

Any regulation of free speech, in any form, which this regulation is designed to do, can only lead to trouble for all Americans. This regulation attacks the very essence of what the United States is; what makes us different from China, Cuba, the former Soviet Union and the like. It is an attack on the Constitution itself and is counter to the oath that all Federal officials and employees swear to uphold. Any author or supporter of it should be held to account for this most serious transgression against the American people.

Comments provided by :
Mangraviti, Nicholas

The FEC is tasked with regulating money spent on elections. You have no duty to regulate political speech. Stay out of it.

Comments provided by :
Aaron, Josh

I do not want my internet regulated! Will you please abide by what the American people desire?

Comments provided by :
Abbott, Mark

Why do you think the freedom of speech is the FIRST Amendment? How dare you keep trying to change the constitution for your own purposes. The constitution is perfect the way it is in it's original form. This country was built on freedom of speech, no matter what changes in the past, present, or future. Our government is suppose to be FOR THE PEOPLE, no in charge of them.

Comments provided by :
Abbott, Susan

Free speech is not free if it involves having the most money. Just as you cannot cry fire in a crowded theater you should not be able to fill the airways with false and misleading statements tax free to convince people of your personal concepts and ideas. If you want to spend your taxed money that should be all right, but you should not expect the public to support your ideas through tax exemption.

Comments provided by :
abfalter, james

The FEC is tasked with regulating money spent on elections, not political speech.
This violates the 1st Amendment - free speech.
More government bureaucracy and regulation is destroying freedom.

Comments provided by :
Abram, Ted

The Internet is a medium for the expression of opinions and is protected by the 1st Amendment. Stop trying to control the Internet - leave it alone!

Comments provided by :
Acevedo, Pedro

DO NOT TAKE AWAY AMERICA'S FREEDOM! Leave the internet alone. It is not the FEC's job to become a censorship board. Do the job you've been tasked with and stop trying to create hardships upon the citizens.

Comments provided by :
Ackeridge , Susan

As an American Citizen I want the Government to be 'FOR THE PEOPLE' as it was designed to be. You work for us. Now do as we tell you we wish you to do, or get out. This is what the oath you took when you gained your office. Live up to it or get out. We don't need you.

Imagine, the American Government regulating what we can SAY! The only talking points that are said are the ones YOU in DC say. We are obviously sick of all of you. The election should have told you that but obviously you don't listen. Who needs anyone around that doesn't listen to them. You are like little children running around to see what you can get from someones candy sack. Well, we are taking the candy away. No Amnesty! No wacky spending! No laws passed we don't agree with! No pay raises except to the Military! No more paid vacations unless you are in your office and working. No more of putting our people in harms way without the Generals leading and Obama is no damn general! We are sick of the destruction of our great country. We are taking it back.

A 75 Year Old American completely embarrassed by her Government.

Comments provided by :
Acton, Mike

Subject: "Useful Idiots"

2014

History lesson:

This has been around before ---- it cannot be re-sent too many times. As you read #6, think: "Common Core."

Saul Alinsky died about 43 years ago, but his writings influenced those in political control of our nation today.....

Recall that Hillary did her college thesis on his writings and Obama writes about him in his books.

Died: June 12, 1972, Carmel-by-the-Sea, Ca

Education: University of Chicago

Spouse: Irene Alinsky

Books: Rules for Radicals, Reveille for Radicals

Anyone out there think that this stuff isn't happening today in the U.S. ?

All eight rules are currently in play

How to create a social state by Saul Alinsky:

There are eight levels of control that must be obtained before you are able to create a social state. The first is the most important.

1) Healthcare— Control healthcare and you control the people
(OBAMA CARE ANYONE??)

2) Poverty – Increase the Poverty level as high as possible, poor people are easier to control and will not fight back if you are

providing everything for them to live. **(EXCESSIVE RULES AND REGULATIONS TO STIFLE BUSINESS)**

3) Debt – Increase the debt to an unsustainable level. That way you are able to increase taxes, and this will produce more poverty. **(OUR NATIONAL DEBT IS INSANE NOW AND RAPIDLY GROWING DAILY)**

4) Gun Control– Remove the ability to defend themselves from the Government. That way you are able to create a police state. **(POTUS (President Of The United States) WANTS TO USE ANY EXCUSE TO DECLARE MARTIAL LAW AND TEAR OUT OUR SECOND AMMENDMENT THEN WITH THE AID OF HIS STORM TROOPERS!)**

5) Welfare – Take control of every aspect of their lives (Food, Housing, and Income) **(48 % OF FOLKS NOW RECEIVE SOME WELFARE SUBSIDIES AND THE LISTS GROW DAILY!)**

6) Education – Take control of what people read and listen to – take control of what children learn in school. **(OBUMA'S MINIONS ARE CHANGING OUR CORE EDUCATION AND TAKING OUT ANTI-MUSLIM TOPICS AND ADDING PRO-MUSLIM MATERIAL; THEY ALSO KILLED MARRIAGE DEFINITION AS "ONE MAN AND ONE WOMEN"!)**

7) Religion – Remove the belief in God from the Government and schools **(AND DENYING WORK PLACE VIOLENCE AS TERRORISTIC WHEN THEY ARE AND PLAYING DOWN ANTI ARAB MUSLIM SENTIMENT AND PRESSING AN ANTI-ISRAEL AGENDA)**

8) Class Warfare – Divide the people into the wealthy and the poor. This will cause more discontent and it will be easier to take (Tax) the wealthy with the support of the poor. **(MAKE THEM PAY)**

THEIR FAIR SHARE!)

