the intelligence of every American who knows full well that many political actors have their own agenda. My freedom of speech means I should be able to address the audiences I choose with the message I want to convey-and others should be able to do so without the heavy hand of the government involved. I'll choose which messages I consider worthy and persuasive-the FEC need not do it for me. Our basic Constitutional freedom of speech is at stake.

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope you'll exhibit restraint before doing anything that would chill political speech on the most democratized platform we have left that is available to any person.

Comments provided by :
TRANFAGLIA, TWYLA

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

It's recently come to my attention that you are considering ways to increase the FEC's regulation of political speech online. The government already regulates the messages I am able to see and hear on television, radio and other public forums - including the paid placements on the internet. These regulations already do plenty to dissuade potential participants in a robust debate over our nation's future. Doing any more to regulate what can appear on blogs, social media, video platforms and other places online is simply overkill-not to mention it insults the intelligence of every American who knows full well that many political actors have their own agenda. My freedom of speech means I should be able to address the audiences I choose with the message I want to convey-and others should be able to do so with the heavy hand of the government involved. I'll choose which messages I consider worthy and persuasive-the FEC need not do it for me.

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope you'll exhibit restraint before doing anything that would chill political speech on the most democratized platform we have available to us.

Charles Pickett

Comments provided by :
Pickett, Charles

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Armato_Diane_01_04_2015_00_51_57_CommentText.txt

=====

Dear Commissioners:

Regulating speech online is against our First Amendment right. Chipping away at our freedom of speech is sure to weaken our Constitutional rights. What is there to fear from free and open political debate and free flowing information?

Before great harm is done to our liberties, please think before you act in controlling online communication.

Yours truly,
Diane Armato

Comments provided by :
Armato, Diane

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Sider_Jack_01_04_2015_01_06_02_CommentText.txt

=====

Gentlemen,

There is no reason for the FEC to involve itself with internet-based discussions. The internet is free to use by anyone, and any questions of representation or access are therefore moot.

Thank You

Comments provided by :
Sider, Jack

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Wilson_Rudy_01_04_2015_01_12_22_CommentText.txt

=====

Please!!! We do not need any political regulation on the internet.

Comments provided by :

Wilson, Rudy

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Reynolds_Randy_01_04_2015_01_30_56_CommentText.txt

=====

All other freedoms rest on the ability to communicate freely without interference by the government.
Freedom of the practice of religion, press, assembly all rest on this central freedom.

Comments provided by :
Reynolds, Randy

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Powell_Ben_01_04_2015_02_17_20_CommentText.txt

=====

The free speech clause of the first amendment is vital to representative government. The medium used to propagate political fact and opinion should make no difference, whether voice, broadcast, video, film or internet.

Keep the internet free and open, without censorship of political expression.

Comments provided by :
Powell, Ben

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Laborde_Lucie_01_04_2015_02_25_54_CommentText.txt

=====

I do not trust my government to govern or monitor one more agency or activities associated with them. Why? Look around you to see how successful it has been thus far. IRS targeting, cover ups of Fast & Furious, Benghazi to name three. Monitor free speech on the Internet? I don't think so. Free speech is a Constitutional right.

Comments provided by :
Laborde, Lucie

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Erdmenger_Herbert_01_04_2015_07_21_26_CommentText.txt

=====

Regulating speech online doesn't just endanger our First Amendment rights- it insults the intelligence of Americans. We can decide what speech we find persuasive-the government shouldn't hold our hand and do it for us.

Thank you!

Comments provided by :
Erdmenger, Herbert

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Medinger_Robert_01_04_2015_07_39_39_CommentText.txt

=====

The government has no right to stifle speech (political or otherwise) on the internet. Its time for you to respect the constitution and our first amendment rights.

Comments provided by :
Medinger, Robert

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

It's recently come to my attention that you are considering ways to increase the FEC's regulation of political speech online. The government already regulates the messages I am able to see and hear on television, radio and other public forums - including the paid placements on the internet. These regulations already do plenty to dissuade potential participants in a robust debate over our nation's future. Doing any more to regulate what can appear on blogs, social media, video platforms and other places online is simply overkill-not to mention it insults the intelligence of every American who knows full well that many political actors have their own agenda. My freedom of speech means I should be able to address the audiences I choose with the message I want to convey-and others should be able to do so with the heavy hand of the government involved. I'll choose which messages I consider worthy and persuasive-the FEC need not do it for me.

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope you'll exhibit restraint before doing anything that would chill political speech on the most democratized platform we have available to us.

