

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Cyr_Jeanette_12_23_2014_15_06_45_CommentText.txt

=====

As unruly and frightening as the internet has become it is freedom of speech personified and something we have not given our elected representatives (or anyone else for that matter) authority over. Please think very clearly about what it means to regulate it for if someday your worthy opponents are in charge they may regulate you in ways that seem unbearable. The truth is our government has many jobs to do and very little cash to do them with. Please stop the power grab and show a little confidence in your people.

Comments provided by :
Cyr, Jeanette

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Durand_Carol_12_23_2014_15_10_56_CommentText.txt

=====

As a true American patriot, I sincerely believe in the Constitution and in the bill of rights. Our forefathers were clear in their plan for a free democracy and exact in their rules for government checks and balances. As a conservative I find the efforts of progressives quite repugnant to attempt any type of takeover of the internet. By virtue of their (Democrat Socialist Party and their Marxist/communist "progressives") takeover of the American mainstream media, one can only assume the further censorship of communications. I protest these actions in the strongest terms and believe that the majority of Americans will do the same. STOP the globalization efforts NOW!

Comments provided by :
Durand, Carol

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_McGahie_Paul_12_23_2014_15_14_08_CommentText.txt

=====

Do NOT allow the government to regulate, censor, or in any and all possible ways to control the internet! The First Amendment covers all information and communication media. The internet is the last bastion of freedom. There is no terrorist threat sufficient to turn this nation into a socialist police state.

Please stiffen your spine and prevent REG 2014-01 and all other proposed regulations now and in the future. Your children and grandchildren will inherit this country from you; do you want them to be free, or be slaves?

Dr. Paul McGahie

Comments provided by :
McGahie, Paul

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Faith_Kathi_12_23_2014_15_28_56_CommentText.txt

=====

The FEC was created to oversee campaign funding not to deny us our first amendment rights.

Comments provided by :
Faith, Kathi

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_DeGrave_Lynn_12_23_2014_15_29_41_CommentText.txt

=====

Please don't "fix" what isn't broken. No government interference in normal interpersonal communications is acceptable under the first amendment. No government intervention in anything has been helpful or constructive. Do your legitimate jobs (protect and defend) and quit trying to micromanage our lives and communications.

Comments provided by :
DeGrave, Lynn

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Doran_LeVerne_12_23_2014_15_30_34_CommentText.txt

=====

Sirs, The internet does NOT need government intervention. Keep your hands out of the internet. It is functioning well enough at this point. You interference is NOT wanted.

Comments provided by :
Doran, LeVerne

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Johnson_Cole_12_23_2014_15_30_23_CommentText.txt

=====

Dear people: Leave my guaranteed first amendment rights alone! You are violating the Constitution of These United States of America! Please refrain from such cowardice and treasonous acts of limiting my free speech! Instead, uphold the Constitution! Be a brave and honest citizen, Stand by the people of America! Stop turning America into a third world dictatorship! Sincerely Cole Johnson

Comments provided by :
Johnson, Cole

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Kepple_Ralph_12_23_2014_15_34_21_CommentText.txt

=====

I am writing to express my disappointment that attempts are being made to regulate the internet. The internet is a form of expression, and as such, is protected as free speech. Our Federal Government has no business trying to control content, taxing the use of or otherwise charging participants who wish to use the internet.

Sincerely,

Ralph J. Kepple
6344 Mountain Brook Way NW
Atlanta, GA 30328

Comments provided by :
Kepple, Ralph

=====

=====

The FEC is tasked with regulating money spent on elections, not political speech. This, in and of itself, is enough reason not to attempt to police the internet.

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

The FEC would need an enormous number 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.

I believe that this type of censorship happens in China, which is not a free country - as ours allegedly is.

Please do not turn our country into a police state.

Comments provided by :

Carney, Suzanne

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Stevens_Wendy_12_23_2014_15_46_17_CommentText.txt

=====

We, as a country, cannot be allowed to give away our rights as given to us in the Constitution and Bill of Rights. I have the right to express myself in writing. If someone has issues with what I express, then our recourse is court. I have the right to disagree with any person or entity and put that in writing or speech. Our country was founded of that right and to take that away will send us back to Nazi Germany.

Comments provided by :
Stevens, Wendy

=====

=====

The FEC is not authorized by the Constitution nor by Congress to control free speech where ever it is used, except to a small degree in the campaign process. It must stay away from censorship of internet exchange.

The Supreme Court has been traditionally very sure to "err" on the side of greater freedom of speech and there is no cause to believe it would be any different now.

At it's very beginning it was clear that the internet was NOT intended to be controlled by government but used as a free pathway of communication, association, and discussion.

The cost to already overburdened (and increasingly so in the last 6+ years) taxpayers to enact this fraud including the costs entailed to fight it from being enacted would unfairly burden those taxpayers even more.

The last mid term election demonstrated the strong yearning for less government, greater free will, lower taxes and expenses, and less meddling.

Please refrain from further efforts in this direction and restrict yourselves to the mandate given you by Congress, that of policing our elective process.

Thank you for your attention.

Comments provided by :
Stewart, Thom

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Perez_Anthony_12_23_2014_15_53_10_CommentText.txt

=====

Greetings. I am against the new legislation giving the federal government the authority to monitor and regulate any political commentary on the internet. This goes against the First Amendment rights of every citizen of this great country. Political comments made online should... must be afforded the same protection that spoken and written commentary receive.

Comments provided by :
Perez, Anthony

=====

=====

I do NOT want the the FEC regulating speech on the internet!

?In 1975, Congress created the Federal Election Commission (FEC) to administer and enforce the Federal Election Campaign Act (FECA) - the statute that governs the financing of federal elections. The duties of the FEC, which is an independent regulatory agency, are to disclose campaign finance information, to enforce the provisions of the law such as the limits and prohibitions on contributions, and to oversee the public funding of Presidential elections.?

The mission statement above, excerpted directly from the FEC website, specifies no duty or responsibility of the commission other than regulating the money associated with elections. It most certainly does not authorize the regulation of speech, on the internet or anywhere else.

To effectively police and sanitize the internet would require a costly expansion to resource and staff the new thought police arm of the FEC.

Censorship is a clear violation of the Constitution. After the controversy stemming from the IRS selectively targeting and suppressing organizations, the last thing the FEC should be contemplating is the regulation of political speech on the internet. It reeks of the abusive practices and policies of totalitarian regimes from Nazi Germany to North Korea.

I will not stand for this sweeping expansion of the FEC, and I will also contact my representatives in Congress to register my disapproval.

Comments provided by :
McGrath, Michael

=====

=====

Lawmakers of the FEC,

I am writing to voice my comments about keeping the internet free from legislation, regulation that would essentially give government the ability to legally squash free speech. It is my right under the Constitution to be able to speak freely in this country whether on-line on the computer or on line at the grocery store.

If I want to read about or support various persons or policies on the internet, I want to do it without fear of surveillance and repercussions for expressing my opinions. Consider the internet the modern day newspaper, book, club, social network, teacher, philosopher - every citizen in the United States is entitled to free and unfettered access to the internet, to purchase, view, and speak out. The Bill of Rights ensures that We the People can peacefully assemble to address grievances particularly grievances with Government.

Please leave the internet free from Government supervision of any kind.

Seriously and sincerely,
Ms. Nancy Alexander

Comments provided by :
Alexander, Nancy

=====

Attachment:

REG_2014_01_Ragsdale_Mr._&_Mrs._James_S._12_23_2014_16_03_40_CommentText.txt

=====

Do NOT regulate the internet.

Comments provided by :

Ragsdale, Mr. & Mrs. James S.

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_collier_robert_j__12_23_2014_16_06_58_CommentText.txt

=====

As A Us citizen I am opposed to any type of attempted censorship of the internet or any type of media that is protected under the 1st amendment of the constitution of the US. We as a people have a RIGHT to SPEAK freely on any subject in any media the constitution does not limit where we speak or on what subject even if it is to criticize the government. I am sick and tired government agencies trying to pass somekind of regulations that are in blatant violation of our rights as citizens. I am sick and tired of a President in the white house that thinks he is some sort of king that he can regulate what everybody says and can do. I oppose this and this dumb idea better be canned now

Comments provided by :
collier, robert j

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Nikel_Samuel_12_23_2014_16_06_20_CommentText.txt

=====

I DO NOT WANT GOVT. INTERFERENCE OR CONTROL OF THE INTERNET! GOVT. HAS NO
BUSINESS IN OUR INTERNAL AND PERSONAL AFFAIRS.

Comments provided by :
Nikel, Samuel

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Huff_Earl_12_23_2014_16_09_21_CommentText.txt

=====

America has had enough of the Federal Government's circumvention of the Constitution through the myriad avenues from Comrade King obama and his endless executive order decrees to brainless bureaucrats imposing their particular favorite flavor of constraint on Liberty.

Read the U.S. Constitution and try to comprehend that the First Amendment gives Americans the right to free speech even when YOU disagree with the conservative message. I know you wouldn't object to the liberal comrade message because you have ignored it during this administration's reign.

So KEEP YOUR HANDS OFF THE INTERNET! It is not a utility. Leave it alone!!!!!!!!!!!!

Comments provided by :

Huff, Earl

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Kline_Karen_12_23_2014_16_23_48_CommentText.txt

=====

The government has no business taking over the internet. Keep your hands off our internet.

Comments provided by :
Kline, Karen

=====

=====

Dear FCC,

I think I speak with great manor and authority on the internet, as a veteran Information Technology professional with over nine-teen years of experience in the field.

The internet has grown and flourished without any form of Government Regulation, and it needs to keep its unregulated status. While I do support the FEC in many of its other endeavors this is one that I will not and can not support.

As with many items that are regulated, they become diminished, and subject to lack luster technological stagnation, and that is exactly what will happen if the FEC or any government institution manged to attempt to control the internet.

I am afraid that all of the advances that have been brought about in the last 20 years as the internet has helped advance and shaped our society, from communication to computers, to the very way We work, will fall to over regulation, technological stagnation and be subject to censorship.

The internet is nothing more than an expression of Free Speech and should never be subject to any form of governmental censorship, regulation, harassment, tax, or any other form of attempt to control, subjugate, convert, control, or otherwise command and make use of.

Just as I would make a public plea to calm and rational individuals of our times, I would point out that look at what regulation has done to any industry it has touched. While done with the greatest of intentions, it has always proven to be a anathema of intervention and often directly contradicts the founding principles our great nation was founded upon.

Comments provided by :
Whitney, Terry

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Zielinski_Michael_12_23_2014_16_34_14_CommentText.txt

=====

Leave my internet alone. Don't tax me anymore. Learn how to control your checkbook like I have to control mine.

Comments provided by :
Zielinski, Michael

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Napier_Jim_12_23_2014_16_35_47_CommentText.txt

=====

The importance of uninfringed free speech in civil society is well-known. While dissenters are sometimes over the top in their expressions, we also know that any regulation of what people hear or read on a voluntary basis sets a precedent for further curtailment of unalienable rights. This is a move towards tyranny. Free speech is not negotiable.

Comments provided by :
Napier, Jim

=====

=====

It has been brought to my attention that the FEC is concerned with censoring the political thoughts written, posted, or recorded to the internet. I believe this would be a costly and unconstitutional burden against the people. Our constitution has been in place for hundreds of years with the bill of right for the protection on the people. Whether or not political parties agree or object is not the concern, but whether the people have the freedom that we are born with is protected against those who object. So, I urge that the constitution continues to be protected and our freedoms continue to ring.

Comments provided by :
Plamondon, Burton

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Stark_John_12_23_2014_16_39_45_CommentText.txt

=====

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

Free speech needs to be protected.

Comments provided by :
Stark, John

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Smith_Barbara_12_23_2014_17_09_44_CommentText.txt

=====

Dear Government,
ou are far outreaching the purpose you are supposed to serve. Keep your hands off the internet.
It does not belong to you, is not a danger to the American people or others in
the world, and you don't own it.
Do you know what the constitution says by the way? You might want to go back and reread it.

Thank you,
Barbara Smith

Comments provided by :
Smith, Barbara

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Smith_Steve_12_23_2014_17_19_27_CommentText.txt

=====

The Constitution of the United States guarantees free speech. By regulating speech on the internet the government is violating the Constitution. This is a serious matter and would grant to the government the ability to suppress the people of these United States. I do not want this to happen.

Comments provided by :
Smith, Steve

=====

=====

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.

If these regulations are enacted, government snoops will monitor online political communication every day. The Chairman of the FEC actually called these regulations "nothing short of a Chinese censorship Board." That's unbelievable.

You need to know that I won't stand for their assault on my free speech. stop this proposal! my voice will be heard!

Comments provided by :

Preston, Kim

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_shepley_cheryl_12_23_2014_17_23_27_CommentText.txt

=====

Now I understand why BO has "provided" military equipment to local authorities! Close access to free speech via internet access, then round US up and incarcerate US, when we take to the STREETS! Not happening, anymore than your Illegal Immigrant Invasion success will be further guaranteed by Executive Order! America for Americans first, NO AMNESTY DEPORT ALL FUGITIVES US LAW! Support of Illegal Immigrants=Aiding,Abetting the ENEMY! Your Treason is evident, as your oath of office was to US, NOT Hispanics or Cubans! The deception of your campaign is unraveling and WeThePeople are NOT allowing anymore of OUR Rights to be denied! This is why we exercised OUR Right to Vote and denied the Democrats the Senate, along with the House.Your Rule is OVER! The Constitution has blocked you!

Comments provided by :
shepley, cheryl

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_madden_susanne_12_23_2014_17_34_54_CommentText.txt

=====

Hands off the Internet. The Government has far exceeded its reach already.

Comments provided by :
madden, susanne

=====

=====

The fact that the wealthy have been given even more power to influence Congress at the expense of the rest of the citizens of the US is bad enough, but for a few (probably many) greedy politicians to sneak this in on the underside of a bill that had no chance of failure is proof enough that the job of congressman is for sale to the highest bidder. The ideals that this country was founded on no longer mean a thing. The gross lack of morals and sense of fairness in our government is what is going to take this country down. This provision must be repealed. If there are any legislators with the guts and sense of decency to take this on, then they need to get moving. It is a sad day when our "representatives" sell our own country out from under us.

Comments provided by :
Faircloth, Tom

=====

=====

The secrecy of political donations is largely irrelevant because we all know who they are - the very wealthy who expect to receive access and influence that will be worth several times the amount of their donations.

It is the ultimate irony that allowable donations of three quarters of a million (or over three million for couples) are justified under the principle of "free speech" when only a minuscule fraction of Americans can afford to "speak" this way.

How is allowing donations of this magnitude any different than politicians accepting cash in an envelope in exchange for political favors? We used to convict politicians for accepting money in exchange for access and influence. What happened to that? As a result of this legislation, it would seem impossible to convict a politician for this behavior, now that both the Supreme Court in collusion with both parties in Congress have made this behavior legal.

What is the future of the United States now that this egregious corruption is open and acceptable? Our Founding Fathers tried to eliminate influence-peddling by establishing the checks and balance of our three part government. They could not have anticipated how greed for power and personal gain have triumphed over principle so quickly.

Comments provided by :
Alpert, Donna

=====

=====

The Internet must continue to be a free speech forum for the public. If free speech would become controlled by the government or any controlling body, then, the world's most valuable venue for easy access freedom of speech would become criminally quashed.

The public is now very used to this great freedom of speech and access on the Internet. To restrict and muzzle this freedom would only accelerate the forces of Liberty already at work in the world moving toward an age of debt-free money, prosperity and personal freedoms not seen anywhere for hundreds of years.

Keep the Internet free of draconian rule.

Comments provided by :
Kyler, Scott

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Bertram_Nicholas_12_23_2014_17_54_17_CommentText.txt

=====

Censorship of anything, especially free speech on the internet is contrary to the American way of life.

Comments provided by :
Bertram, Nicholas

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Foster_David_12_23_2014_18_00_44_CommentText.txt

=====

I spent 20 years in the Marine Corps to make sure we the people are living under the constitution without anyone trying to regulate us. As we are your employer it is simple do only what you are hired to do. If we want changes made we are very capable of requesting them. If you want to find out what we think send us an email and those of us who have a brain in our head will be glad to help you decide.

My vote: do not change what is put on the internet.

Comments provided by :
Foster, David

=====

=====

to the employees of the FEC
please try and control your democratic urges.
you are employees of the citizens of the united states
and as such you do not have the authority or the permission of
the people to try to control we the people. we will no longer
stand still while petty unelected bureaucrats try to control us.
pay attention to the results in the last election,

Yours Truly
Thomas Manning

Comments provided by :
manning, thomas

=====

=====

I am writing to you in opposition to "REG 2014-01 Earmarking, Affiliation, Joint Fundraising, Disclosure, and Other Issues." This proposed rule change is one of the greatest threats to freedom of speech that we have seen in America in my lifetime.

Currently, individuals are allowed to discuss politics and even make videos to post online, in which they discuss politics. It is truly "Free Speech" as the Founding Fathers of our nation intended. This robust political discussion happens every single day on personal blogs, popular websites such as Facebook and YouTube, and on large news websites such as the Drudge Report and the New York Times.

Under this proposed rule change, individuals would be treated as political entities engaging in paid political speech. They would be regulated just like big super PACS and would be required to fill out mountains of paperwork to submit to the FEC.

If I have to purchase a license from the government to engage in speech online, then I do not actually have "Freedom of Speech." Repressive governments already use censorship boards like this to troll the internet for any dissent; this chilling of free speech has no place in America!

Regulation also brings enforcement along with it. If we the people refuse to abide by this rule change, are you planning to fine and imprison all of us?

This rule change is clearly unconstitutional and you need to stop it. Vote NO on this plan to censor speech on the internet!

Comments provided by :
Stark, John

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Erb_Richard_D_12_23_2014_18_20_22_CommentText.txt

=====

PLEASE PLEASE KEEP THE INTERNET FREE.
WE DO NOT NEED ANY FEDERAL INVOLVEMENT IN THIS GREAT TOOL FOR AMERICANS.
PLEASE KEEP OUT !!
THANKS.

Comments provided by :
Erb, Richard D

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Roland_Matthew_12_23_2014_18_32_26_CommentText.txt

=====

Do not regulate the internet

Comments provided by :
Roland, Matthew

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Yates_Sandra_12_23_2014_18_57_58_CommentText.txt

=====

I do not want the internet to be regulated. 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. Freedom of speech should include the internet.

Comments provided by :
Yates, Sandra

=====

=====

The FEC is tasked with regulating money spent on elections, not political speech. They need to stay within the scope of their intended purpose. Any additional encroachment invites lawsuits which are costly and time consuming. This will place an undue burden on small groups and individuals.

These new regulations would be extremely costly for taxpayers and difficult to enforce. I would also have to ask if these "new" regulations would properly address and more importantly solve any perceived problems. Chances are that these rules would exacerbate and not solve any shortcomings that they are trying address.

Comments provided by :
Speiser, Darryl

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Hildenbrand_Gwen_12_23_2014_19_00_01_CommentText.txt

=====

"If freedom of speech is taken away, then dumb and silent we may be led, like sheep to the slaughter."
George Washington

Comments provided by :
Hildenbrand, Gwen

=====

=====

The purpose of the first amendment is to protect political speech, and it is not to be regulated by any branch of government or agency. Since Congress is the only branch of the federal government with the authority to enact legislation, and they are strictly prohibited by our Constitution from infringing on speech, religion, assembling, addressing grievances, or the press, neither your agency nor any other agency within the executive branch has any authority to limit/control political speech.

The courts have already ruled that the nastiest of expressions are protected under the provisions of the First Amendment. If use of the "F word" is protected speech, then so is speech that is critical of government, and especially when it acts outside of the boundaries established by law under our Constitution. It is obvious that the agencies under the umbrella of the Executive Branch feel they have unlimited authority to infringe on those "rights" granted by a sovereign God and protected by the rule of law which government is to protect. The purpose of "the law" is to preserve liberty, not infringe or eliminate it. We are a free people, and we are not to be "enslaved" by an out-of-control government.

It seems that the expression that I've just written would be in violation of the regulations the FEC is planning to promulgate. Even if I were to say that the FEC needs to check the US code found on page one of volume one about the proper role of government and what the right of the people is as it pertains to a tyrannical system, your proposed rule would place my comments in violation of those rules.

In recent protests, we've seen groups of protesters chanting, "What do we want? Dead cops! When do we want it? Now!" As much as I find this speech abhorrent, they have the right to say it, and that right needs to be protected.

Free speech needs to be protected in all areas, including the internet. Therefore, I am in strong opposition to the FEC rulemaking to limit political speech on the internet.

Comments provided by :
Bozikis, Tom

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Elliott_Cheri_12_23_2014_19_04_30_CommentText.txt

=====

Keep our internet free and secure!

Comments provided by :
Elliott, Cheri

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Higgins_Druce_12_23_2014_19_16_38_CommentText.txt

=====

To whom it may concern. Please do not try to regulate the internet. Every time we have more and more regulations we lose more freedom...Thank You

Comments provided by :
Higgins, Druce

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_martinez_saviniano_12_23_2014_19_23_52_CommentText.txt

=====

The Internet should remain free as it is currently. Our federal government should leave regulations within the private domain.

Comments provided by :
martinez, saviniano

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Peters_Charles_12_23_2014_19_38_42_CommentText.txt

=====

I am opposed to any further government regulation of the Internet!

Comments provided by :
Peters, Charles

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Raner_Debbie__12_23_2014_19_46_11_CommentText.txt

=====

Keep the Internet free! We don't need any regulation.

Comments provided by :
Raner, Debbie

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Nemec_Michael_12_23_2014_20_08_25_CommentText.txt

=====

I am not in favor of the federal government regulating the content of comments made on the internet. I oppose any limitation on my freedom to express my opinion on matters of interest to me.

Comments provided by :
Nemec, Michael

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Herr_Ken_12_23_2014_20_15_51_CommentText.txt

=====

Please allow our country to have freedom of expression when individuals are sharing comments on the internet. It does not seem to be a wise use of government resources to attempt to control comments posted by individual citizens. If the agency has that much available extra staff time, would you please consider paying everyone to go home a half hour earlier each day?

Comments provided by :
Herr, Ken

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Betz_Robert_12_23_2014_20_28_06_CommentText.txt

=====

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.

Comments provided by :
Betz, Robert

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_REECE_PATRICIA_12_23_2014_21_26_38_CommentText.txt

=====

please do not tax internet under first amendment-free speech

Comments provided by :
REECE, PATRICIA

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Hall_Margo_12_23_2014_21_29_47_CommentText.txt

=====

Stop trying to take away our constitutional freedom of speech. Our relatives & friends died so that we could live with freedom of speech. It was purchased at a high price of lives!

Comments provided by :

Hall, Margo

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_grove_carolyn_12_23_2014_21_33_28_CommentText.txt

=====

Keep the internet free of the FEC. We the people have a right to freedom of speech and that includes on the internet. Outlets like YouTube should be free from Federal government control.

Thank you.

Comments provided by :
grove, carolyn

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_martin_dan_12_23_2014_21_39_56_CommentText.txt

=====

Free speech includes opinion pages such as newsprint, internet and advertisement, no matter what media - print, audio or video. Keep your laws off my internet.

Comments provided by :
martin, dan

=====

=====

I oppose Vice Chair Ann Ravel's proposal to regulate individual political speech on the internet. Her suggestion that individual bloggers should not be protected online is un-American and unconstitutional. Free speech, in whatever form, is a constitutional right and is not for Ms. Ravel to take away because she may not like the form or the content. I may not like the content of Ms. Ravel's comments, but I honor her right to make them. She, especially from her position of governmental authority, owes that to the rest of us as well.

Comments provided by :
Bonadonna, Penny

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_fisher_art_12_23_2014_21_53_14_CommentText.txt

=====

we do not want, need ,or willingly desire any government control of our free speech given us by our creator and not any government entity. the 1st amendment is a reminder that free speech is granted by our creator and not by any government
those that are willing to sacrifice there freedom for security are worthy of neither

Comments provided by :
fisher, art

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Jordan_Lemuel_12_23_2014_21_58_36_CommentText.txt

=====

Do not put any part of the internet under government control. Let it remain the wild wild west.

Comments provided by :
Jordan, Lemuel

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Benfield_Tamra_12_23_2014_21_58_50_CommentText.txt

=====

The Internet needs to free like America used to be. Stop taking away our freedoms! We should be able to learn and communicate as we (each individual) sees fit.

Comments provided by :
Benfield, Tamra

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Humphrey_Philip_12_23_2014_22_25_50_CommentText.txt

=====

Please stop any attempt to create regulations that bring free YouTube videos, bloggers and other sites under government control. The internet works because it allows for free speech and it needs to stay that way. We have rights in this country. Thank you.

Comments provided by :
Humphrey, Philip

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Quinones_Harry_12_23_2014_22_34_31_CommentText.txt

=====

Good morning,

Please stay clear off my freedom of internet navigation.

Thank you.

Comments provided by :
Quinones, Harry

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Fish_Susan_12_23_2014_22_36_44_CommentText.txt

=====

Dear Sirs:

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.

I am against regulating the internet.

Susan Fish

Comments provided by :

Fish, Susan

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Weitzel_Charles_12_23_2014_23_11_47_CommentText.txt

=====

This attempt to regulate FREE SPEECH granted to us Americans by our Constitution is outrageous! what makes you people think you can override our Constitution when you have a little power for a short time and have the option to override my right to Free Speech? You do not have that option. I have served my country for twenty five years and took the Oath to defend our Constitution against any enemy foreign or DOMESTIC!!! You are violating your oath by trying this and therefore you are my enemy!! STOP this terrible thing you are trying to shove down our throatS!

Comments provided by :
Weitzel, Charles

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Allen_Sarah_12_23_2014_23_36_31_CommentText.txt

=====

Don't reverse the exemptions for free postings online. No need to regulate the internet. Thanks but no thanks. Have a good day.

Comments provided by :
Allen, Sarah

=====

=====

The only government regulation that would actually be productive is to push for a fundamental change in the way computers communicate with each other on the internet. A new standard must be implemented that unequivocally confirms the physical locations of all of the computers each packet of info passes through. No more anonymous web activity. Release of malware would be traceable to the originating computer within a few milli-seconds. Any computer or device not utilizing these standards would not be able to communicate on the internet.

Most of the "jerks" trolling on the internet would be much more careful if they knew that anything they put "out there" could be immediately traced back to them. Ninety-five percent of the present internet problems would fade away.

Trying to control anything else is a waste of time and would lead to many more unintended consequences

Comments provided by :
Hagel, Fred

=====

=====

CONGRESS

The Senate prays for wisdom---
Then seeks it through it's own path
I'm sure, through natural calamity,
That God is showing his wrath.

The House is just as impertinent
And both make laws they wont keep.
The scribes and Pharisees did the same,
And, the wrath of God, they had to reap. Mt. 23:2-7
(A.D. 70 destruction of Jerusalem)

How long will men be so foolish?
As long as continuing time!
But when Christ shall come in His glory
He'll put all things into rhyme.

In the meantime people must suffer
As congress continues it's CHARADE,
Desiring, as the Pharisees, their plaudits,
As they pass along in parade.

God says that people must work
If they expect to be fed. II Thes. 3:10
But to the troughs of government welfare
The ne?er-do-wells are being led.

A lot of the people realize
That congress can't pass wisdom's test.
But, isn't it sad, one must ask,
That they seemed to have fooled all the rest.

If people don't come to their senses
And return to the morals of God,
His wrath will continue on the U. S. of A.,
And that is a truth not so odd.

By L. B. Strawn
October 28 & 29, 1993_CONGRESS, ONCE MORE

Congress is becoming tyrannical
Not doing what the people want.
It is making me somewhat cynical
For their power they want to flaunt.

They are so much better that we are.
Their educations make them superior.
They'd like to send our suggestions afar,
Because, after all, we are so inferior.

Those Republicans on Capital hill
Had better wake up and smell the roses,
Or come election, they'll swallow a bitter pill;
At voting for them, we'll turn up our noses.

Shut down the border with old Mexico.
Send all of those illegals home.
If they want, in the US again to show,
Let them file the paper to legally come.

If we need guest workers, as is the claim,
Let them come for only two or three years.
If we grant amnesty, Congress must shoulder the blame,
And hopefully will shed a few tears.

They must get back to supporting their constituents,
And not their own pernicious ways.
If not they must suffer the consequence
Of bringing to a close their power hungry days.

I've been a Republican over sixty years,
But I'm about ready to throw in the towel.
Their actions in Congress bring me to tears.
If I leave them now, will it cause them to howl?

By L.B. Strawn
October 4, 2006

Comments provided by :
Strawn, L.B.

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Secord_David_12_24_2014_03_10_37_CommentText.txt

=====

Keep it open & free !!!!

Comments provided by :
Secord, David

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Beatty_Ronald_12_24_2014_07_48_46_CommentText.txt

=====

Obama has taken over ALL tv and paper media, lets not give him the internet.

Comments provided by :
Beatty, Ronald

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Florence_Joan_12_24_2014_08_24_49_CommentText.txt

=====

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.

Comments provided by :
Florence, Joan

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Nelson_Van_12_24_2014_09_06_18_CommentText.txt

=====

Any proposed government control of the internet is viewed as an attempt to restrict the liberties of the people you work for and is not acceptable, wheather from your commission or any other government agency. We the people need your to protect our freedom not limit or take it away.

Comments provided by :
Nelson, Van

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Kent_Duncan_Daryn_12_24_2014_09_08_07_CommentText.txt

=====

I strongly object to any government interference with the freedom of the Internet. It has been free and grown and developed for many years and it does not require the government to obstruct our free use of it. It would be wrong for the government to interfere.

Comments provided by :
Kent-Duncan, Daryn

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Thomas_S_12_24_2014_09_08_05_CommentText.txt

=====

I am opposed to the amendment passed with the recent spending bill that allows more secret money than ever to influence elected officials. This is WRONG. It also demonstrates a disregard for the democratic process and provides more evidence that our elected officials consider themselves above the electorate.

Comments provided by :
Thomas, S

=====

=====

To FEC,

I would like to voice my distress in any move to "regulate" the internet. At this point in our History I can think of no other source better to research what is and what is not. Sometimes a tedious journey in the search for the facts, but still leaves the individual with a choice to reason, determine, think and share thoughts and entertain others thoughts. That process would be attenuated and/or distorted by any regulation from any Central body and would lead to the destruction of a priceless source of Communication between the Citizenry, echoing Jefferson's words "An Enlightened citizenry is indispensable for the proper functioning of the Republic....." Now as then, this is still true, and as now, and then it is up to the Citizen to determine what is relative or not, what is important and not so much. An individuals vote is a right, and all information should be allowed to be accessed for the voter to examine and discern what is real and not. Too often History has taught us that any sequestering or censoring of information to the citizenry leads to a disaster for a Society. So many Historical accounts show this to be true through propaganda and outright lies for the purpose of "corralling" individuals to a specific point of view. This is why We The People... have as our first right, the freedom of speech. Through this it is paramount that all information and views be available to the people to discuss, rebuke, embrace, dismiss and add a different light to determine how they will vote thus voicing their right to decide which way they want our Country to go. Anything short of that would be an assault on freedom and all individuals rights to self Government. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
John Basile

Comments provided by :
basile, john

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Dall_Brian_12_24_2014_09_08_14_CommentText.txt

=====

I oppose the FEC getting involved in regulating free speech on the Internet that might contain personal political opinions. Unless there is money involved in buying actual advertising, the opinions expressed by private citizens should not be of concern, nor be investigated by the FEC.

Comments provided by :
Dall, Brian

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Halle_Marrk_12_24_2014_09_30_55_CommentText.txt

=====

Any proposal or suggestion that free speech on the Internet be under any Federal government oversight is totally unacceptable and therefore there shall not be any new law, rule or regulation limiting such.

Comments provided by :

Halle, Marrk

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Kunkel_Tedd_12_24_2014_09_34_36_CommentText.txt

=====

Do not regulate the internet, the 1st amendment!

Comments provided by :
Kunkel, Tedd

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_holbrooks_jack_12_24_2014_09_37_56_CommentText.txt

=====

this has got to stop! I do live in America not under a dictator

Comments provided by :
holbrooks, jack

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Thompson_Lee_12_24_2014_09_44_34_CommentText.txt

=====

It is my contention That the Internet should remain free from overburdening TAXATION, I vote and I vote not liberaly, Should this pass more politions will go the way of those that voted for obama care.