Comments provided by :
Botting, NW

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Knudtson__Mark_01_04_2015_07_56_52_CommentText.txt

=====

Hi

Comments provided by :
Knudtson , Mark

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

It's recently come to my attention that you are considering ways to increase the FEC's regulation of political speech online. The government already regulates the messages I am able to see and hear on television, radio and other public forums - including the paid placements on the internet. These regulations already do plenty to dissuade potential participants in a robust debate over our nation's future. Doing any more to regulate what can appear on blogs, social media, video platforms and other places online is simply overkill-not to mention it insults the intelligence of every American who knows full well that many political actors have their own agenda. My freedom of speech means I should be able to address the audiences I choose with the message I want to convey-and others should be able to do so with the heavy hand of the government involved. I'll choose which messages I consider worthy and persuasive-the FEC need not do it for me.

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope you'll exhibit restraint before doing anything that would chill political speech on the most democratized platform we have available to us.

Comments provided by :
McCall, David

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Wellen_Patricia_01_04_2015_09_11_59_CommentText.txt

=====

Free speech is a very important part of American life why would you want to censure free speech on the internet this is absolutely the wrong thing to do. I am totally against the Federal Election commission doing this it is not part of their responsibilities and it is unconstitutional

Thank You

Patricia L. Wellen

Comments provided by :

Wellen, Patricia

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Bowditch_William_01_04_2015_10_08_46_CommentText.txt

=====

Freedom of speech is a Constitutional right and should never be infringed.

We are asked to listen to all kinds of hate speech and junk, but we can shut it off if it offends us. The liberals should learn to accept that fact and shut all programs off if they do not like it.

That is freedom of speech and hearing that even the simpletons should be aware of.

Comments provided by :

Bowditch, William

=====

=====

The FEC has no legal authority to stifle ANY American
citizens' 1st Amendment right to freedom of speech, political or otherwise.
That includes ANY political commentary by ANY US citizen,
whether it be on the internet, the radio, newspaper, book or magazine.
I may not like what some people have to say but I will
defend their 1st Amendment right to say it.
This is America, not 1935 East Berlin.

Thank you and Respectfully,

Lisa Thompson

Comments provided by :
Thompson, Lisa

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Smith_Jack_01_04_2015_10_54_32_CommentText.txt

=====

As our First Amendment states, Freedom of Speech, Congress (nor any POTUS appointed agency) should attempt to make any law that would prohibit the free speech, whether written or spoken by any citizen. After all, this is one Freedom that separates America from the rest of the world. No regulations.

Comments provided by :
Smith, Jack

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

It's recently come to my attention that you are considering ways to increase the FEC's regulation of political speech online. The government already regulates the messages I am able to see and hear on television, radio and other public forums - including the paid placements on the internet. These regulations already do plenty to dissuade potential participants in a robust debate over our nation's future. Doing any more to regulate what can appear on blogs, social media, video platforms and other places online is simply overkill-not to mention it insults the intelligence of every American who knows full well that many political actors have their own agenda. My freedom of speech means I should be able to address the audiences I choose with the message I want to convey-and others should be able to do so with the heavy hand of the government involved. I'll choose which messages I consider worthy and persuasive-the FEC need not do it for me.

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope you'll exhibit restraint before doing anything that would chill political speech on the most democratized platform we have available to us.

Sincerely,
Robert Mack

Comments provided by :
Mack, Robert

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_McAvoy_Joe_01_04_2015_11_34_58_CommentText.txt

=====

Stay out of controlling Free Speech and the political process!

Comments provided by :
McAvoy, Joe

=====

=====

The FEC Commissioners must strengthen our disclosure rules so that voters know who is behind the monetary contributions to elected officials with the goal of unjustly influencing policy.

Shame and disgust with Senator Richard Burr, Senator Hagan, Senator Hudson, Senator Pittenger and Senator McHenry. Great disappointment with Speaker Boehner and Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid for allowing this loophole on page 1599 of the recent funding bill.

Politicians in general have little ethics and one overriding motive: get re-elected and gather as much money as possible while in office. How shameful.

Thanks to the elected leaders who strive to remain true to our Country's basic fundamentals of honesty and high ethical standards.

We will remember the above politicians as being dishonest, self-serving and unethical.

Please explore all available opportunities to expose the givers of these monetary contributions.

Best regards,
Ken Kolling
Charlotte, NC

Comments provided by :
Kolling, Kenneth

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Robbins_William_01_04_2015_12_11_51_CommentText.txt

=====

Since I received a decent education during my younger years ,I assure you that I do not need some government official making decisions for me concerning political speech.

Comments provided by :
Robbins, William

=====

=====

Surely the 1st Amendment's clear declaration, "Congress shall make no law ... abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press" applies to the Federal Election Commission, and "the press" must also include material published in electronic form. And clearly the intent is for POLITICAL speech above all else, relating to "a redress of grievances."