Comments provided by :
Thompson, Lee

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_DesJardins_Deb_12_24_2014_09_44_31_CommentText.txt

=====

The FEC is tasked with regulating money spent on elections, not political speech. This is an infringement on my First Amendment rights. I don't need the thought police hovering over me. Reversing the exemption for free postings online would have dangerous ramifications for constitutionally-guaranteed free speech.

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

Comments provided by :
DesJardins, Deb

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Amato_Bethe_12_24_2014_09_58_00_CommentText.txt

=====

Very quietly in late October, the Democrat members of the Federal Election Commission (FEC) proposed new regulations that would bring free YouTube videos, bloggers, and even sites like The Drudge Report under government control. This attempt to chill free speech is alarming. As U.S. News & World Report said, Democrat FEC members envision an "Establishment utopia, with only politicians, political parties and the media able to comment purposefully.

This is yet another attempt at eroding away our freedoms. Why Democrat/Liberals think they know what's best for everyone BUT themselves is beyond me. We're "Too Stupid" is the general opinion. Well, that's where you're wrong. We, the educated and informed, will not sit by quietly by and watch this great nation be chiseled away bit by bit.

The Constitution has much wisdom built into it. Follow it!

Thank you.

Comments provided by :
Amato, Bethe

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Bingham_Barbara_12_24_2014_10_32_47_CommentText.txt

=====

I heartily object to your assuming oversight over this last bastion of a public square. LEAVE THE INTERNET ALONE!

Comments provided by :
Bingham, Barbara

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Allen_Jean_12_24_2014_10_49_00_CommentText.txt

=====

I do not support regulation of free speech on the internet. Expression of thought and ideas without fear of reprimand is one of the things that make this country and the principles it was founded on great.

Comments provided by :
Allen, Jean

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Harris_Roni_12_24_2014_11_03_37_CommentText.txt

=====

I want to know who is behind the messages that are being broadcast. Specifically I want to know if corporations, billionaires and labor unions are broadcasting messages to influence my vote. If they are, they should be required to say who they are. Please require full disclosure of corporate, union and wealthy funding sources behind express advocacy ads and electioneering communications.

Comments provided by :
Harris, Roni

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Penn_Arthur_12_24_2014_11_05_29_CommentText.txt

=====

Please do not regulate content posted on YouTube. People should be free to post whatever they wish.
The government has no role in regulating this aspect of free speech on the internet.

Comments provided by :
Penn, Arthur

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Lutes_Kathleen_12_24_2014_11_09_09_CommentText.txt

=====

It is my understanding that the FEC is considering regulating the Internet.

I wish to express my disapproval of FEC oversight of the Internet, including YouTube. The Internet must be free from federal government control as it is one more way of expressing our constitutionally-protected right of free speech.

We will not allow suppression of that right. If some speech may not be "politically correct" or if someone doesn't like it, he/she does not have to read it. It is as simple as that.

Comments provided by :
Lutes, Kathleen

=====

=====

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.

Please refrain from regulating our speech. It is against the law.

Comments provided by :

Thatcher, Dustin

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Amato_Carl__12_24_2014_11_17_10_CommentText.txt

=====

Very quietly in late October, the Democrat members of the Federal Election Commission (FEC) proposed new regulations that would bring free YouTube videos, bloggers, and even sites like The Drudge Report under government control. This attempt to chill free speech is alarming. As U.S. News & World Report said, Democrat FEC members envision an "Establishment utopia, with only politicians, political parties and the media able to comment purposefully.

This is yet another attempt at eroding away our freedoms. Why Democrat/Liberals think they know what's best for everyone BUT themselves is beyond me. We're "Too Stupid" is the general opinion. Well, that's where you're wrong. We, the educated and informed, will not sit by quietly by and watch this great nation be chiseled away bit by bit.

The Constitution has much wisdom built into it. Follow it!

Thank you.

Comments provided by :
Amato, Carl

=====

=====

Regulating content on the Internet is just another step of the ever-expanding, over-sized federal government. You have NO BUSINESS OR NEED TO REGULATE THE INTERNET. Just look at the line of "successes" the government has established... Oh, wait, almost everything the government gets involved in becomes a confusing fiasco, a quagmire of regulations, and another out-of-control federal agency full of over-paid, unworking, self-important, abusive, power hungry, zealots determined to force THEIR beliefs down the throats of anybody and everybody that disagrees with them. NO, DO NOT TAKE ANY ACTION TO REGULATE, CONTROL, RESTRICT... WHATEVER... THE INTERNET. NO, LEAVE THE INTERNET ALONE. NO, THE GOVERNMENT DOES NOT NEED TO BE INVOLVED IN CONTROLLING YET ANOTHER ASPECT OF OUR LIVES. NO, NO, NO. The federal government is too big now and does not need to expand its power or authority over anything else. LEAVE THE INTERNET ALONE!! Just pretend it doesn't exist and go home. I know that will prove extremely difficult for you government types, but trust me, we DO NOT NEED YOUR INVOLVEMENT. Just look how successful it was before!! You think you can improve that?? NO, the government can't, and won't, improve the Internet... You want something to do? Start looking for the crooked politicians and employees, that will give you plenty to do.

Comments provided by :
Lamb, Joe

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_wilson_james_12_24_2014_11_18_41_CommentText.txt

=====

Please do not regulate the internet. Freedom is important!

Comments provided by :
wilson, james

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_weeks_benjami_12_24_2014_11_23_40_CommentText.txt

=====

please if u must interfear with us,then do something about the number of commercials ,there are way to many,getting so we cant evern watch a full show without arleast 10 minutes of rgwmthat are in rv

Comments provided by :
weeks, benjami

=====

=====

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.

Comments provided by :
Kelley, Sherrie

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Busse_Toni_12_24_2014_11_44_34_CommentText.txt

=====

Respect the constitution, you dint need to take over the internet.

AGAINST government regulating internet posts and conversations.

I don't want you regulating my internet. Who do you think you are? Hugo Chavez? The Chinese communist government? Stalin? You want to silent everybody who disagrees? You don't understand freedom. For those of you who want to impose regulations and take away freedom from this country, please move to Venezuela, China, The Arab world. You don't belong here.

You are destroying freedom on this country.

Please read history. Marxism has failed over and over again. Why? Because it is against human nature, it is against God. It is an evil philosophy.

Toni Busse

Comments provided by :

Busse, Toni

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Holmes_Steve_12_24_2014_11_49_25_CommentText.txt

=====

STOP messing with free speech.

Want to regulate something?

Take X-Lax but leave the internet alone.

Stop trying to manipulate everything to your personal political advantage.

Comments provided by :

Holmes, Steve

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Schendel_Harold_12_24_2014_11_53_06_CommentText.txt

=====

We do n not want you to control the internet.
Thanks,

Comments provided by :
Schendel, Harold

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Boronow_Thomas_12_24_2014_12_07_39_CommentText.txt

=====

Federal government needs to govern by the law of the land, our US Constitution, as written.

Comments provided by :
Boronow, Thomas

=====

=====

Representative Funding for a Representative Democracy

We have a representative democracy. AS SUCH, (Or CONSEQUENTLY) the proportion of representatives in the House of Representatives is adjusted every 10 years after the census is taken TO ACCURATELY REPRESENT THE NUMBER OF PEOPLE IN THE DISTRICT. .

To be more in line with the fundamental structure of a representative democracy it is here by proposed that donations for campaigns be limited to those people who are registered voters within the district or jurisdiction of the candidate or ballot initiative. This would prohibit donations of any type coming from outside the boundaries of the congressional district, state, city, or other governmental districts.

This would also preclude any donations from any ONE who IS NOT registered TO VOTE within the district or government entity that is being governed by the candidate or ballot initiative. (While those with greater finical resources would still have a greater ability to voice their support it would more clearly conform to the ideals of a representative democracy.)

At the same time it would become illegal for any candidate to accept a campaign contribution from anyone who is not a registered voter in his or her district.

James Cole
jimcole1@mac.com

Comments provided by :
Cole, James

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Brooks_Scott_12_24_2014_12_10_54_CommentText.txt

=====

I don't believe it's the purpose of the FEC to remove our first constitutional amendment rights- Free Speech. The FEC has no business monitoring the online posts and conversations period.

And in addition the FEC has no business regulating the Internet. This would be a grievance affront to free speech of which the internet has become a part of.

Comments provided by :
Brooks, Scott

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Hammond__David_12_24_2014_12_13_12_CommentText.txt

=====

As an American I am appalled that the FEC is even considering the removal of First Amendment protections from the internet.

Government bureaucrats do not have the moral authority to take away an American citizen's First Amendment right to FREELY express their political views.

Do not attempt to enact any regulations that allow any type of government snooping or monitoring of online posts and conversations.

The freedom to openly and publicly debate political opinions was so foundational to the birth of our country that it became our First Amendment. That was not an accident, that was intentional.

Comments provided by :
Hammond , David

=====

=====

The Constitution grants me freedom of speech on the internet & else where & the FEC is overstepping its authority by trying to regulate the internet.

1. The FEC is tasked with regulating money spent on elections, not political speech.
2. Reversing the exemption for free postings online would have dangerous ramifications for constitutionally-guaranteed free speech.
3. 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.
4. This will place an undue burden on small groups and individuals.

Comments provided by :
Liptak, Joyce

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_McKaskle_Kimery_12_24_2014_12_30_06_CommentText.txt

=====

The proposed rules are beyond ridiculous. In order for the FEC to monitor speech (which isn't yours or any government agency's duty) you would have to unleash an army of regulators to police You Tube, Facebook, and any other internet social media site just to look for violators. This is draconian to say the least. Citizens have a guaranteed right given to us by the Almighty of freedom of speech. You do not have any authority to deny this right.

Comments provided by :
McKaskle, Kimery

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_LeBlanc_Michael_12_24_2014_12_59_04_CommentText.txt

=====

Up hold and do not change current FEC guidelines stating that political advertising or commentary posted on YouTube is exempt from campaign reporting requirements. Up hold are right of free speech!
Stop the assault on our Bill of Rights and prevent Federal Government from having any control over the Internet (including outlets like YouTube, etc).

Comments provided by :
LeBlanc, Michael

=====

=====

The FEC needs to stick to its mission - regulating money spent on elections, not "judging" whether internet communications are "political speech". This sounds like a politically-motivated witch hunt and/or unions like SEIU wanting to increase their union dues collections prior to the next election cycle.

1. Eliminating the exemption for free online posts would limit free speech.
2. How many new federal employees would need to be hired by the FEC to search on YouTube and other internet sites to look for "violations"?
3. Who is going to police the FEC employees for the potential wasted time looking at entertaining YouTube posts like cute cat videos?
4. Who would conduct the investigations that would be necessary?
5. Are the potential offenders going to get a fair hearing?
6. Who (or what political party) would conduct these hearings?
7. 8. Who is going to pay for all the costs to even attempt to implement a ridiculous plan like this?
8. Is the FEC going to "tax" the individuals and small groups that post online?
9. Who is going to collect the tax or fees involved?
10. Would this further involve the IRS in political muck raking?

I think the FEC and Congress need to mind their own "stores". Budget deficits are skyrocketing in tandem with discontentment with politicians and bureaucrats who apparently have too much spare time on their hands to dream up these schemes.

Sincerely,
Faye Nordbeck
Grand Rapids, MI

Comments provided by :
Nordbeck, Faye

=====

=====

Government is not allowed to regulate your online posts and conversations. Reversing the exemption for free postings online is against our constitutionally-guaranteed free speech. If these regulations are enacted, government snoops will monitor 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. 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 individuals as these new regulations would be extremely costly for taxpayers and difficult to enforce.

Comments provided by :
Bayer, Joe

=====

=====

I do feel that there should be some regulation for the internet though I am not thinking tax-wise.
It concerns me that cyber-bullying has harmed individuals and businesses.
I am against any laws that would restrict free-speech but I do think there should be some screening concerning cyber-bullying.
As a victim myself I have found that it has harmed me concerning employment and my reputation.
I am not affluent that I can hire a lawyer to fight these assaults on my person and having reported the persons responsible for these malicious attacks I find that these con-artists are very persuasive in their endeavor to harm me at whatever costs.
Let us find some way to stop this type of crime. For it is a crime and should be dealt with accordingly.
Linda

Comments provided by :
Dake, Linda

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Ponx_Dwane_12_24_2014_14_00_01_CommentText.txt

=====

This is the last thing we need, more control and power for the government. Who is going to pay for this? More taxes and bloated pensions. It's time to stop the over expansion of the government in our life's.

Comments provided by :

Ponx, Dwane

=====

=====

I am commenting with few, but hopefully, that will impact the concerns of all United States citizens. This marvelous country, the US, was founded by God fearing individuals, who wanted to be free from the dictatorship of the Monarchies in Europe! After a century & three quarters, they decided to bring war against King George, due to taxation with no representation! These courageous men, starting with Jefferson to Patrick Henry, designed the Act of Independence. Along with that infamous, well thought out, document, which still governs our country, the Constitution!! It is a well sought after document to many nations, who want to duplicate what we have, here in the United States. Why, because it gives us the freedom, that so many people in foreign countries want! Part of that Constitution is the Bill of Rights, which allows citizens to design certain businesses. It is these industries that keep the designers going, without any intervention from the federal government! There is no purpose to allow a takeover by the gov't, except for them to use the internet as another taxation option! We are still governed under the auspices of the Constitution, hence the gov't has no right to steal from a business designer who developed the internet for the usage of the citizens of the US, to be turned into a taxing machine!

Comments provided by :
Rawls, Louise

=====

=====

1. The FEC is tasked with regulating money spent on elections, not political speech.
2. Reversing the exemption for free postings online would have dangerous ramifications for constitutionally-guaranteed free speech.
3. 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.
4. This will place an undue burden on small groups and individuals.
5. These new regulations would be extremely costly for taxpayers and difficult to enforce.

Comments provided by :
Negeli, Robert

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Pankow_Kathy_12_24_2014_15_04_27_CommentText.txt

=====

Please do not remove First Amendment protections from the internet. We have a right to free speech in this country. Thank you.

Comments provided by :
Pankow, Kathy

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Robbins_Philip_J_12_24_2014_15_28_36_CommentText.txt

=====

Re: FEC regulating the internet.

WE don't want the FEC regulating the internet.

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

These new regulations would be extremely costly for tax payers and difficult to enforce.

The internet has worked well for many years, without intervention from the government.

Sincerely,
Philip J. Robbins

Comments provided by :
Robbins, Philip J

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_CURTISS_LOIS_12_24_2014_15_46_48_CommentText.txt

=====

Just leave the internet as it is. The government doesn't need to control he internet.

Lois Curtiss

Comments provided by :
CURTISS, LOIS

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Fowler_Bobby_12_24_2014_17_04_56_CommentText.txt

=====

Please keep Freedom of Speech free from government overreach, control and taxation. There's too much government regulation already.

Comments provided by :
Fowler, Bobby

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Zunker_Stacy_12_24_2014_17_07_49_CommentText.txt

=====

Haven't you taken away enough already?

Comments provided by :
Zunker, Stacy

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Sharp_Kathleen_12_24_2014_17_52_14_CommentText.txt

=====

The FEC job is not to monitor our free speech. Americans, via the constitution, are guaranteed to have the right to post our personal thoughts via emails, including political opinions.

The FEC is suppose to regulated money spent on elections. It would take an army of regulators to monitor internet sites including YouTube on a daily basis. This would place an undue burden on small groups and individuals to subject them to inquiries simply because they posted opinions online.

I do not want the FEC to regulate the Internet.

Thank you

Comments provided by :
Sharp, Kathleen

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Durichек__Michael__12_24_2014_18_32_44_CommentText.txt

=====

The FEC is tasked with regulating elections in regards to donations, NOT in regards to free speech.
Please stay out of my and my countrymens social media and or blog posts.

Comments provided by :
Durichек , Michael

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Wittenbrook_Charles_12_24_2014_18_40_26_CommentText.txt

=====

I hear that there is talk about limiting free speech on the Internet, if it is of a political nature. Leave it alone! The FEC has no business limiting political speech!

Comments provided by :
Wittenbrook, Charles

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_flemming_dan_12_24_2014_18_43_49_CommentText.txt

=====

keep the internet free from regulation and government control

Comments provided by :
flemming, dan

=====

=====

Dear FEC people,

The Internet, since its inception, has been a major vehicle for people to not only stay in touch with people they care about but also a way for them to meet and interact with other people from all over the world. The fact that we can voice our opinions more rapidly and more widespread now than ever before is nothing to be feared. People will ALWAYS have opinions (valid, honest or not) and will ALWAYS express them.