So--unlike in Turkey, Russia, Cuba, China, etc.--no court here will permit you to "regulate" political speech no matter what form it takes. The Supreme Court has upheld some restrictions on CONTRIBUTIONS for political activities, but that is not at issue here. Any private person may advocate any policy he or she likes, from anarchy to communism, on any Facebook posting or blog, and it is all protected by the Bill of Rights.

This terrible idea should be dropped at once.

Comments provided by :
Leonard, Robert

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Celedon_Castro_Sandra_01_04_2015_12_19_55_CommentText.txt

=====

Elections should be fair: one vote, one person. Money should be limited at all levels. As an individual, I can only contribute up to a certain reasonable amount. This should apply to all contributions. Democracy should not be bought.

Comments provided by :
Celedon-Castro, Sandra

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Casebolt_Gerald_01_04_2015_13_33_48_CommentText.txt

=====

I don't think thr internet needs any new regulations regarding political matters and would be a violation of first amendment rights

Comments provided by :
Casebolt, Gerald

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

It's recently come to my attention that you are considering ways to increase the FEC's regulation of political speech online. The government already regulates the messages I am able to see and hear on television, radio and other public forums - including the paid placements on the internet. These regulations already do plenty to dissuade potential participants in a robust debate over our nation's future. Doing any more to regulate what can appear on blogs, social media, video platforms and other places online is simply overkill-not to mention it insults the intelligence of every American who knows full well that many political actors have their own agenda. My freedom of speech means I should be able to address the audiences I choose with the message I want to convey-and others should be able to do so with the heavy hand of the government involved. I believe I can choose which messages I consider worthy and persuasive-the FEC need not do it for me.

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope you'll exhibit restraint before doing anything that would chill political speech on the most democratized platform we have available to us.

Sincerely, Mrs. Linda Hansen

Comments provided by :
Hansen, Linda

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

It's come to my attention that you are considering ways to increase the FEC's regulation of political speech online.

The government already regulates the messages I am able to see and hear on television, radio and other public forums, including paid placements on the internet. These regulations already do plenty to dissuade potential participants from a robust debate over our nation's future. Doing any more to regulate what can appear on blogs, social media, video platforms and other places online is simply overkill -- not to mention it insults the intelligence of every American who knows full well that many political actors have their own agenda.

My freedom of speech means I should be able to address the audiences I choose with the message I want to convey, and others should be able to do so without the heavy hand of the government involved. I'll choose which messages I consider worthy and persuasive -- the FEC need not do it for me.

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope you'll exhibit restraint before doing anything that would chill political speech on the most democratized platform we have available to us.

Comments provided by :
Tavares, C D

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Burgess_Carol_01_04_2015_14_22_21_CommentText.txt

=====

Regulating speech online doesn't just endanger our First Amendment rights- it insults the intelligence of Americans. We can decide what speech we find persuasive-the government shouldn't hold our hand and do it for us!

Comments provided by :
Burgess, Carol

=====

=====

The internet does not have the problem the regulation wants to cover.
The regulation will stop innovation. We need to finish the build out
of high speed internet connections and to develop higher transmission
rates for our DSL networks (Europe already has them).
Do not impose further regulation on the internet. We don't need more
government regulation, and especially, no more regulation that stifles
private job growth and innovation.
Jim Shaffer

Comments provided by :
Shaffer, James

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Barglow_Raymond_01_04_2015_15_14_51_CommentText.txt

=====

If we are to consider our nation a democracy, then the following is pretty obvious:

1. Elections should not be controlled by those with wealth. Lobbying and advertising should be strictly regulated.
2. There should be transparency in giving of donations for political purposes.

Thank you,

Raymond Barglow

Comments provided by :
Barglow, Raymond

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Foulkes_James__01_04_2015_15_31_28_CommentText.txt

=====

Please stick to the bill of rights and stop trying to restrict free speech.

Comments provided by :
Foulkes, James

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Bertz_Ken_01_04_2015_15_47_50_CommentText.txt

=====

To put it simply, I am against this poorly masked attempt to further regulate free speech. I am also against the government continuing its never ending power grab in hopes of eventually having a single party leftist system. We do not need additional regulation. We need the government to stay out of this.

Thank you,
Ken Bertz

Comments provided by :
Bertz, Ken

=====

=====

The FEC is tasked with regulating money spent on elections, not political speech. Free speech is guaranteed by the constitution, and the FEC is acting criminally by violating the constitution. Moreover, the FEC would need an army of regulators to police YouTube and other internet sites on a daily basis to look for potential violations, and subject them to inquiries simply because they posted opinions online. In these times of lower Federal budgets, that is not realistic. This will place an undue burden on small groups and individuals. There is no way that Federal employees (or private contractors, for that matter) can scour the entire internet and enforce these kinds of laws. It is absurd to think otherwise.

Comments provided by :
Kelly, Sean

=====

=====

You do not need to go looking/digging for more aspects of the political process to regulate, control or otherwise micromanage. The Federal Election Commission, like most entities comprised of human beings, is capable of doing only a limited number of things well. That must be remembered as its leadership is considering adding projects and oversight to its already-sufficient load of responsibility.

The FEC serves all voters, and thereby all Americans, by confining its focus to activities related to the supervision of the practicality, streamlining and security of the process whereby we select our leadership (who need to remember that they are servants of the nation embodied in the Constitution to which they swear their support and allegiance). I have worked polling places for decades, and (through FOIA requests) have seen the work of other poll workers. It is clear, by the struggles in each political subdivision, that there is much yet to do to secure election processes through prevention of voter fraud perpetrated upon the nation by both the manipulation of ill-informed or older voters (at the polling places and through their mail-in ballots) and by the unwise management of the polling place (which allows for the breaking of election law, either inadvertently or otherwise).

Do well what you are already doing. If you expand your perview, seeking either to exercise authority over all venues, or to arbitrate the CONTENT of various forms of political discourse and advertizing/information, you will be running afoul of the First Amendment at every turn. You will end up before the courts at all levels, which will cost the taxpayers both their wasted tax money and your lost productivity. Do not dissipate your usefulness by scattering effort, especially into areas which will so clearly conflict with the prerogatives of free people. Feel free to make recommendations, but do not take unto yourself the meddling you are currently considering.

Comments provided by :
Owens, Lorraine

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_HOLLINGSWORTH_THERESA_01_04_2015_17_06_07_CommentText.txt

=====

I feel that everything must be disclosed in any election or elected official. Every bit of campaign monies be disclosed along with who is supplying the funds. There needs to be no back deals to have certain companies or individuals to have the most swaying in the political systems. This is America where everyone has the right to have great opportunities in their lives.

Comments provided by :
HOLLINGSWORTH, THERESA

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Brautigam_David_01_04_2015_17_26_10_CommentText.txt

=====

Please do not adopt a rule for further regulation of internet communications.

Comments provided by :
Brautigam, David

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

It's recently come to my attention that you are considering ways to increase the FEC's regulation of political speech online. The government already regulates the messages I am able to see and hear on television, radio and other public forums - including the paid placements on the internet. These regulations already do plenty to dissuade potential participants in a robust debate over our nation's future. Doing any more to regulate what can appear on blogs, social media, video platforms and other places online is simply overkill-not to mention it insults the intelligence of every American who knows full well that many political actors have their own agenda. My freedom of speech means I should be able to address the audiences I choose with the message I want to convey-and others should be able to do so with the heavy hand of the government involved. I'll choose which messages I consider worthy and persuasive-the FEC need not do it for me.

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope you'll exhibit restraint before doing anything that would chill political speech on the most democratized platform we have available to us.

Comments provided by :
Nourse, David

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

It's recently come to my attention that you are considering ways to increase the FEC's regulation of political speech online. The government already regulates the messages I am able to see and hear on television, radio and other public forums - including the paid placements on the internet. These regulations already do plenty to dissuade potential participants in a robust debate over our nation's future. Doing any more to regulate what can appear on blogs, social media, video platforms and other places online is simply overkill-not to mention it insults the intelligence of every American who knows full well that many political actors have their own agenda. My freedom of speech means I should be able to address the audiences I choose with the message I want to convey-and others should be able to do so with the heavy hand of the government involved. I'll choose which messages I consider worthy and persuasive-the FEC need not do it for me.

Every time new government regulations come out, it seems that more and more of our freedoms are being put in danger of being eliminated and that is unconstitutional to say the least. We have had too much of our government and it's departments overreaching its bounds and trying to tell us what is best for us. We are quite capable of deciding what speech is suitable and what is not. We can determine what is hate speech and what is not. We can determine what speech is acceptable and what is not. We don't need a nanny to do that for us. We are actually pretty intelligent, perceptible and able human beings and quite capable of making decisions in our own interests.

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope you'll exhibit restraint before doing anything that would chill political speech on the most democratized platform we have available to us.

Comments provided by :
Traeger, Patricia

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

It's recently come to my attention that you are considering ways to increase the FEC's regulation of political speech online. The government already regulates the messages I am able to see and hear on television, radio and other public forums - including the paid placements on the internet. These regulations already do plenty to dissuade potential participants in a robust debate over our nation's future. Doing any more to regulate what can appear on blogs, social media, video platforms and other places online is simply overkill-not to mention it insults the intelligence of every American who knows full well that many political actors -- if not most -- have their own agenda.