One of the greatest things about America has always been that we CAN voice our opinions without fear of retribution from others or the government. I still believe that this is an important aspect of our culture and NO ONE has the right to diminish or take that away. People can easily stop voicing opinions if they choose to!

The Bill of Rights and the Constitution were VERY well thought out guidelines that addressed and corrected situations that existed elsewhere in the world. To lose those "Rights" would be a travesty at least and a catastrophe at best.

WHY would anyone think it ok to do such a thing? They would find it come back to bite them just as easily as it would the general public.

I, for one, am VEHEMENTLY OPPOSED to governmental regulation of the Internet.

IF (and when) the government finally decides that governance "For the People, By the People and Of the People is a REALLY GOOD IDEA (always has been) then ideas like this foolishness of regulating the Internet to prevent ideas that oppose someone else's from being voiced will no longer be tolerated!

People should be able to voice their opinions no matter WHAT they are. It doesn't mean everyone else is to be bound by them...

Sincerely,

Rev. Peter Anderson

Comments provided by :

Anderson, Peter

=====

=====

This is in regards to the proposed removal of 1st Amendment rights from the internet. Such an action is in violation of the Bill of Rights. Opinion should be allowed to be freely expressed anywhere, so long as it does not infringe on the rights of others. How could such a regulation be enforced? Not without an immense amount of tax dollars spent to have personnel viewing the endless streams of internet feed. I am strongly against this action. Distinguishing between opinion and fact is not something that can easily be determined. The government needs to stay out of everyone's business.

Comments provided by :
Darrah, Genevieve

=====

=====

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.

Enforcement would require unleashing an army of regulators to police YouTube and other internet sites on a daily basis in a witch hunt for potential violators, and subject them to inquiries simply because they posted opinions online.

Aside from being entirely unconstitutional, such regulations will place an undue burden on small groups and individuals, would be extremely costly for taxpayers and difficult to enforce. What the hell could regulators possibly be thinking in even proposing this gross overreach?

Comments provided by :
Trombley, Terry

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Renneberg_Ron_12_24_2014_20_06_03_CommentText.txt

=====

The government control of anything is not good--but government control of the net can be harmful and dangerous. Being able to control who says what and when, would be a dangerous threat to free speech

U Tube and sites like it must be free and open, so individuals can express their ideas and opinions. Without this freedom, there is no free speech. no exchange of ideas or opinions.

For these reasons, I urge you to not creste more regulations for the net. Leave the net open and free and out of the control of the federal government.

Comments provided by :
Renneberg, Ron

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Buckle_Paul_12_24_2014_20_25_49_CommentText.txt

=====

This is another way to give more favor and access to people who can pay. Our legislators have shown us that they are for sale. The compromising that was done to achieve a budget bill was really more giving something to as many members as possible and had nothing to do with doing good work.

Comments provided by :
Buckle, Paul

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_bowen_cyndy_12_24_2014_20_48_52_CommentText.txt

=====

keep free internet

Comments provided by :
bowen, cyndy

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Hart_Lonnie_12_24_2014_21_29_52_CommentText.txt

=====

The internet should remain free of government regulation. To do otherwise would be an infringement on our right to free speech.

Comments provided by :
Hart, Lonnie

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_carlson_michele_12_24_2014_21_58_30_CommentText.txt

=====

I am against over regulation by the federal government. Recently,i became aware of this new proposed regulation of internet communications. I am definitely against this intrusion on my liberty.

Comments provided by :
carlson, michele

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Gordon_William__12_24_2014_22_40_03_CommentText.txt

=====

Sirs,

Please do not create any further rules that limit free speech on the internet. Instituting FEC regulations on personal blogs and posts online is an unnecessary infringement on free speech.
William Gordon

Comments provided by :
Gordon, William

=====

=====

To those who BELEIVE in free speech,

We now know that the IRS can target, the IRS can release tax data of political enemies. With this track record what prudent person would expand the government of I plead the fifth, contempt of congress and I resign but until I actually leave I will insert myself into everything. Better yet I could just go on administrative leave and then retire! So, by what evidence that government of the people and by the people, a constitution representative Republic preside over this unaccountable administrative state.

Comments provided by :

Graves, W.j.

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Nelson_Ann_12_24_2014_23_15_43_CommentText.txt

=====

I am requesting the FEC to not change this rule which would have the effect of forcing all Christian Conservatives to register with the Government to be able to voice their political opinions on the Internet.

This represents ruthless, chilling suppression of the constitutional right to freedom of speech in America. This is criminal, unconstitutional, and wrong.

Comments provided by :
Nelson, Ann

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Anderson_Christine_12_24_2014_23_16_59_CommentText.txt

=====

Americans do not need the government at any level determining what they may say. Any gov't intrusion into the spoken/written expressions of Americans is a tyrannical usurpation of Americans' rights.

I cannot fathom why this is even an issue in a free country. Leave us alone. Do not meddle with the internet; do not subject citizens to untoward scrutiny.

Comments provided by :
Anderson, Christine

=====

=====

The founding fathers are rolling over in their graves. This is not democracy. It is madness!! A sane Congress should never let something such as this come to pass. We do not need the richest in America to be able to hijack our country to do their bidding. If they can give up to \$777,600 per year to their PACs and outside spending group it won't be long before they have what they think they want. By 2021 there will be poor people (94%) and rich people (6%). By 2025 the 6 per centers will have wished they would have enacted sensible gun laws in 2013. Why? Because they will have a lot of money and an illusion of law. The rest of the population will have a little money and an abundance of hardware. Do the math. It will not be pretty!!

Comments provided by :
bost, floyd

=====

=====

The Internet must remain free and unregulated from any government or business entity where sensorship of free speech can be abused for political gain or power control over the people of the United States of America. The internet has grown into its own life form and is the life blood connecting the world. The Internet and its content now belong to the people as the people were responsible for its content and no government shall ever control content or throttle speed based upon campaign donations as this always leads to Americans being stripped of free speech rights. This will harm the people's right to voice against this type of regulation. Just think, we wouldn't be able to voice our negative opinions ever as we can today, because any opinion posted against the regulation could then be removed and the regulating entity could then impose a fine since they would control content and favor one sided postings. Is this really what you want? Don't think so. The individual has God given right of free will to make their own decisions on how to obtain and to best use the Internet to their benefit. As with any regulation, once enacted, our rights stripped away once again, will become another struggle that we will never be able to get restored. The American voter should make a stand to keep the Internet free from all and any regulatory actions by the government no matter what good intentions they claim.

Comments provided by :
Stephens, John D

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Schall_Jr_Fred_12_25_2014_01_56_06_CommentText.txt

=====

I would like to see the internet stay free. People use it to do whatever they need to. I use it to chat with family and friends. So please keep it free.

Comments provided by :
Schall Jr, Fred

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Magee__Dawn__12_25_2014_04_50_51_CommentText.txt

=====

Protect Internet security

Comments provided by :
Magee , Dawn

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Davis_Lee_12_25_2014_07_00_30_CommentText.txt

=====

Why can't you busybodies just leave people alone. The internet is the last bastion of free speech and your acting like Nazi brownshirts trying to control every aspect of our life. Butt out assholes!!!!

Comments provided by :
Davis, Lee

=====

=====

Dear Ms/Sir,

I am very alarmed as a citizen of this wonderful country, that a government body wants to limit not only what can be printed, what I can read but what I can say. Why is my "freedom of speech" being limited? Is "free speech" hurting anyone's physical being? It may hurt ones pride or ideology!

Only through "free speech" does varying ideas get disseminated, argued about, agreed upon, with eventual consensus of the majority. This is what the founding fathers wanted. I think controlling the internet is not only wrong, but truly not American. Each person has the right to choose what he or she wants to read, believe in, and work for in life. This is one of the greatest assets of this country. Don't help to destroy it with limited speech.

Comments provided by :
Bernardon, Stephen

=====

=====

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.

Comments provided by :

Parker, Don

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Trook_Jim_12_25_2014_09_17_36_CommentText.txt

=====

My comment is very simple. Leave the Internet alone;don't mess with something that works. If you "repair" it long enough,you will surely ruin it. Let it be market-governed.

Comments provided by :

Trook, Jim

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Brooks_Ena_12_25_2014_09_20_48_CommentText.txt

=====

stop the intrusion into our personal lives. Stop regulating our society.

Comments provided by :
Brooks, Ena

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Braden_Jeff_12_25_2014_09_40_58_CommentText.txt

=====

I am stunned that Congress would further shift power from voters to the super wealthy in our country. I oppose this new rule, and hope that Congress will restore some semblance of sanity in rejecting it.

Comments provided by :
Braden, Jeff

=====

=====

I DO NOT LIKE using a spending bill to slide in a huge increase in the amounts individuals can donate to political parties.

Our representatives in government should be working to create a more democratic government instead of increasing the oligarchy and plutocratic nature of our government and dramatically increasing the problems that result when big money comes into the political playing field.

The current limits are plenty high enough, there is no need to bring more money and more undue influence into the political system.

Our democracy is turning into a shambles of its former self due to maneuvers and shenanigans like this that continue to drown out the voices of those who don't have oodles of money to purchase influence.

Restore democracy now and stop the corruption and undue influence of money in politics.

Comments provided by :
wofford, dave

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_hillyard_mark_12_25_2014_11_03_07_CommentText.txt

=====

keep the commies out of inter -net AKA obama regime!!

Comments provided by :
hillyard, mark

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Fawe_Robert_12_25_2014_11_38_25_CommentText.txt

=====

Your charge is regulating elections not the internet. Please do not infringe on our right of free speech.

Comments provided by :
Fawe, Robert

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Becker_Mark_12_25_2014_11_38_45_CommentText.txt

=====

Government needs to quit trying to stifle free speech in any way shape or form. Need to start following the language that is in the constitution and bill of rights instead of trying to under mine them. we need less government period.

Comments provided by :
Becker, Mark

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Ashby_Jay_12_25_2014_12_15_34_CommentText.txt

=====

REG 2014-01 Earmarking certainly meets the standards of Herr Goebbels, Stalin, Mao, Castro, Ho Chi Minh, Kim "Ill Dung" and of course the savages of ISIS. Dictators and communists everywhere will hail this a great leap forward! Are we in America or the Soviet Union? Incremental destruction of Americans God given freedom is unacceptable and deplorable. Perhaps best to change the FEC name to 'Freedom Erosion Committee'.

Comments provided by :
Ashby, Jay

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_klein_carol_12_25_2014_12_15_55_CommentText.txt

=====

The increase in "dark money" political donations allowed by this bill seriously erodes the democratic process. Political donations should be transparent and limited; this bill allows the rich undue power to influence voters without disclosing their identity.

Comments provided by :
klein, carol

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Cole_Patricia_12_25_2014_12_30_32_CommentText.txt

=====

We have constitutionally-guaranteed free speech.

People have a right to their opinions and should be able to state them without FEC regulating what is said.

Also it would cost an enormous amount of money to have enough people watching every place people post like youtube,facebook and a host of other places.

I think that we need to leave free speech on the internet alone.

Comments provided by :

Cole, Patricia

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Hocutt_Bryan_12_25_2014_12_48_05_CommentText.txt

=====

I am not in favor of regulation for the enter net. We should have less regulations by the Government not more. Please stop trying to control everything and let the free market work. If the government must control something, how about slowing down the garbage shipped to use from China. Or the hard drugs that are destroying our cities and families. These are subjects that need your attention. Government regulations are sufficiently damaging business. We don't need you to do anymore assistance from the government. God bless American,
Bryan Hocutt

Comments provided by :
Hocutt, Bryan

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_custer_patricia_12_25_2014_12_56_35_CommentText.txt

=====

stop trying to control all aspects of american life! internet has a few problems yes, BUT self control out weighs any heavy judgemental control you may offer!

Comments provided by :
custer, patricia

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Muaja_Benny_12_25_2014_14_18_00_CommentText.txt

=====

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. Thereby, in my opinion, the FEC shall not regulating the internet.

Comments provided by :
Muaja, Benny

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_sicard_kevin_gershom_12_25_2014_14_19_31_CommentText.txt

=====

No law or regulation should be passed that allows the FEC to monitor anyone's internet activity without probable cause and especially not the content of their activities.

Comments provided by :
sicard, kevin gershom

=====

=====

The Federal Elections Commission

The proposed changes to the campaign finance rules as passed in the Trillion dollar budget bill just passed by congress are absolutely criminal. The money being allowed will only corrupt our democracy even further.

I urge this commission to deny the changes as proposed and even allow less than is currently allowed. The average citizen in the US doesn't stand a chance to have his political Representative elected.

Stand up for America!

Don Morris

511 Broad Creek Loop Rd

Newport NC 28570

PH: 252-571-9052

Comments provided by :

Morris, Don

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_blaufuss_ed_12_25_2014_15_16_18_CommentText.txt

=====

keep the government out of internet regulation.

Comments provided by :
blaufuss, ed

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Morrison_Richard_12_25_2014_15_20_27_CommentText.txt

=====

Stop the money, please! We need campaign finance reform, not an increase in dark money. Please stop!

Comments provided by :
Morrison, Richard

=====

=====

Sirs,

The FEC is not tasked with monitoring free speech and should there for stick with what is spent on elections and not on Americans opinions posted anywhere. This is dangerously close to violating the first amendment of the Constitution. This is the main crux and not to mention the costs to all Americans for you to have an army of censors looking over our shoulder trying to determine the meanings of what we say. I don't care what ones opinion is because they have a God given right to express it whether I agree or not. Honest discourse will suffer if you feel you are above our God given rights and you some how know better than we the people. Because you do not Sirs and shame on you and you heritage if you think so.

A Concerned Citizen,
David Richardson

Comments provided by :
Richardson, David

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Gilligan_Arend_12_25_2014_16_14_09_CommentText.txt

=====

Keep the FEC within it's task to regulate money spent on elections.

Do NOT OBSTRUCT POLITICAL SPEECH!

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

This a massive expansion of the FEC, there would be an army of speech police on internet sites everyday looking for violations, and subject them to unfair inquiries simply because they posted an opinion online.

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

Comments provided by :
Gilligan, Arend

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_SWYMN__Kathy__12_25_2014_16_21_21_CommentText.txt

=====

We want our internet freedom of speech protected

Comments provided by :
SWYMN , Kathy

=====

=====

From what I have been able to gather, these FEC rules changes being considered will subject internet speech via YouTube, various blogs, and the like, to FEC oversight. This is not only a monumentally bad idea for our Democracy, but I believe that it directly violates the First Amendment to the Constituion of these United 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."

Clearly, any regulation from any government agency that would *abridge* the above mentioned speech, press, assembly, and/or petitioning the Government for redress of grievances, would be unconstitutional.

Dictionary.com defintes Abridge as follows: "to reduce or lessen in duration, scope, authority, etc.; diminish; curtail:"

In my opinion, any regulation that would diminish, curtail, reduce or lessen my free speech, whether online or offline, clearly violates the First Amendment.

As such, I strongly oppose any rule change that would cause any government agency to have purview over anything posted by a US Citizen online in any form.

Comments provided by :
Burkey, Jr, Craig

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_diorio_anthony_12_25_2014_19_06_53_CommentText.txt

=====

?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.

Comments provided by :
diorio, anthony

=====

=====

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.

Comments provided by :
Stepp, Gaty

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Hegna_Susan_12_25_2014_20_18_07_CommentText.txt

=====

Slowly but surley they are taking all our liberties away and taxing everything that they possible can.
America please stand up and fight before it has all benn taken from us.

Comments provided by :
Hegna, Susan

=====

=====

Freedom of speech is a Constitutional right given to citizens of the United States. This right is unprecedented in the history of the world but for it to be truly meaningful, it is imperative that this freedom not be interfered with by any governmental office, private group, or person for any reason and that includes undermining it's effectiveness by generating something as bogus as a "campaign regulation" designed specifically to limit or restrict a person's views. Our law makers today have managed to convolute the legality of campaign contribution laws to the point where any and all contributions to them are legal when the campaign reporting requirements are fulfilled under specific paths they determined. This then is where the problem with campaign oversight starts, because people that use YouTube or any other internet outlet for political commentaries do not possess that specific path knowledge and that means their views, and consequently their right to freedom of speech will be infringed upon, AND THIS IS NOT ACCEPTABLE!