My constitutionally guaranteed freedom of speech means I should be able to address the audiences I choose with the message I want to convey-and others should be able to do so with the heavy hand of the government involved. I'll choose which messages I consider worthy and persuasive-the FEC need not do it for me.

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope you'll exhibit restraint before doing anything that would chill political speech on the most democratized platform we have available to us.

Comments provided by :
Holmes, Mark

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_simpson_marc_01_04_2015_19_52_00_CommentText.txt

=====

This is the home of the brave and land of the free if you don't like it mmove to a communist country and let those of us who do love this country free to enjoy our God give constitution protected right

Comments provided by :
simpson, marc

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Roberson_Michael_01_04_2015_20_21_15_CommentText.txt

=====

HANDS OFF the internet and HANDS OFF our precious, constitutionally-protected freedom of speech.

Comments provided by :
Roberson, Michael

=====

=====

Our country is based on freedom! We can choose what we will watch or choose not to watch or listen to. I feel that we are able to decide what conforms to our beliefs and desires. I do not feel that any outside entity should determine what we can hear when we make decisions about our government politicians and who we support when they are running for office. Most of the citizens who follow politics can make informed decisions. It is the reason our country has run as well as it has in the past. It does not help when Government decides what we can listen or watch, in order to make intelligent decisions.

Comments provided by :
Peterson, Donna

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Hall_Robert_01_04_2015_20_39_03_CommentText.txt

=====

Please do not restrict individual freedom by regulating political speech on the internet.

Comments provided by :
Hall, Robert

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Schlaffer_Andrew_01_04_2015_22_17_34_CommentText.txt

=====

To Whom It Concerns,

To be short and sweet, this is an unacceptable burden on our freedom of speech. To think that this type of regulation is even being considered is very discouraging. I hope you decide to do what is just and constitutional which would be to not pass any law that would limit our freedom of speech in any way.

Regards,
Andrew

Comments provided by :
Schlaffer, Andrew

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Jones_Max_01_04_2015_22_23_04_CommentText.txt

=====

I am tired of our Federal Government taking away our freedoms. Do not take away free speech of individuals that want to discuss or make unsolicited comments on the political process. Any control of this would be a violation of our freedom.

Comments provided by :
Jones, Max

=====

Attachment: null_Garland_GCC_01_05_2015_03_25_38_CommentText.txt

=====

The fact that you are even discussing bridling American's 1st Amendment Rights is worrisome, and any attempt to implement such regulations is, in fact, illegal, unconstitutional, and therefore, null and void upon its inception... The ONLY legal and constitutional avenue you have to consider such Rulemaking is a properly ratified Amendment to the Constitution, which does not currently exist... Therefore, you are, in fact, a criminal considering criminality, and inciting others to engage in criminality, yes? Please, for the love of your children, and/or your friends children, and/or yourself, stop wasting everyone's time and energy on constitutional circumvents... Do you and yours not live here too? Do you ever stop to consider where all your efforts to circumvent will end us all up? Do you not realize the Constitutional Protections protect everyone, including you and yours? Have you been promised Utopia and Power for Cooperation? Is the Power you seek not the Power to live your life freely as YOU choose? Will then, you really be happy as a Prison Guard on a Prison Planet? Will your children be happy as Guards or worse, someone else's Inmates? Stop it... Stop it now.

Comments provided by :
Garland, GCC

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_POWELL_ROGER_01_05_2015_08_05_28_CommentText.txt

=====

LEAVE FREE SPEECH ALONE. I FORONE AM TIRED OF "BIG BROTHER" INTRUDING INTO VERY ASPECT OF MY LIFE.

Comments provided by :
POWELL, ROGER

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Lenfert_Robert_01_05_2015_08_11_50_CommentText.txt

=====

I believe the Federal government has intervened far too much already on issues that should be handled on a lower level. This proposal would be a continued effort to choke one's freedom of speech and contrary to the right to voice that opinion. Keep the FEC off the internet!

Comments provided by :
Lenfert, Robert

=====

=====

The FEC is tasked with regulating money spent on elections,
not political speech.

Reversing the exemption for free speech postings on-line would jeopardize our
constitutionally-guaranteed free speech.

These new regulations would be extremely costly to the taxpayers and difficult to enforce.

Thank you Cheryl Thompson

Comments provided by :
Thompson, Cheryl

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Denton_Barbara_01_05_2015_09_02_50_CommentText.txt

=====

Political comment is every American's right and duty. This is not an area which the FEC should interfere with or be concerned about. This is not in your jurisdiction. The internet is not your jurisdiction and you have no right to interfere with public discourse on any subject.