Comments provided by :
Aiello, Bruce

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Jacobs_Daniel_12_25_2014_20_45_28_CommentText.txt

=====

I believe the greatest threat to our Democracy is the fact that Congress' actions don't reflect the will of the American people. They do seem to coincide with the will of the wealthiest Americans, who place profits over people, and don't seem to care how much harm they do, as long as it makes them richer. I believe term limits and campaign financing reforms are the best way to encourage Congressmen to act upon the will of the majority of Americans.

Comments provided by :
Jacobs, Daniel

=====

=====

I am writing to you in opposition to "REG 2014-01 Earmarking, Affiliation, Joint Fundraising, Disclosure, and Other Issues." This proposed rule change is one of the greatest threats to freedom of speech that we have seen in America in my lifetime.

Currently, individuals are allowed to discuss politics and even make videos to post online, in which they discuss politics. It is truly "Free Speech" as the Founding Fathers of our nation intended. This robust political discussion happens every single day on personal blogs, popular websites such as Facebook and YouTube, and on large news websites such as the Drudge Report and the New York Times.

Under this proposed rule change, individuals would be treated as political entities engaging in paid political speech. They would be regulated just like big super PACS and would be required to fill out mountains of paperwork to submit to the FEC.

If I have to purchase a license from the government to engage in speech online, then I do not actually have "Freedom of Speech." Repressive governments already use censorship boards like this to troll the internet for any dissent; this chilling of free speech has no place in America!

Regulation also brings enforcement along with it. If we the people refuse to abide by this rule change, are you planning to fine and imprison all of us?

This rule change is clearly unconstitutional and you need to stop it. Vote NO on this plan to censor speech on the internet!

Comments provided by :
Byers, Susan

=====

=====

I strenuously object to any proposed rule by the FEC which would give the FEC the authority to control or otherwise restrict the free speech on the internet. This proposed rule is nothing more than a blatant partisan attempt to constrain free speech that is not to the liking of a political party. Congress has given no such power to the FEC to enact any rule or regulation in this area.

The FEC must cease immediately any action toward this proposed rule.

Comments provided by :
Kahler, James

=====

=====

Reg 2014-01

In reading over the McCutcheon case it is stated very plainly "err on the side of protecting political speech rather than suppressing it" Ann Ravel rule changes are supporting suppressing our FREEDOM OF SPEECH! Our Founding Fathers so blessed by God, stated in the First Amendment Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech.....Free speech is one of our unalienable rights from God. Vote "NO" on all the rule changes.

Comments provided by :
Schiller, Bernice

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Young_Lon_12_26_2014_00_07_23_CommentText.txt

=====

STOP ONLINE SPYING YOU CRIMINALS! ITS WRONG AND YOU ALL KNOW IT!

Comments provided by :
Young, Lon

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Chatham_Andrea_12_26_2014_00_25_11_CommentText.txt

=====

The FEC is tasked with regulating Money spent on elections,not political speech.
Everyone has the right by the Constitution of free-speech. This would also be
costly to taxpayers as well to enforce.

Comments provided by :
Chatham, Andrea

=====

=====

This is an act of the evil ones. satan's hole goal is to make it were this is a one world religion and to make so much corruption on this earth so the government can in force the Martial Law. Jesus will return according to His word and He can't lie so everything that was written has to come to pass. There will be no piece they will strip everything from us all we can do is Pray and have Faith in the Word and stand firm on the rock which is Jesus Christ. We must get on our knees and pray and have hope.. Don't give in keep on fighting. This is a spiritual war that where in. Jesus will bring peace to earth. God bless you all Don't convert that's what they want us to do. We have to be willing to die for Jesus as He died for us... You don't have to believe me, but in 2015 this world is going to change for the worse

Comments provided by :
Upshaw, dorothy

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Grubb_Harold_12_26_2014_03_16_19_CommentText.txt

=====

Continue protection of our 1st amendment rights please

Comments provided by :
Grubb, Harold

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Davis_Lee_12_26_2014_07_52_30_CommentText.txt

=====

You assholes of the FEC have a lot of gall to be messing with first amendment rights of free political speech. Each and every one of you can suck my rosy red asslips!!!

Comments provided by :
Davis, Lee

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_HAMMANN_ALLAN_12_26_2014_08_21_58_CommentText.txt

=====

I do not want the fec regulating our free speech rights on the internet or any other organization. thank-you Allan

Comments provided by :
HAMMANN, ALLAN

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Bolle_Dan_12_26_2014_08_47_56_CommentText.txt

=====

It is not your business to censor the internet. The First Amendment protects our free speech whether you like it or not!!! Free speech is just that, FREE SPEECH!! As such you must pull your nose out of free speech no matter what form it takes!!!

Comments provided by :
Bolle, Dan

=====

=====

I believe the FEC should not attempt to regulate political adds or commentary on the internet. Most of the online political commentary would be free or nearly so to the person or group making the comments anyway, since youtube, facebook, twitter etc. accounts or publications are either free or insignificant in cost to use. This appears to simply be an attempt to investigate and hamper americans interested in voicing their oppinions, democratic, republican, independant and all others included, and to stop free speach. The resources needed to even begin such oversight and investigations, prosecute, etc. would be a horrendous waste of hard earned taxpayer money as well. We do not live in China or Russia, and I personally do not appreciate being made to feel more and more like I do by increasing government regulation and sensorship such as is being proposed here.

Comments provided by :
boucher, jan

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Danforth_Sandra_12_26_2014_10_34_00_CommentText.txt

=====

I would like to make known that I strongly object to the loophole that will allow individual Americans to give \$777,600 per year to committees affiliated with the national political parties

Comments provided by :
Danforth, Sandra

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Caldwell_Paul_12_26_2014_10_36_02_CommentText.txt

=====

I am opposed to the allowance of such obscene amounts of money being contributed to campaigns and especially to the shrouding of the source of the contribution. At the VERY LEAST we need to know who is influencing our most fundamental national right. I urge you to require full exposure of contributors and amounts.

Comments provided by :
Caldwell, Paul

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Saucedo_Erin_12_26_2014_10_55_26_CommentText.txt

=====

I do not want FEC regulating the Internet.
Erin Saucedo

Comments provided by :
Saucedo, Erin

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_McOmber_Carol_12_26_2014_11_43_15_CommentText.txt

=====

Freedom of speech is CRITICAL for our safety and liberty!

Comments provided by :
McOmber, Carol

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Marshall_James_12_26_2014_12_14_34_CommentText.txt

=====

I oppose government snooping on the internet. Such an intrusion stifles free speech. Only with proper justification and authorization should any government agency be allowed to intrude on private internet content.

Comments provided by :
Marshall, James

=====

=====

We the people of the United States have not authorized our federal government to do any more than is in our Constitution. The proposition to regulate free speech, whether it be via newspapers, television, radio, books, or IN THIS CASE, the internet, is unconstitutional, and is a direct violation of our God-given right to Free Speech, established in the United States of America under the First Amendment to the Constitution. I oppose the FEC's thought of creating a government review board to determine what political, religious, or any kind of speech is acceptable to post. People can choose to view or not view what is on the internet, or any other media source. We did not authorize the federal government to be our NURSEMAID. The FEC itself is considering a constitutional violation by granting itself this authority, which is not granted to ANY branch of the federal government--let alone an unelected group of bureaucrats.

Comments provided by :
Kelley, Joe

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Ramsaroop_Hermina_12_26_2014_14_17_18_CommentText.txt

=====

Stop trying to infringe on our constitutional rights. We're all fed up with more, and more governmental control. You want to oppress the people of this country, try it somewhere else like China, or Russia. Go ahead, move there with my blessings.

Comments provided by :
Ramsaroop, Hermina

=====

=====

Once again, people like FEC Chair Ann Ravel have made an issue about politics instead of our God given rights as Americans - our freedom of speech. The fact that she and others on her commission want to regulate YouTube videos shows how far the "left" will go to stop American citizens from voicing their opinions. They are not thinking of us, they are thinking of how they can intimidate people and control political elections. This is an outrage. Ms. Ravel and her team are by no means a voice for the average American and they should be stopped in their tracks. The fact that they are pushing this agenda is outrageous and they should all be ashamed of themselves. If a poll was taken and the American people knew what they were trying to do, they would be voted out of their current positions. Keep your hands off the internet and start doing your job protecting our constitution and our freedom of speech!

Judy Manzer

Comments provided by :
Manzer, Judith

=====

=====

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. For these reasons, I do not want the FEC regulating the internet.

Comments provided by :
Hrinowich, Thomas

=====

=====

"Free Speech" is not regulated by the 'type' of speech used. Like all other liberties, it is defined as having NO limits. There are no provisions within the Constitution of the United States, nor the Bill of Rights, to limit the individual liberties outlined by those documents. They are not 'given' by the founding documents, but are simply acknowledged as natural rights of every person that holds citizenship of the United States. They are not even limited by citizenship, but apply to all humans. The US is only the place that these liberties are fully acknowledged.

The internet exists. The ability to opine, argue or debate cannot be 'regulated' simply because of its nature. Truthfully, if there is an avenue for speech, it must be actively un-regulated and fiercely defended by all. Any and all attempts to stifle liberty, regardless of the venue, must be met with the force of law. Liberty, once lost, may be impossible to reclaim.

If we do not halt even the tiniest example regulation of our freedoms, then all freedoms are in danger, for once government has assumed control of anything, it will never release that control without a fight.

Do not attempt to relinquish control of our natural rights to government regulation.

Comments provided by :
Edwards, Clark

=====

=====

Over the past several years it has been becoming increasingly disturbing at the lengths politicians will go to fund campaigns. Up to this point and as evidenced in our recent elections, the ability of individuals and whoever, to make large political contributions and create extensive and expensive attack TV and Radio commercials is completely out of control. The fact that these commercials and other info presentations contain "supposed" facts which are usually baseless at best and skewed to the sponsors cause with blatant untruths at worst, should have no place in our society. The fact that they run 24 hours a day leading up to election day is becoming cruel and unusual punishment for the common voter....most of us, I'm sure, are ultimately tuning them out and thereby missing the valid commercials that have some merit. The most disturbing part of this whole paradox is that the individuals, entities, etc. that make these relatively huge contributions via these 501 (c) nonprofits do so in a completely anonymous fashion and the American public has no earthly idea if these funds are coming from upstanding and concerned US citizens or Kim Jong Un (or worse)! It was reported during the elections, with quotes coming from such respected politicians as Senator John McCain that not only will these anonymous contributions continue but that there was no pressure to correct this travesty. Now with the passage of the recent \$1.1Trillion Dollar Spending Bill it is being reported that hidden back on page 1599 of this bill is a provision increasing the contribution limits to over \$777,000 per individual or \$3.1M for married couples every 2 year cycle. Obviously, there was no debate on this provision, it was approved by Congress, signed by the President and I would guess that most citizens and probably even some politicians didn't even know it was there. These 2 facets, contribution limits and anonymous contributors, need serious political and legal review to safeguard the sanctity of the election process. With our next major elections on the horizon, the citizenry of the US needs to become much more proactive in getting their politicians to address these kind of highly provocative campaign financing methods.....otherwise who are they listening too?

Comments provided by :
Lenzen, Leonard

=====

=====

Federal Elections Commission
United States of America
26 December 2014

Dear Sir or Madam:

This note is to voice very strong disapproval of the earmark which was hidden in the recent \$1.1 trillion spending bill; page 1599, increasing the amount that individuals can give to political causes by nearly eight times the previous amount.

We are in an era of rampant corruption and growing plutocracy, the very same issues our country was intended to avoid. Average voters have less and less influence, and the further the democratic process moves away from average citizens the less we can claim a real democracy.

The bill has passed; it is now law. The FEC is encouraged to do everything in its power to strengthen disclosure laws so that average voters at least know who is buying favor in our government.

David Miller
Durham, NC

Comments provided by :
Miller, David

=====

=====

The First Amendment of the Constitution guarantees freedom of Religion, free speech, freedom of the press, freedom of peaceful assembly, and the right to petition the government.

The Internet is a place where people can post ideas concerning a wide range of topics. Some post ideas about what the government is doing and/or should be doing. Some post criticism of government policies especially if they seem to go against the U.S. Constitution.

The idea that the Government wants to regulate this activity or have the power to remove postings they do not like is a direct violation of the Constitution.

When the government has the power to limit free speech, we enter a period where freedom ends, and the dictatorship starts.

Comments provided by :
Steele, Charles

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Minica_James_12_26_2014_16_22_17_CommentText.txt

=====

Overreach of the federal government into all aspects of our private lives is intolerable. The internet must remain free of intrusive taxes with no speech codes or zones whatsoever and certainly not #Progressive #Socialist oppression of conservatives as we have seen at the IRS.

Comments provided by :
Minica, James

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_MacInnes_Danielle_12_26_2014_16_25_25_CommentText.txt

=====

Do not regulate the internet.

Comments provided by :
MacInnes, Danielle

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Streeter_Scott_12_26_2014_16_29_59_CommentText.txt

=====

The government corporation must be stopped from its relentless assault against the Constitution of the United States and its citizenry!

Comments provided by :
Streeter, Scott

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Eichstaedt_Donald_12_26_2014_16_39_04_CommentText.txt

=====

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

Comments provided by :
Eichstaedt, Donald

=====

=====

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.

And would be overturned in every court, hopefully.

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, and these new regulations would be extremely costly for taxpayers and difficult to enforce.

And again would be overturned in every court, except for those kangaroo courts.

Comments provided by :

Chapel, Gerald

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Wiesner_David_12_26_2014_17_00_50_CommentText.txt

=====

I want the Internet to be perennially free. That means no taxation, no regulation, no barriers to entry, ever.
I will join or start a not elect you, if you still/or if you want to insist on convincing others to insist on
governmental regulation.

Comments provided by :
Wiesner, David

=====

=====

Dear FEC Commissioners:

I implore that you establish the strictest rules possible to enable broad disclosure of dark-money sources for political campaigns and party activities.

The Supreme Court's definition of corporations as persons and its rulings in the Citizens United and McCutcheon cases have opened the flood-gates of money, many sources of which are kept secret from the public. As three of the six Commissioners have noted, "Outside spending by groups that hide their donors [have] increased from just \$5 million in 2006 to more than \$300 million in 2012." That's over a sixty-fold increase in just six years!

And yet recently Congressmen and Senators, without any debate whatsoever, tucked into the recent bill that keeps the federal government functioning a provision that allows the richest Americans to give even more enormous sums of money to political parties and activities. The \$1.1 trillion appropriations bill, passed by Congress and signed by President Obama, permits an individual to give \$777,600 per year to committees affiliated with national political parties. Married couples could give \$3,110,400 to these committees every two-year cycles. That is eight times the previous limit.

Despite all the legalisms that legislators, the courts, the Supreme Court, ALEC, et al. may cite, no one is fooled into thinking that the increasingly huge sums of money that pay for political campaigns and activities do not corrupt the U.S. system of government. At the very least, such sums of money give very special Congressional and Presidential access to its donors, closing out both the access and the voices of ordinary, hard-working citizens.

All of this makes claims to a representational democracy ring very hollow.

If you don't do your part to help restore some of that democracy, then the FEC will have let down all Americans—even the 1% that seem to think that ever-bigger megaphones and ever-greater access to the halls of power will increase their wealth, broaden prosperity, enhance liberty, and secure America's future.

Please establish the strictest rules possible to enable broad disclosure of dark-money sources for political campaigns and party activities.

Sincerely,

Dennis Welch, Ph.D.

Comments provided by :
Welch, Dennis

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_carlson_gary_12_26_2014_17_58_11_CommentText.txt

=====

Opinion and comments on the internet is free speech and is protected by the first amendment.

Comments provided by :
carlson, gary

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_kellam_janet_12_26_2014_18_07_25_CommentText.txt

=====

I believe there should be a rule/law saying that any donation to a candidate, party, issue organization or lobbyist in excess of \$100 would have to be entered into a national database (not state or county, as this breakdown could be incorporated into an online reporting form) within no more than 5 days. ALL who donate should be identified down to the city level. Much more information should be collected in the form besides the name and location of the giver. We should not have to guess where the money is going. The database should be searchable, open & free to all. Fund the creation of the form and database, anti-hacking features, and storage of the results through a fee that is a percentage of each donation. There currently seems to be a shortage of outrage but that's no reason not to Let The SUNSHINE In! Sign me, Living and Hoping for the Outrage. Thank you for asking.