Comments provided by :
Denton, Barbara

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Miller_Don_01_05_2015_09_14_10_CommentText.txt

=====

YouTube and the broader Internet should be free from federal government control.

Comments provided by :
Miller, Don

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Lewis_Tammy_01_05_2015_09_54_42_CommentText.txt

=====

There are very few places you can get information that is not controlled by extreme left media outlets. The internet is a needed avenue to get information from other sources. Please refrain from interfering with this means of communication. The government is already controlling too many things that are not necessary for it to be involved in.

Comments provided by :
Lewis, Tammy

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Elliott_Ruth_Elaine_01_05_2015_10_25_02_CommentText.txt

=====

I object to any censoring of unpaid political comments on the internet, or anywhere else....radio, newsprint, magazines, etc.

Ruth Elaine Elliott.

Comments provided by :
Elliott, Ruth Elaine

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Enerson_Wayne_01_05_2015_10_27_41_CommentText.txt

=====

No control of comments on internet.

Comments provided by :
Enerson, Wayne

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

It's recently come to my attention that you are considering ways to increase the FEC's regulation of political speech online. The government already regulates the messages I am able to see and hear on television, radio and other public forums - including the paid placements on the internet. These regulations already do plenty to dissuade potential participants in a robust debate over our nation's future. Doing any more to regulate what can appear on blogs, social media, video platforms and other places online is simply overkill-not to mention it insults the intelligence of every American who knows full well that many political actors have their own agenda. My freedom of speech means I should be able to address the audiences I choose with the message I want to convey-and others should be able to do so with the heavy hand of the government involved. I'll choose which messages I consider worthy and persuasive-the FEC need not do it for me.

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope you'll exhibit restraint before doing anything that would chill political speech on the most democratized platform we have available to us.

Comments provided by :
Vasas, Gregory

=====

=====

DO NOT REGULATE the INTERNET!! It is NOT right! Nor is it the AMERICAN WAY!!

? The FEC is tasked with regulating money spent on elections, not political speech.

? Reversing the exemption for free postings online would have dangerous ramifications for constitutionally-guaranteed free speech.

? The FEC would have to unleash an army of regulators to police YouTube and other internet sites on a daily basis to look for potential violations, and subject them to inquiries simply because they posted opinions online.

? This will place an undue burden on small groups and individuals.

? These new regulations would be extremely costly for taxpayers and difficult to enforce.

Americans are entitled to FREE SPEECH in the Constitution. You DO NOT have the power to regulate the internet and our right to FREE SPEECH!!

Comments provided by :
Meyer, Kim

=====

=====

Dear Madam,

Regulation of speech on the internet is an overreach of government. It is unconstitutional insofar as regulation of speech is prohibited in the 1st Amendment. There is no rationale that can nullify free speech on the internet. The 1st Amendment is not restricted to a time and place; it is open-ended precisely because the writers of the Constitution were not ignorant of changes going forward in history. They, after all, could look back and assess the changes that had occurred during their life times. So, do not take a vindictive step to shut down free speech on the internet because people's opinions, ideas, and knowledge don't parallel yours. Such a move is unbecoming of someone who prides oneself on being compassionate, caring, and good.

Comments provided by :
Fuller, Rhonda

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Carmichael_William_01_05_2015_11_24_32_CommentText.txt

=====

Attempt after attempt is being made to dismantle the Constitution & the Bill of Rights of the United States of America. No more political hacks! NO MORE!!

WE THE PEOPLE are working and joining forces to dismantle YOU & YOUR HENCHMEN!!

Comments provided by :

Carmichael, William

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Hocker_Dale_01_05_2015_11_29_34_CommentText.txt

=====

All election related funding must have complete disclosure of who provided funding. This must include all forms of advertising even if claims are made the ads are "issue related only.

Comments provided by :
Hocker, Dale

=====

=====

Right now, the government only regulates political comments that are placed for a fee - paid video or web advertisements and sites. But they want to go even further and explore ways to have even more oversight over what we can say and when.

The FEC doesn't need to find more ways for government to control our political debates or discourage us from sharing our opinions.

Yet the commission's new chair has hinted that she's looking to do a major investigation into whether and how to regulate anything from political blogs and websites, news aggregators, social media and video content and "all other Internet-based forums for political discussion and debate."

Regulating speech online doesn't just endanger our First Amendment rights- it insults the intelligence of Americans. We can decide what speech we find persuasive-the government shouldn't hold our hand and do it for us!