Comments provided by :
kellam, janet

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Ling_Steven_12_26_2014_21_57_46_CommentText.txt

=====

I thought this was America. Now the FEC wants to bring internet speech under government control? No!
No more infringement of individuals' liberty! No more trampling on the bill of rights! No more attempts to
chill free speech!

Comments provided by :
Ling, Steven

=====

=====

I am very disturbed and outraged that the limits on campaign donations have been lifted so high that the average citizen's participation in elections will be reduced to a farce. The voters will be buried under ads, false news reports and lies told over and over in a modulated voice that expensive research shows will convince us. It will be impossible to identify the people behind the proposals, and the amount a political candidate needs to raise in order to campaign will be astronomical, and all candidates will openly pander even more for money. Are we sure that the wealthiest are also the smartest, the most gifted, the most enlightened, the most patriotic, the people with the most concern for everyone? But maybe we will be so busy patting ourselves on the back for being exceptional that it doesn't matter whether our true values are represented in Congress. And to think that my own Democratic senator voted for this--and allowed it to be snuck into a gotta-pass bill--for shame.

Comments provided by :
gardner, susan

=====

=====

1. End anonymous giving of any kind.
2. Individuals should not be allowed to give more than \$5,000 per year all told to political parties or any organizations affiliated with political parties whether or not non-profit.
3. Whatever it takes to require the Supreme Court to honor these limits should be done.
4. All candidates for political office should be required to disclose their political giving past and present in detail so that the voters can consider these facts before voting.
5. Tax rates for individual income levels above half a million dollars should be significantly increased in order to finance important projects.
6. Corporations should not be allowed to give funds that can be used for political purposes, period.

Comments provided by :
segal, bruce

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Barr_Allen_12_26_2014_19_15_59_CommentText.txt

=====

I am directly opposed to the government regulating the internet in any way!

Comments provided by :
Barr, Allen

=====

=====

Restricting freedom of speech is in violation of the 1st Amendment of the Constitution Of The United States. It reads: 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.

The governments lack of respect of our Constitution by disregarding that it even exist MUST BE STOPPED. We the people need to take back the control of the government not the government controlling us. I stand UP for the 1st Amendment and say FEC HANDS OFF THE INTERNET!

Comments provided by :
Lyons, Cindy

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Buckner_Steve_12_27_2014_09_13_48_CommentText.txt

=====

It is wrong for Washington to censor what is said on facebook and other intertnet sites and the FEC should not let them do this. When this happens it will be as if we are in China or some other repressive country that wants their citizens to just shut up and kiss their asses. This is America and things like this should be stopped cold. Our government is too big now and taking away peoples privacy to talk about things that concern them on social media sites is taking us down a road that will cripple free speech. Do not do this, this is not what the American public wants. I don't want it because it will not be good for me or any other citizen, Sincerely, SB

Comments provided by :
Buckner, Steve

=====

=====

The increase in political contributions by hidden donors is unacceptable. The commission adopt policies that donors are identifiable, no matter what group they are donating to. This also included the legal classification of said groups. When individuals are donating at maximum levels, the public has a need to know who is paying for the political machine. I hope that the commission sides with the American people on this issue, not against them.

Comments provided by :
Straughn, Linda

=====

=====

Our country has thrived for 200 years due to the fact that people are free to think, to act and to take risks in business ventures. When the government monitors people's ideas, and thoughts it produces a people who can not think and the government grows and grows. This is NOT the way for free people to function, for our economy to bloom, for our citizens to govern themselves. Keep the republic free and eliminate all tendencies of Communism, as it's about the few elitists at the top having power and wealth despite the masses being shackled and poor. No one wants less for their children's children because the government took it.

Keep America home of the free and the brave. Keep the 1st amendment alive.

Comments provided by :
Arnett, Nellie

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_MacWilliams_Dennis_12_27_2014_11_52_48_CommentText.txt

=====

I do not think that the internet needs to be regulated
by the Federal Government. I would also like to say
that everyone I know also think the same way.

Thanks again
Dennis Macw

Comments provided by :
MacWilliams, Dennis

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Akes_Marcia_12_27_2014_12_20_09_CommentText.txt

=====

I do not want the FEC to regulate any part of the Internet. Leave things as they are now.

Comments provided by :
Akes, Marcia

=====

=====

Since our Supreme Court ruled that corporations can be considered as individuals with contributions seemingly the average American has been put out of the game of the support of their party in any meaningful way. It's obscene the amount of monies that are currently invested in the elections and support of candidates which then become beholden to the special big money interest that support them. So this being understood the most recent recent action by Congress has on page 1,599 for government funding this new allowance for individuals to donate up to \$777,600 per year to committees affiliated with national political parties. This in my humble opinion only es-abates the problems of buying a government that will be answerable to these special interest only and not the American working class that is under the boots of these groups.

Comments provided by :
Henderson, Albert

=====

=====

I would like to see everyone's First Amendment rights being protected. Everyone is entitled to free speech. Not one or a group of individuals should be allowed to speak against the freedom of a persons ideas or thoughts. This is a free country and we are not to be judged like other countries. This is the United States of America. As a US born citizen it is our obligation to stand up for what is right in this country. Just because someone voices their opinion does not give someone else the right to do harm to them physically, spiritually or otherwise. I believe IN GOD WE TRUST just as our forefathers.

Comments provided by :
stewart, june

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_baumann_chase_12_27_2014_14_45_52_CommentText.txt

=====

I can't believe the length you people will go just to help silence someone who has a different opinion.
Grow up!

Comments provided by :
baumann, chase

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Thew_Janet_12_28_2014_00_12_57_CommentText.txt

=====

Given the Supreme Court's shameful lack of respect for limits on money thrown at political campaigns, we look to the FEC to impose maximum disclosure of contributions. Sunshine is the best disinfectant, and that goes doubly for politicians. Please stand up for the citizens who deserve to know who's buying whom.

Thank you.

Comments provided by :
Thew, Janet

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Munselle_Carol_12_27_2014_23_40_20_CommentText.txt

=====

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. I am opposed to the FEC regulating the internet.

Comments provided by :
Munselle, Carol

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Jackson_Barbara_12_27_2014_17_06_44_CommentText.txt

=====

Dark money is polluting our electoral system. It deafens my freedom of speech. The fact that a corporation, group, or individual wants that contribution hidden is an indication that it should not be allowed. Please do everything you can to ensure that our elections are honest, that every American has their voice heard, and that dark money and the corruption it breeds is regulated to the fullest extent of the law.

Comments provided by :
Jackson, Barbara

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Preston_Teresa_12_27_2014_17_02_38_CommentText.txt

=====

I do not want the internet regulated. I do not think the government should be regulating anything that is a safety issue, leave that to the citizens of the United States to oversee. The government should be working on issues that concern the nation with running the country.

Comments provided by :
Preston, Teresa

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Gardner_Stephen_12_27_2014_16_45_22_CommentText.txt

=====

I can not think of anything more damaging to the integrity of our republic than for the government to regulate and censor the very political speech guaranteed in the first amendment.

Comments provided by :
Gardner, Stephen

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Roper_Lynda_12_28_2014_00_17_56_CommentText.txt

=====

Please do not allow regulations to the internet. I am protected by the Constitution with freedom of speech and do not want my private writings on the internet monitored. Please protect my rights promised to me and every citizen in this country.

Thank you,
Lynda Roper

Comments provided by :
Roper, Lynda

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Chwaszczewski_Richard_12_27_2014_16_48_16_CommentText.txt

=====

Thank you for the opportunity to express comments on this proposed rule.

I do not approve of the rule and believe that it is an infringement of my constitutionally protected right of free speech. I am against any limitation on spending associated with any free speech application or interpretation. I oppose the rule.

I ask that FEC Chair Ann Ravel and the Obama administration refrain from any regulation of the Internet.

Thank you.

Comments provided by :
Chwaszczewski, Richard

=====

=====

To US Congress and Office of the President:

As a citizen I am offended by and very disappointed in:

1. The campaign contribution laws that allow corporations to be treated as persons
2. The escalation of corporate and wealthy person contributions to elections which have the effect of allowing the wealthy and super-wealthy to control elections and/or to control the deluge of messages we hear in advance of elections

Stop the insanity of allowing corporations and the wealthy to contribute such large sums to the political parties and to specific elections. The US is a Republic done by Democratic means. The proliferation of money from selected sources and the very wealthy is not in the interests of this Country. It is only in the interest of the very wealthy.

I would like to testify at the 2/11/15 hearing, and request the opportunity to do so.

Comments provided by :
Conway, Glenn

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Kohlwaies_Jr_Kenneth__12_27_2014_16_15_22_CommentText.txt

=====

I would please ask that you do not try to regulate free speech on the internet. The Federal Gov't has no business monitoring online political discourse on the Internet. I would ask that the FEC please not do this. Kenneth Kohlwaies Jr

Comments provided by :
Kohlwaies Jr, Kenneth

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Silva_John_12_27_2014_17_50_09_CommentText.txt

=====

Your job is is to oversee the regulation of money spent on elections, not political speech. You are trying to remove my First Amendment rights from the internet. Stop trying to censor Americans.

Comments provided by :
Silva, John

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Mills_Philip_12_27_2014_22_48_09_CommentText.txt

=====

The First Amendment: Congress shall make no law regarding the abridgement of speech. The federal government does not need to monitor our speech. See other amendments regarding unreasonable search and seizure.

Comments provided by :
Mills, Philip

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Lyons_David_12_27_2014_18_08_15_CommentText.txt

=====

Government bureaucrats cannot be allowed to regulate our online posts and conversations.
The Chairman of the FEC actually called these regulations "nothing short of a Chinese censorship Board." That's unbelievable.
Stop trying to regulate our Free speech on the internet. I won't stand for your assault on free speech.

Comments provided by :
Lyons, David

=====

=====

The FEC is tasked with regulating money spent on elections, not political speech; so reversing the exemption for free postings online would have dangerous ramifications for constitutionally-guaranteed free speech.

The FEC would have to create another potentially corrupt and unaccountable 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 actually enforce and will provide nothing more than another political tool for corrupt and extreme politicians to oppress and vex innocent citizens with whom they disagree.

The internet is the last and only voice of the people. Government must not be allowed to interfere with this voice of the people. Such interference can only mean one thing and that is that the corrupt politicians who run for office insisting that they will represent their constituents and then turn only to representing every voice but the people are taking this action to silence the voice of the people that they are supposed to be representing. That is un-American and that is a crime worthy of impeachment and prison time for any politician who takes such action against the people whom they swore to represent but by taking this action prove that they only wish to silence them.

Comments provided by :
Gooden, Larry

=====

=====

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.

Comments provided by :

Mills, Philip

=====

=====

Allowing higher ceilings on political donations is going to give us the worst government money can buy. It's already heading that way. Allowing that money to permeate our elections without requiring full disclosure of the identity of the donors should be a crime. The Citizens United decision by the Supreme Court should be reversed. Allowing that kind of participation by the rich means that we will have a government of the rich, by the rich, for the rich. That is not what our forefathers envisioned. Money donated into nonprofit organizations that works its way into political contributions should not be allowed unless donors are fully disclosed. This country is headed down a slippery slope with special interest groups having the ability to purchase the government they desire. Most people are unable to compete with that and dark money has become the defining force of our elections. With government bought and paid for by the rich, they will be able to gerrymander election districts to the point where there will be no reason to have elections because the outcome will be determined by the way the votes are counted. All elections should be determined by popular vote, including the presidency, so that it will be impossible to force the outcome of elections by gerrymandering districts to get the outcomes the rich desire. And along those lines, the Supreme Court should not have lifetime appointments. No Supreme Court judge should be allowed to sit for more than ten years.

Comments provided by :
Flachman, Annette

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Brown_Newman_Cox_Karen_12_28_2014_13_41_29_CommentText.txt

=====

Every day it seems that the government wants to spy on us more and more. We don't live in China, we have a Constitution that is the law of the land and all government officials should live by these laws.

Comments provided by :
Brown Newman Cox, Karen

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Green_Jaclyn_12_28_2014_14_12_37_CommentText.txt

=====

I believe that there needs to be a cap on the amount of money that can be donated by any individual to a political campaign, and that the cap needs to be within the reasonable reach of average Americans. Allowing individuals with greater financial means to donate more money to political campaigns gives them greater influence over elections, which undermines the democratic process. I also think that there needs to be complete disclosure on the part of politicians with regard to who is financing their campaigns and to what degree. The American public has a right to know who is backing our politicians, as they will likely be answering to these people if in office.

Comments provided by :
Green, Jaclyn

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Gerkens_Fred_12_28_2014_16_21_03_CommentText.txt

=====

All contributions should be completely identified and sourced so the voters can see who, or what, is supporting a candidate or position. Citizen's United should be repealed, or at least modified to specifically identify the individuals behind a corporate contribution. To me, it makes a big difference whether the contribution reflects the combined will of a "corporation" or the individual input of one or two people.

Comments provided by :
Gerkens, Fred

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_aprill_paul_12_28_2014_17_57_52_CommentText.txt

=====

Our constitution prohibits government regulation of our freedom of political speech.

Comments provided by :
aprill, paul

=====

=====

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.

Comments provided by :

Ruggles, Sandra

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Wren_Constance_12_28_2014_18_25_13_CommentText.txt

=====

I am heartsick at the capture of our democracy by sources with unlimited funds who are able to support their causes without revealing their affiliations. The monetary limits are inordinately generous, and the devious methods used to disguise sources are so blatant that they serve to undermine our entire democracy. Penalties should be strong, enforceable and immediate and thereby more effective.
Respectfully, Constance Wren

Comments provided by :
Wren, Constance

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Murray_Margaret_12_28_2014_19_53_17_CommentText.txt

=====

The FEC needs to stay out of the internet and free speech issues. For Christ sakes this is America. The internet is already trolled on the national level by other agencies in an intrusive manner. You and all the other agencies have out grown your primary purpose for being and continually encroach on our freedoms. Btw, your encroaching on your on individual freedom as well...guess they aren't all that important to you if you work for the federal government.

Comments provided by :
Murray, Margaret

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_adams_elaine_12_28_2014_20_08_32_CommentText.txt

=====

Leave our internet alone! Government needs to get out of our lives! The government has a place in our society but WE make the choices of what and where the government needs to be and our internet is not one!!!

Comments provided by :
adams, elaine

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Gudel_Leon_12_28_2014_20_11_38_CommentText.txt

=====

The government should not have any control of the internet! Is this still America???

Comments provided by :
Gudel, Leon

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Gayou_Deborah_12_28_2014_21_37_44_CommentText.txt

=====

It is not the place of the Federal Elections Commission to interfere in any aspect of the internet. The internet is a free and open forum. The participants have and are entitled to keep all personal liberties and rights accorded them by the United States Constitution. We, the People communicate free of censorship and will continue to do so. The federal government is already bloated, ineffective and overreaching. The FEC should not continue on this misguided track of restricting internet use.

Comments provided by :
Gayou, Deborah

=====

=====

The government intrusion into our every day lives is so far past where our founders believed it should ever be. And just for the reasons they talk about, describing a run-a-way government like this currant one. The IRS scandals, Benghazi, amnesty, gun running and that's just a few we know about. If you take away our communication ability that may just be the last straw! Remember the Gov. is not to restrict free speech (as if the US Constitution means anything to you people).

Keep the internet and sites on it that are used free from Government rules and regulations. Leave the internet alone!

Comments provided by :
Vernarsky, Craig

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Jones_Jr._George_V._12_29_2014_06_48_31_CommentText.txt

=====

Please stop trying to destroy the constitution. Free speech is constitutional even if you don't like what is said.

Comments provided by :
Jones Jr., George V.

=====

=====

I urge you to not attempt to remove First Amendment protections from the internet. The FEC's role is to regulate money spent on elections, not how people exercise their speech with regards to politics on the internet. The FEC has no role in regulating, nor should it, free speech. Eliminating the exemption of free postings on social media, websites, blogs, etc would have very dangerous ramifications for protected free speech. The cost alone with attempting to regulate such a damaging rule would be crippling, and the regulation would lead to more opinion-related regulation by regulators. The elimination of free speech on political opinions by individuals could result in unfair persecution of people or groups for their religious or other beliefs.