Comments provided by :
Sawicki, Bruce

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Trexler_Cresslyn_01_05_2015_11_43_32_CommentText.txt

=====

I am writing in response to an editorial from the Charlotte Observer about the contributions individuals can now make to political campaigns. The Supreme Court did enough damage in this regard. Congressional seats can now be bought by the richest people of the country. Is this the democratic way? Is this how the best and the brightest among us can even hope to run for political office? I think not! What can be done, that is the question and my concern.

Comments provided by :
Trexler, Cresslyn

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Casalaina_Vincent_01_05_2015_11_53_00_CommentText.txt

=====

I am concerned about the influx of dark money into the election process. The public deserves to know who is supporting candidates and/or ballot initiatives.

I urge you to tighten disclosure rules to make sure that the major contributors will be visible in both print, over the air and electronic communications.

Comments provided by :
Casalaina, Vincent

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Yost_Thomas_01_05_2015_12_09_01_CommentText.txt

=====

Oversight of political discourse on the Net should ONLY be scrutinized where there is paid advertisements involved. Any other form of restriction is a clear infringement upon Political Free Speech. It only leads to a lot of subjective regulations that can be applied against the party that is currently not in power. Any additional restrictions, beyond what is currently in place, are clearly unwarranted in the present environment & will only have a chilling effect upon our Constitutional rights to Free Speech.

Comments provided by :
Yost, Thomas

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Slinkard_Renee_01_05_2015_12_48_01_CommentText.txt

=====

I urge you to vote against any regulation that restricts the use of our 1st Amendment Rights and allows the federal government to infringe upon those rights of freedom of speech, freedom of press.

Comments provided by :
Slinkard, Renee

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Housner_Ernest_01_05_2015_12_56_00_CommentText.txt

=====

To whom it concerns,

I oppose any changes that you are proposing on REG 2014-01, please leave it alone.

Thank you,

Ernest Housner

Comments provided by :
Housner, Ernest

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

It's recently come to my attention that you are considering ways to increase the FEC's regulation of political speech online. The government already regulates the messages I am able to see and hear on television, radio and other public forums - including the paid placements on the internet. These regulations already do plenty to dissuade potential participants in a robust debate over our nation's future. Doing any more to regulate what can appear on blogs, social media, video platforms and other places online is simply overkill-not to mention it insults the intelligence of every American who knows full well that many political actors have their own agenda. My freedom of speech means I should be able to address the audiences I choose with the message I want to convey-and others should be able to do so with the heavy hand of the government involved. I'll choose which messages I consider worthy and persuasive-the FEC need not do it for me.

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope you'll exhibit restraint before doing anything that would chill political speech on the most democratized platform we have available to us.

Sincerely,
Molly Yacko

Comments provided by :
Yacko, Molly

=====

=====

No public bill submitted should be allowed to contain earmarks. Bills should be limited to a single subject or category only.

In terms of campaign reform, a great change is necessary. Current fundraising is from any source, which means our political office holders are already 'bought and paid for' by the time they achieve office, simply to get enough money in their campaign fund to achieve the election. THIS DOES NOT CREATE a government 'OF the people, BY the people, and FOR the people", but rather a government OF, BY, and FOR the highest bidders - the corporations and lobbyists. This is a horrible violation of the spirit in which our nation was formed.

Campaign fundraising needs to be strictly controlled from individual U.S. citizens ONLY. We neither need nor desire anyone NOT a citizen of this country to be affecting our internal politics. ALL contributions other than individual US citizens' should be re-routed to a single fund, and used to pay down the U.S. national debt. All remaining 'war chest' campaign funds of any retiring politician should go to the same fund.

If we do not restructure campaign finances to limit any non-individual, or non-citizen source, we have effectively sold out our nation to the highest bidder. God forbid that should be the likes of Iran, Russia, or China. WASHINGTON may have lost its belief in God, and it's faith "In God We Trust", but the voters have NOT.

The voters have watched in horror as Washington has paid itself more and more, feathered its own nest, and cut benefits to those who worked hard their whole lives for them, for less and less usefulness to our nation. We have watched in disgust as Congress and the President scheme and violate the intent and legality of the laws upon which our nation was founded. We need to close our borders, and find and DEPORT all illegal aliens, once and for all. We need Washington to stop lying to the public to promote its own ends.

Many of these events have occurred because our politicians have been bought and paid for by special interests of NON citizens, interest groups from outside the USA, and by corporations and minor special interest groups who happen to have large funding available, regardless of their small representation in the population, NOT by individual voters.

We desperately need to RETURN the control of the USA to the CITIZENS and taxpayers - NOT foreign and business interest groups. REFORM CAMPAIGN FINANCING. Allow ONLY private contributions, and ONLY those from bona fide U.S. citizens!! Help to restore our nation to the glory it once had, not sell it down the Potomac.