Again, I urge you to not attempt to remove the First Amendment protections from the internet.

Regards,
Avery J Menefee IV

Comments provided by :
Menefee, Avery

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_amos_lemoine_12_29_2014_13_39_52_CommentText.txt

=====

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

Please don't introduce even More government intrusion into our First
Amendment Rights.
Speech-stifling power grabs such as this should Never be introduced by our
own Federal government - ours is supposed to be a
Government Of the People, By the People and For the People.

Please reconsider what you are doing!
Thank you...

Comments provided by :
amos, lemoine

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Lowe_Jan_12_29_2014_14_02_16_CommentText.txt

=====

Anyone (company or individuals) that gives money to someone running for public office or in public office should be required to list their name and address. This information should be available to the public.

Comments provided by :

Lowe, Jan

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Bishop_Lila_12_29_2014_15_03_44_CommentText.txt

=====

People who state their political opinions on the Internet must continue to be free from campaign reporting requirements. This is a free speech issue. The FEC needs to keep hands off.

Comments provided by :
Bishop, Lila

=====

=====

I am writing in opposition to expansion of so-called "dark money" in political campaigns. Enabling, for example, the President, the Senate Majority Leader, the House Speaker and other congressional leaders and powerful members of Congress to solicit contributions of up to \$1,555,200 from an individual donor and \$3,110,400 from a couple for their respective national parties is corrupting our crippled increasingly undemocratic electoral campaign system even further.

I object, moreover, to the underhanded way these proposals are being enacted, i.e., by inserting these campaign finance provisions into the Omnibus Appropriations bill, they have created a new system of legalized bribery in which massive contributions to the parties can be used by very wealthy donors to buy influence with and results from federal officeholders.

Please think not only twice, but many times, and reverse course!

Comments provided by :
Bellin, Judith S.

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Marquart_Ron_12_29_2014_16_42_33_CommentText.txt

=====

Dear Federal Election Commissioners:
Dec. 29,2014

I am very concerned about money in politics. I urge the commission to strengthen its disclosure rules so that voters know who is behind the messages intended to influence our votes. Thank you for asking and considering my opinion. This is how a true democracy works.

Comments provided by :
Marquart, Ron

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Marquart_Cay_12_29_2014_16_47_27_CommentText.txt

=====

Dear Federal Election Commissioners:
Dec. 29,2014

I am very concerned about money in politics. I urge the commission to strengthen its disclosure rules so that voters know who is behind the messages intended to influence our votes. Thank you for asking and considering my opinion. This is how a true democracy works.

Comments provided by :
Marquart, Cay

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Roth_Christopher_12_29_2014_17_50_49_CommentText.txt

=====

Just wanted to let you know my feeling's on REG 2014-01. I am against any regulation on the usage of the internet

Comments provided by :
Roth, Christopher

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Gresham_Jimmy_12_29_2014_17_56_13_CommentText.txt

=====

The internet does NOT need FEC regulations regarding political speech and individual freedoms.
America is NOT a communist country as of today.

Comments provided by :
Gresham, Jimmy

=====

=====

Offices and agencies of the federal government are large and expansive; federal government is expanding far too much into the private sector. This is bad; this is wrong. The internet is an attractive target for federal government to tax, place regulations and exact ever more revenue for schemes they invent. The proper remedy for citizens is to regulate, eliminate some federal agencies and departments. We want the internet to remain in private hands; it is being administered properly. Actually, federal government has no business regulating the internet or placing rules on it. It is for citizens of the world to decide, as they currently do through their appointed internet representatives, not governments. Keep out of the internet.

Comments provided by :
Baer, Ken

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Wise_Shirley_12_29_2014_18_43_44_CommentText.txt

=====

Government cannot manage the issues it is responsible for today.
It should not interfere with the Internet. It should not restrict
free speech, nor try to tax users of the Internet.

Comments provided by :
Wise, Shirley

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Berry_Michael_12_29_2014_19_22_04_CommentText.txt

=====

FEC stands for Federal Election Commission. This is not the commission nor the place to dictate what can and can't be said during political speeches. I encourage you to maintain the exemption for free postings online, otherwise there will be dangerous ramifications against our constitutionally-guaranteed free speech. Moderating free speech would also take a large number of people and an even larger amount of money to look for potential violations and subject the posters of that content to inquiries simply because of the posters opinions. Do not regulate the internet. It isn't common sense and it will burden too many people for too little return. That and it's unconstitutional to regulate free speech.

Comments provided by :
Berry, Michael

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Donovan_Thema_12_29_2014_19_26_47_CommentText.txt

=====

ATTN.. Fec. I Thelma
Donovan, object to the fec messing with the people of America right to freedom of Speech 1st
Amendment law. Online ..or in any other way.. We as Americans shouldn't have to ..feel that we don't
have that right. This is America... Not a communist country. So...you're wrong for even trying.
TID.

Comments provided by :
Donovan, Thema

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Nelson_St Stanley_12_29_2014_19_54_39_CommentText.txt

=====

It is extremely important that the internet be preserved as a way of free speech, without FEC intervention.
Our existing rights must be protected.

Comments provided by :
Nelson, Stanley

=====

=====

I strongly favor the requirement for more disclosure information of political contributions. The donors to any organization that purchases or pays for the production or broadcast of political advertisements designed to influence voters decisions on any candidate who is running for public office or is currently holding public office should be required to publicly disclose all of its donors, and if the donor is an organization, the contributing organization should be required to disclose all of its donors as well. The requirement should go back far enough in any chain of organizational contributions to assure that all individuals who have contributed directly or indirectly to the advertisement are disclosed.

Comments provided by :
Fitzgerald, Robert

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_McNally_Deborah_12_29_2014_23_54_10_CommentText.txt

=====

We don't want the FEC involved with the internet. We don't want regulations ,restrictions or taxes. We will have to protest this at all cost.

Comments provided by :
McNally, Deborah

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_White_Fred_12_30_2014_09_54_36_CommentText.txt

=====

With the newly enacted election financial contribution law the Congress will join the Supreme Court as a fully owned subsidiary of the hallowed 1%. The country will then function as an oligarchy behind the facade of a representative democracy.

Comments provided by :
White, Fred

=====

=====

Good Morning,

A New Year will be upon us soon.

Already the "guns" are lining up to wrest the next election from the people.

And guess what, the people are becoming less enchanted all the time.

After donating in bits and dabs to a few candidates during the lowest turnout midterm election since WWII, my frustration with the entire email spurred campaign reached a peak.

How can the ordinary citizen ever feel that he is truly represented.

Our town is looking forward to "Oil Trains" on our doorstep. The Fossil Fuel Monied interests are taking away any chance of turning around our society's trend towards self annihilation.

The FEC must act to reverse this trend. Th grip that the monied interests have upon our "democratic" election system must be released.

Thank you for your efforts.

Sincerely,

RLONGDEN@PACBELL.NET

Comments provided by :

Longden, Roger

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_thompson_sandra_12_30_2014_11_25_47_CommentText.txt

=====

Please leave the Internet alone. Do not add unnecessary restrictions to its use.

Comments provided by :
thompson, sandra

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_McKenzie_Tammie_12_30_2014_11_53_53_CommentText.txt

=====

We are supposed to be the light of the Free world but more and more we are becoming something I do not recognize. Keep the internet Free of the regulations that are dragging us down. NO REGULATIONS!

Comments provided by :
McKenzie, Tammie

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Stone_Daniel_12_30_2014_12_00_58_CommentText.txt

=====

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 is not a wise use of our precious resources. We need forums where people can express their opinions and thoughts without the threat of being censored or threatened.

Comments provided by :
Stone, Daniel

=====

=====

First of all, it disgusts me to even think that this can even be on the table in America. The censorship is nothing short of communism and a total infringement on our citizens constitutional rights. And don't think you are fooling America , we know the wishes of the Obama administraton to bring America to it's knees and impose marshal law. I am fully aware of your December 2nd blackout of our media as a test to keep information from being put out to the public. Please stop playing games with your special appointments to the Supreme Court of people that would undermine our Constitution and the inherent rights it gives us real Americans. All NON-Oath-keepers should be removed from office. Please quit trashing our country and stop your stoking the fires of racism. Leave my Constitution alone or leave office. Enough is enough. Government over-reach is disgusting.

Comments provided by :
Rutledge , Aaron

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Blocher_Roy_12_30_2014_12_39_45_CommentText.txt

=====

The most fundamental right of Americans is free speech. This regulation is a direct attack on that right. I do not always agree with my neighbor, but I will defend his right to speak, whether on a street corner or on the internet. This regulation must never be approved.

Comments provided by :
Blocher, Roy

=====

=====

I believe the Supreme Court decision to allow corporations to contribute to political campaigns is detrimental to our democracy and should be nulled by appropriate legislation. In the meantime, I believe that all contributions over \$1,000 to political campaigns should be transparent to the public, posted on a website for that purpose. If multiple contributions are received from one source they should be grouped/added together. Recent elections have proven that huge sums of money are poured into even local election campaigns from out of state/out of country interests who have no business circumventing the desires of the people who live in any particular state/district. At the national level it is even more apparent that reform is necessary, because these interferences are only magnified. Money coming from corporations, lobbying groups, and large organizations (including unions) should be identified in a way that the general public can see who is trying to influence their local/state/national elections.

Comments provided by :
harber, emilie

=====

=====

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.

Comments provided by :

Coon, Donna

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Busch_Lewis_12_30_2014_14_13_40_CommentText.txt

=====

To me, it is obscene to have authorized enormous raises in campaign contribution limits in an omnibus budget bill and without general debate of the issue. Congress has erred. Shame on those who voted for this.

Lewis Busch, 27514

Comments provided by :
Busch, Lewis

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Smith_Jeff_12_30_2014_18_35_56_CommentText.txt

=====

Leave the Internet free. We do not need more Big Government intruding in our free speech. On the internet let free speech be free.

Comments provided by :
Smith, Jeff

=====

=====

The FEC should require that political ads should carry the names of those who paid for them. With the new limits on individual contributions, it insures that government will be run for the wealthy. Government is no longer working for the vast majority of citizens, but is serving the interests of the 1%. Congress and the Senate will now be catering to the tiny number of wealthy households and corporations who can contribute the new limit of \$777,600. My check for \$100.00 will mean nothing to those trying to get elected or re-elected. Please rethink these new limits and please put restrictions on these contributions by making donors put their names on the ads they are paying for.

Citizens United should be reversed. Corporations are not people. They are operating for profit - not for the benefit of the people of this country.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Margaret S. Parr

Comments provided by :
Parr, Margaret

=====

=====

I am very disappointed that a bill was hid on page 1,599 of the 1,603 budget that allows a person to give up to \$777,600.00 to committees affiliated with the national political parties. There is already too much money that a person could give now, just look how much money was spent in the last North Carolina elections. To hide a bill like this with no discussion is just a crooked way of doing business. When this goes into affect the people who cannot contribute will not have any say on political decisions with their vote or contact with their representatives. You can believe that the big contributors will have their say which can greatly increase their wealth and spread the gap even more between the wealthy and the middle class. Our country is almost run by lobbyists and large corporations now who give a lot of money which gives them special favors on new bills that give them the advantage over others.

Thanks for listening to me.

Comments provided by :
Hicks, Kenneth

=====

=====

To whom this may concern,

Keep your sticky fingers away from my computer, television, radio, telephone, cellphone, smart phone, dumb phone, and off of my keyboard!

While you're at it keep your sticky finger out of my pockets, out of my bank account(s), and away from my retirement funds, IRA(s), investment(s), etc.

Do not intrude upon, interfere with, or molest in any manner whatsoever, my ability to communicate as I choose, with whomever I choose, in whatever manner or medium I choose.

Do not intrude upon, interfere with, or molest in any manner whatsoever, the medium or manner (i.e., newspaper, radio, television, internet, etc.) in which I choose to consume information (i.e., political, religious, etc.).

I declare that FREE SPEECH IS MY CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT, and I demand that it be preserved, protected, and that my rights not be molested in any manner whatsoever, by any government official, government agency, or governing body, or by any associate or affiliate thereof.

My government officials, agencies, and governing bodies are individually and collectively CONSTITUTIONALLY OBLIGATED TO PRESERVE AND PROTECT MY CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO FREE SPEECH!

They are not permitted to OFFEND against it!

I (and I alone) have the Constitutional Right to determine for myself whichever media and/or internet content is appropriate, and that which is not.

I (and I alone) also have the Absolute Constitutional Right to determine for myself whichever media and/or internet content (i.e., political, religious, etc.) that I will not consume.

If you must censor, or otherwise molest, somebody's Free Speech Rights please feel absolutely free to molest only those of your own.

Censor yourselves; leave all of the rest of us GOD LOVING, PEACE REVERING UNITED STATES CITIZENS unmolested, uncensored, and in blissful peace here ever after!

Have a nice day!

Comments provided by :
Hopper, Ron

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_June_Elmer_12_31_2014_03_22_36_CommentText.txt

=====

as a citizen of this USA for 78 years I personally oppose the the attacks on my personal first amendment & all other freedoms granted by the constitution of the united states of america, of what you are supposed to uphold & and not exacerbate!! stop the inter net spying on us, we are not the ones destroying this country but it seams you are, We the people are your payees Obey us, not the debilitating status quo! their is a God he is alive! will you have to answer to Him? for the wrongs perpetrated on this His people, His Lighthouse america? I say hold the bloody fort! & Katie bar the door!!

In love of God & country Elmer June

Comments provided by :
June, Elmer

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Berger__Mark__12_31_2014_13_12_59_CommentText.txt

=====

Freedom of speech, get it? No censorship!

Comments provided by :

Berger , Mark

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Bade_Barbara_12_31_2014_14_54_49_CommentText.txt

=====

It's simple

It's against the Constitution

Therefore, it's against the law

AND

It's not within the FEC' authority to even think of enforcing

Comments provided by :
Bade, Barbara

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Durmaz_Evelyn_12_31_2014_16_51_29_CommentText.txt

=====

Please make sure there is complete and full transparency in every kind of political donation to any individual or group. Voters must have the chance to see what donations are made, by whom they are made, and the amount.

Comments provided by :
Durmaz, Evelyn

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_MCGUIRE_BETTY_12_31_2014_18_46_03_CommentText.txt

=====

Please add my support for a ruling that requires those who distribute messages to voters to disclose who they are.

Comments provided by :
MCGUIRE, BETTY

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Smith_Roger_12_31_2014_18_56_43_CommentText.txt

=====

MOLON LABE

Comments provided by :
Smith, Roger

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_McCauley_Paula_12_31_2014_19_05_25_CommentText.txt

=====

Americans can no longer tolerate Governments attacks on the liberties and freedoms we were born with. The loss or infringement of just one of our rights endangers us to a life of tyranny and oppression.

Those that attack the liberties guaranteed by our Constitution are guilty of treason and sedition and should immediately be removed from power and prosecuted to the fullest extent of the laws of our nation. As an American I will demand it.

Comments provided by :
McCauley, Paula

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Pope_Rock_12_31_2014_19_09_36_CommentText.txt

=====

Leave our internet alone and get off our backs.

Comments provided by :
Pope, Rock

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_McCracken_Andrew_12_31_2014_19_39_09_CommentText.txt

=====

Keep government intrusion out of all individuals' private business

Comments provided by :
McCracken, Andrew

=====

=====

Outlets like YouTube and the broader Internet should be free from federal government control. This is part of our constitutionally-guaranteed free speech. This is complete government overreach and should not be allowed to go forward or even be considered in the first place as it is unconstitutional to create these types of regulations that violate the Bill of Rights.

Comments provided by :
Burwell, Julie

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Gehres_Tanya_12_31_2014_20_03_17_CommentText.txt

=====

Keep the Freedom of Speech free on the internet. Constitution rules Americans

Comments provided by :
Gehres, Tanya

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Yentas_Nicholas_12_31_2014_20_29_09_CommentText.txt

=====

Do not trample the Constitution and our Bill of Rights! Protect our freedom of speech, keep the internet free.

Comments provided by :
Yentas, Nicholas

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_SOUTHERLY_TERRY_12_31_2014_21_38_27_CommentText.txt

=====

keep free speech on the internet!

Comments provided by :
SOUTHERLY, TERRY

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Kay_Zachary_12_16_2014_13_03_00_CommentText.txt

=====

I support the petition.