Comments provided by :
Berger, Joseph

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Drake_Peggy_01_05_2015_14_59_44_CommentText.txt

=====

It is unfortunate that we are having this conversation. Free speech is fundamental to our America. It follows that undermining this right is un-American. The issue is no more complicated than that. Venues, such as the internet and YouTube, must be free from restriction!

Comments provided by :
Drake, Peggy

=====

=====

Dear Sirs,

The public does not need more scrutiny from the government. Regulating speech online doesn't just endanger our First Amendment rights- it insults the intelligence of Americans. We can decide what speech we find persuasive-the government shouldn't. The FEC should not regulate free speech on the internet.

Thank you.

Comments provided by :
Capron, David

=====

=====

It's recently come to my attention that you are considering ways to increase the FEC's regulation of political speech online. The government already regulates the messages I am able to see and hear on television, radio and other public forums - including the paid placements on the internet. These regulations already do plenty to dissuade potential participants in a robust debate over our nation's future. Doing any more to regulate what can appear on blogs, social media, video platforms and other places online is simply overkill-not to mention it insults the intelligence of every American who knows full well that many political actors have their own agenda. My freedom of speech means I should be able to address the audiences I choose with the message I want to convey-and others should be able to do so without the heavy hand of the government involved. I'll choose which messages I consider worthy and persuasive-the FEC need not do it for me.

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope you'll exhibit restraint before doing anything that would chill political speech on the most democratized platform we have available to us.

Comments provided by :
Miller, John

=====

=====

Dear Commissioners,

It's recently come to my attention that you are considering ways to increase the FEC's regulation of political speech online. The government already regulates the messages I am able to see and hear on television, radio and other public forums - including the paid placements on the internet. These regulations already do plenty to dissuade potential participants in a robust debate over our nation's future. Doing any more to regulate what can appear on blogs, social media, video platforms and other places online is simply overkill-not to mention it insults the intelligence of every American who knows full well that many political actors have their own agenda. My freedom of speech means I should be able to address the audiences I choose with the message I want to convey-and others should be able to do so with the heavy hand of the government involved. I'll choose which messages I consider worthy and persuasive-the FEC need not do it for me.

Thank you for your consideration, and I hope you'll exhibit restraint before doing anything that would chill political speech on the most democratized platform we have available to us.

Freedom should be enhanced with every step all of you take. If it doesn't make us more Free, we should not even think of doing it.

Thanks,

Harold Rozier

Comments provided by :
Rozier, Harold

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Bedell_Darren_01_05_2015_16_15_54_CommentText.txt

=====

Commenting on the investment bill that was just passed.

I am appalled and against allowing the increases to special interest contributions. To include this provision in a bill that much pass and to hide it at the very end of the bill is clearly designed to avoid public debate and outrage.

Money must not equal speech. To allow even more money into the mix is not good for the majority of America. I see this as corrupt and it is on both sides of the isle. Where is a true leader? I will remember and cast my vote.

Comments provided by :
Bedell, Darren

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Hunt_Jim_01_05_2015_16_31_20_CommentText.txt

=====

The Federal government,(FEC), has no legal standing to regulate the amount or content of political speech that any citizen wishes to post on the internet. Keep your hands off of our constitutionally protected free speech on the internet. This is not North Korea or communist China yet!

Comments provided by :
Hunt, Jim

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Czurylo_Dennis_01_05_2015_17_19_30_CommentText.txt

=====

Political debate and speech that is not fee based or paid for is protected by the Constitution and should not be subject to the government trying to violate our constitutional rights.

Comments provided by :
Czurylo, Dennis

=====

=====

I find it deeply offensive that at every turn our government seems to be taking away our God given, Constitutionally protected freedoms. Now you are wanting to censure free speech that is given or expressed over the internet. The internet must remain free, and unencumbered by government intrusion. American citizens should have the right to express their opinions, their approval or disapproval of whatever subject about which they might choose to comment. They should not be levied with a tax, or a fee for the privilege of commenting on any form of social media. This should include Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, LinkedIn, Pinterest, etc.

God gave us the ability to have freedom of speech, and for more than 200 years, our wonderful Constitution has guaranteed us that right. Even if we disagree, or find something offensive, the person making the offensive comment still has the right to say it. To force him or her to pay a price for making those comments, is unfair, unjust, and definitely anti-American.

I pray that God will bless you to do what is right and proper. I pray that God will consider still blessing America, even though our government has turned its back on Him, and has vehemently turned against Him and His followers.

Patricia Carr

Comments provided by :
Carr, Patricia

=====