Quite the corrupted system we have. And by system I mean government.

Comments provided by :

Kay, Zachary

=====

=====

I am 83 years old, Korean Veteran, What happen to our Country! We served and protected our Country, for our Grand kits, lost many men all the wars that we are having today. I have never seen our Country in such a bad shape. What is our Government doing today! You tell me!
God bless us, and the USA.
Regards Erwin.

Comments provided by :
Taper Korean Veteran, Erwin

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_TARTAKOFF_DAVE_12_19_2014_16_55_15_CommentText.txt

=====

Just follow the US Constitution
Freedom of speech means FREEDOM OF SPEECH !!!!!
Who died and made yoos G-D ???????????

Comments provided by :
TARTAKOFF, DAVE

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Watson_Ryan_12_19_2014_18_54_06_CommentText.txt

=====

The internet is fine the way it is. I am sick of the biased media feeding us garbage for news. The internet has been instrumental in bringing me facts and various resources to get the information i need. Most of it never makes it to the TV. This is nothing but a move to silence the cold hard truth. The internet needs to be left alone! Period.

Comments provided by :
Watson, Ryan

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Kilgarriff_Jeffrey_12_19_2014_20_01_57_CommentText.txt

=====

Stay out of regulating speech on the internet. The commission members are completely incompetent at identifying any speech as inappropriate and are agenda driven.

Comments provided by :
Kilgarriff, Jeffrey

=====

=====

It is my understanding that the FCC is considering increased regulation of the internet under Reg 2014-01. Please note that this would be an inappropriate and unconstitutional trampling of individuals' free speech rights. The internet has been, and should remain, an open forum whereby anyone can express their thoughts, viewpoints and opinions on any subject they choose and at any time they feel like it. The government's duty is to protect free speech... especially political speech. The idea that the government has any right whatsoever to limit political discourse goes against the very principles this country was founded on. It is my sincere hope that you will do the right thing by keeping the government out of the internet and making sure there is no regulation, a/k/a restriction, of people's rights to express their thoughts, political and otherwise, online. Thank you for attention to this important matter.

Comments provided by :
Burke, Jeff

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Fisher_Tom_12_20_2014_14_08_46_CommentText.txt

=====

To FEC members; Stop trying to politicize the internet by muzzling the internet's 1st Amendment's
protections!

Tom Fisher

Comments provided by :

Fisher, Tom

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Wood_Walter_12_20_2014_21_32_53_CommentText.txt

=====

OPPOSE reg 2014-01

Political commentary including advertising posted on the internet should continue to be exempt from campaign reporting requirements. Individual bloggers and online commentators must be vigilant to guard their first amendment rights to free speech without interference or intrusion from government.

Comments provided by :
Wood, Walter

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Hall_Gerald_12_21_2014_19_17_09_CommentText.txt

=====

I DO NOT want the FEC regulating my first ammendment rights by restricting my facebook posts or any other of my internet or written comments

Comments provided by :
Hall, Gerald

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Starr_James_12_22_2014_09_53_26_CommentText.txt

=====

Let freedom ring. Government needs to keep their hands out of our private matters. The power to tax is the power to control.

Comments provided by :
Starr, James

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Williams_Durbin_12_22_2014_10_08_06_CommentText.txt

=====

I see absolutely no reason for the FEC to in any way to regulate free speech. Especially comments that may be construed to be "political".

What authority allows the FEC to regulate public expression?

Comments provided by :
Williams, Durbin

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Rudolf_Ludwig_12_22_2014_12_47_08_CommentText.txt

=====

A tendency & attempts to "regulate" speech - in particular, speech in/over Internet - stem from totalitarian mentality. Repeat : TOTALITARIAN MENTALITY.

Voltaire: "Monsieur l'abb?, I detest what you write, but I would give my life to make it possible for you to continue to write."

Otherwise, see First Amendment.

Comments provided by :
Rudolf, Ludwig

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_thoma_michael_12_22_2014_13_14_30_CommentText.txt

=====

The FEC shouldn't in any shape nor form regulate the internet.

Comments provided by :
thoma, michael

=====

=====

I believe that the Internet is one of the few things that we have left in America where we can share things with others, voice our personal opinions, etc. without the government interfering. The Internet has leveled the playing field between the big businesses of this country and the smaller businesses that do not have unlimited budgets. It is a wonderful resource that we can all enjoy. "We the people" do not need more government regulations trying to stifle free speech. Please do not put it under another government regulation that will encroach on our free speech. Please LEAVE THE INTERNET ALONE!

Comments provided by :
Leffingwell, Nancy

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Geary_Jon_12_22_2014_14_05_19_CommentText.txt

=====

STOP TAKING OUR RIGHTS AWAY!

Comments provided by :
Geary, Jon

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_khoury_robert_12_22_2014_15_29_29_CommentText.txt

=====

why change something that was so beautiful in its beginnings. No reason to have your hands into everything.

Comments provided by :
khoury, robert

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Lamore_Vaughn_12_22_2014_15_43_51_CommentText.txt

=====

I do NOT like more Government Intrusion into my life and that said I will NOT accept more of it in the form of a new tax on the internet disguised to control us and track users for everything they do online. I won't pay another dime on any Tax legislation passed regarding use of the internet. Lastly, if this gets approved then I among other will join a growing groundswell of supporters to insist our congressman to defund FEC drastically so that you will NOT be able to implement government control of any kind on the internet! Have I made myself clear people?

Comments provided by :
Lamore, Vaughn

=====

=====

- ?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.

Comments provided by :
Bridgewater, Ed

=====

=====

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.

Comments provided by :

Fox, Michele

=====

=====

PLEASE give us a break the government does not run the world. We have a right to be free. And it will always be our right.. IF the government trys to take our freedom that we have left away they will find out that a civil war will happen. Obama needs to be removed from his spot in the government. He has no right to be our president anymore. He has done more wrong things in his term then any other president or all our presidents in the past put together.<<<<<<< OBAMA IS NOT A GOD AND WE NEED TO MAKE SURE THAT HE KNOWS THIS>>>> IF we let him get away with what he is doing the world is going to goto the crapper.....

AT least President Clinton only screwed one person OBAMA is screwing the whole United States.

Comments provided by :
gould, richard

=====

=====

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 end

I am writing this for both myself and my wife as we are both disabled and retired and due to high medical and prescription costs we don't have the finances to use postal mail to contact our Senators, Represenatives and other Government Officials to advise our feelings on policies and regulations which affect us so it is imperative that we have FRER access To a free internet!

Respectfully submitted,

Donald and Susan Klapproth

Comments provided by :

Klapproth, Donald

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_kissoff_karen_12_22_2014_16_58_22_CommentText.txt

=====

Please take time to keep my first amendment rights for free speech on the internet.
My online posts and communications fall under the first amendment and should not be regulated. I will
be watching who votes this in and will take action in the voting booth(I vote in all elections). Please stop
all action on limiting my first amendment rights

concerned taxpayer
Karen Kissoff

Comments provided by :
kissoff, karen

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Nolte_Charles_12_22_2014_17_14_51_CommentText.txt

=====

I refuse any limits on my speech

Comments provided by :
Nolte, Charles

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_rubright_annette_12_22_2014_18_41_35_CommentText.txt

=====

we the people do not want our internet regulated by the government ,

Comments provided by :
rubright, annette

=====

=====

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.

Comments provided by :
Salib, Marcella

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Madruga_Joseph_12_22_2014_19_45_10_CommentText.txt

=====

Dear Sirs:

Please leave the internet alone!! It doesn't need any government regulation; it has been doing fine all by itself! Your regulation will hamper innovation and creativity.

Sincerely,

Joseph J. Madruga

Comments provided by :
Madruga, Joseph

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Forsberg_kent_12_22_2014_19_46_36_CommentText.txt

=====

I as a private unemployed citizen take advantage of a free internet. If fees are charged, I and others lacking in funds will be restricted in our usage. I think such would restrict our ability to communicate and would tend to isolate those of us who do not drive and lack employment. I do not want my access to the internet to be restricted by what is free such as when government fees or taxes are part of online transactions.

Comments provided by :
Forsberg, kent

=====

=====

The right to free speech is an unalienable right that our Founding Fathers recognized as fundamental to the individual pursuit of happiness and pre existing the formation of government.

Those who would curtail, hinder, impede, or deprive others of this right do so at their own peril and that of their children. For ultimately no one can bring harm to another without bringing harm upon themselves.

Freedom of speech; the right to criticize, scrutinize, excoriate, government in whom so much trust is invested by "We the People", having been purchased by the blood of fallen patriots, is so precious a thing that it will never be "given up".

We stand against any persons, agencies or governing bodies whom are willing to violate our right of free speech.

Kirk Hepburn, representing a local community of like minded citizens.

Comments provided by :
Hepburn, Kirk

=====

=====

What happen when did we become a communist country, what happen to we the people! Not we the government, what happen to our constitution and amedments that govern our government, its such a shame that our four fathers had made to stop our goverment from Tierney! it is such a shame that our government tell us what to do, we have let our government get out of control for so long that now there trying to remove amendments these amendments our here to control our government not the government control us!!!! It sadden me to see our government trying make us communists! You need too think about the people not what the government needs we need to take care of us not other countries we need to focus on the us bring back job you gave away we our making nation weaker and weaker, so please do not change or remove any amendments! Its we the people!

Comments provided by :
Gomez, Kelly

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Moline_Dan_12_22_2014_22_04_24_CommentText.txt

=====

Keep the internet free and free from the government that is trying to shut opposition down of the people. Just because you Obama don't agree with the majority of "WE THE PEOPLE", does not give you and the left radical party of racist a right to take control of our free speech!

Comments provided by :
Moline, Dan

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_vrahnos_chris_12_22_2014_22_24_13_CommentText.txt

=====

The constitution must be up held at all costs.Any changer that run afoul of it should never be brough up.

Comments provided by :
vrahnos, chris

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Tavares_Dennis_12_23_2014_00_08_40_CommentText.txt

=====

*DITTO(USA)!!!

>

>

>

Comments provided by :
Tavares, Dennis

=====

=====

I routinely attend a group study on many things in the Government and Banking sectors and our group meetings cover a wide range of current event discussions as a group and we all some how came together over the years and we are a slightly better informed, by saying slightly I mean far more then most about what we see going on behind the scenes in this country today. And this REG 2014-01 is sure to be an item for discussion group wide. My personal feeling is this notion should just stay exactly that, just a notion, and a bad one at that. I object to it, as my gut feeling is this is how slippery slopes are discovered only after it's too late.

If we start monitoring political dialogs on the internet and thereby end up suppressing such discussions by regulating those who host such dialogs and blogs by regulating and monitoring their activities financially then those who hold such open forums will end up being silenced by the very system that claims to represent us, the people. In essence this will be the same thing as the IRS was just caught doing very recently. This is the stuff that distrust gets built on.

Any Government that seeks to suppress free speech is in it's self, by definition, not a free Government from and of the people it claims to represent. History is rife with such Governments, and they are history are they not?

I wish to thank the FEC to let me air my thoughts on this REG 2014-01 proposal, lets keep it just that.

Comments provided by :
Rhodes, Eric

=====

=====

- ?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.

Comments provided by :
Watson, Ralph

=====

=====

Dear Mr. President and law Makers,

The infringement on our constitutional rights of "free speech" is an extraordinary over reach of power!!! It says in the Bible the TRUTH will set you FREE!! To stifle this truth is to put us back to the day when only the kings and noble men had the access to certain books and knowledge, the common people were not allowed and were not free!! We can't believe our eyes and ears is this Nazi Germany?!! Dear God save us from this disaster!

Our company depends on the ability to advertise and sell on the internet. We no that if this rule would be in place it's just a matter of time when the next items are governing individual companies and persons from the freedom of speech and commerce!!!

We ask you to please stop this lawlessness now for the sake of our children and grandchildren, for the sake of all the men and women who lost lives and loved ones for our freedom we ask you to STOP!!!!!!

Truly,
D. Wren
Spokes Person
Then and Now Clearance Center

Comments provided by :
Wren, D

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Smith_Jack_12_23_2014_06_34_45_CommentText.txt

=====

Freedom of Speech, whether oral, written, or visual, is one of the basic protected freedoms of all Americans. There should never be any effort to curtail the ability of the People to speak openly and freely about our government, or any other matter.

Comments provided by :
Smith, Jack

=====

=====
Lee Goodman
Federal Election Commission
999 E Street NW
Washington, D.C. 20463

Dear Chairman Goodman:

I am writing to you in opposition to "REG 2014-01 Earmarking, Affiliation, Joint Fundraising, Disclosure, and Other Issues." This proposed rule change is one of the greatest threats to freedom of speech that we have seen in America in my lifetime.

Currently, individuals are allowed to discuss politics and even make videos to post online, in which they discuss politics. It is truly "Free Speech" as the Founding Fathers of our nation intended. This robust political discussion happens every single day on personal blogs, popular websites such as Facebook and YouTube, and on large news websites such as the Drudge Report and the New York Times.

Under this proposed rule change, individuals would be treated as political entities engaging in paid political speech. They would be regulated just like big super PACS and would be required to fill out mountains of paperwork to submit to the FEC.

If I have to purchase a license from the government to engage in speech online, then I do not actually have "Freedom of Speech." Repressive governments already use censorship boards like this to troll the internet for any dissent; this chilling of free speech has no place in America!

Regulation also brings enforcement along with it. If we the people refuse to abide by this rule change, are you planning to fine and imprison all of us?

This rule change is clearly unconstitutional and you need to stop it. Vote NO on this plan to censor speech on the internet!

Sincerely,
Eliz carlson

Comments provided by :
Carlson, Eliz

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Williams_David_12_23_2014_13_27_47_CommentText.txt

=====

I guarantee an underground net will develop one nanosecond after you power hungry thieves grab our net.

Yes, I said OUR net. It does not belong to any government.

As with every other human endeavor it functions best with the least possible interference by self righteous know-it-alls like you.

Comments provided by :

Williams, David

=====

=====

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.

Comments provided by :

Pogue, Terri

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Finley_James_12_23_2014_17_24_03_CommentText.txt

=====

Please. No new regulations pertaining to the internet! This is a free speech issue. We cannot allow ANY intrusion from OUR government in this sacred area of our lives. The internet is the ONLY place left where speech is free! We can handle the negative raw speech from others on our own with out federal referees! This is a FREE republic, not a soviet block country.

Comments provided by :
Finley, James

=====

=====

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.

Comments provided by :

Bruton, Jay

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_cooper_jackie_12_24_2014_15_38_40_CommentText.txt

=====

The U.S. government is continuously intrusive in our private lives...and it HAS TO STOP! We do not need a dictator in chief. We need a President who will lead us to prosperity.

Comments provided by :
cooper, jackie

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Rockefeller_Ronald_12_24_2014_21_20_02_CommentText.txt

=====

Keep the FEC out of our internet! No government involvement or control!

Comments provided by :
Rockefeller, Ronald

=====

=====

I am appalled at the change (on page 1,599) in the spending bill that increased the limit from \$32,400/year to \$777,600/year in political contributions that may be made by individuals to funds and committees run by the Republican and Democratic parties! This is ridiculous. \$32,400 was already well beyond the amount an ordinary citizen could contribute. But the new level gives an insane amount of power to the most wealthy, people who have their own interests at heart, not mine. Money talks and theirs is not speaking for me. Reject/repeal this change - please!!

What we really need is a way to finance elections and candidates so that everyone has the same amount of money to spend. Let the strengths or weaknesses of issues and candidates speak for themselves. Election results should NOT be decided based upon who has the most money to spend to try to influence results.

Comments provided by :
Rhodes, Kathleen

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_Fitzgerald_Gayle_12_29_2014_21_51_54_CommentText.txt

=====

I favor strengthening the disclosure rules so that voters know who is behind the messages intended to influence my vote.

Any organization that pays for political ads should be required to make available to the public the names of all of its donors.

Comments provided by :
Fitzgerald, Gayle

=====

Attachment: REG_2014_01_McCord_Larry_12_30_2014_16_24_58_CommentText.txt

=====

Freedom of speech are key to the American Society. Those who disagree to what is being said is also free to state his opinion. Federal bureaucrats (whatever Bureau) should not be allowed to censor these spoken opinions. This freedom of speech applies to the Internet as well as other forms of communications.

Comments provided by :
McCord, Larry

=====