Does any of this sound like what is happening to the United States ? ***(IT IS ALL HAPPENING NOW! WAKE UP AND SMELL THE STINK OF SOCIALISM, IT IS HERE! NOW!)***

Alinsky merely simplified Vladimir Lenin's original scheme for world conquest by communism, under Russian rule. Stalin described his converts as "Useful Idiots." The Useful Idiots have destroyed every nation in which they have seized power and control.

"It is difficult to free fools from the chains they revere."

Please keep the Internet free from Government censorship and support the First Amendment rights of all American citizens. Thanks.

Comments provided by :
Adam, Kelley

the internet should not be regulated! But taste & common sense should be a guide.

Comments provided by :
ader, harriet

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 :

Adkins, Charles

There's only one restriction against the First Amendment: when it presents a "clear and present danger" such as saying someone's life was going to end unnaturally very, very, very soon.

Also, the FEC's key responsibility is regulating money spent on elections, not political speech.

What they're proposing is simply too costly to taxpayers and far too difficult for even them to enforce.

Comments provided by :

Akers, Kevin

Free speech is critical to keeping a free America! Please don't make any regulation that impacts use of the internet. The internet is a major method of communication and it should not be impaired or limited in any way.

Thank You
Michael Albers

Comments provided by :
Albers, Michael

We do not need the FEC to regulate the Internet.

Regulating money spent on elections is the job of the FEC - not political speech.

We don't need new regulations on posting online.

Comments provided by :

Albertson, Sharron

If your a communist move to China or Russia or Cuba I'm sure you will be happier there. If you are an American leave our freeking rights alone....., stupid

Comments provided by :
Albro, Michael

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 :
Alexander, Jason

Dear sirs,

I am very troubled that you wish to insert a political censor into the Internet Public spaces. The Internet serves as an open forum ,marketplace for the free exchange of ideas. There is no room for censorship of free speech especially as it pertains to political ideas. Do you really wish to entertain such totalitarian ideas? Are we still the land of the free? Or are we only free if we speak and think a certain way. I am from a long line of Democrats and I think they would all be appalled by your proposals.

Comments provided by :
Aliotta, Armand

Forget trying to regulate the internet.

Comments provided by :
Alldredge, Don

To whom it may concern,

I am writing today to try and sway a change of mind for taxing the public's Internet. I have always said if it is not broke don't fix it! this is one of those Situations that everything is moving along smoothly, why would you need to charge A 16.1% tax by including taxes for the FCC on our internet bill that rises every Month? that could potentially be the biggest Tax increase ever on the internet in History, it is one of the last free enterprises we have left, people are free to Create anything from work at home Jobs, to selling personal products, And opening Up new online stores and services. the internet is used for education And reaching Out to loved ones all over the world. not to mention some of our jobs require Internet so it needs to be affordable for All to use freely, please consider a Different venue for getting extra tax Dollars.

Thank you in advance,
Kimberly Allen
(AKA)
We the people!

Comments provided by :
Allen, Kimberly

LEAVE OUR FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHTS ALONE - WE DON'T WANT THE INTERNET REGULATED NOR DO WE WANT YOU POLICING FREE SPEECH.

Comments provided by :
Andersen, Nancy

Greetings,

It seems to me that the FEC is tasked with regulating money spent on elections, not political speech. I am concerned about the idea of 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 carefully consider these concerns.

Thank you,
Jill Anderson

Comments provided by :
Anderson, Jill

We do not need more government control

Comments provided by :
Anderson, 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 enforce.

FEC has no business regulating internet.

Comments provided by :

Anderson, Roy

It is my opinion that

- ? 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 :
Antolic, Gerald

Democrats in the FEC are attacking the First Amendment. They're trying to regulate the internet. They're trying to regulate our free speech. I ask that all Americans stop the FEC's war on the First Amendment. I submit my comment to the FEC and let them know that I don't want them regulating my internet?

Comments provided by :

Apa, Lou J

We do not need the Government interfering with the internet. It is function quite well without Government oversight. Please leave this avenue of communication free.

Comments provided by :
Apicelli, Salvatore

I believe in a open and fair internet. But I do believe you can also help eliminating child pornography from the internet. All I ask ask is not to limit information to the public, which is the heart of freedom of the press. And please don't limit people from posting political feelings and ideas. Thank you for your time.

Comments provided by :
Ard, Ryan

We do NOT need the Internet monitored, especially private conversations. This is NOT Nazi Germany. We have enough Govt. intervention, drones, taxation on everything - S T O P !~!

Comments provided by :
Armstrong, Michael

The FEC should focus on what they are intended to govern and not overreach their abilities by trying to monitor the internet. 1. How would you pay for the staff to read internet posts? 2. What a nightmare it would be to enforce. 3. We as Americans have a constitutionally-guaranteed freedom of speech, even when those ideas disagree with the establishment.

The main reason this is a horrid idea to add regulation to the FEC is that our founders knew the trouble a government could cause it's people when speech about political ideas is monitored. Freedom of speech is a free flow of ideas and the FEC should be the least concerned with enforcing freedom of speech issues and more concerned with fraud in the voting booth. When illegal aliens are voting there is a major problem with our system.

The internet is the new newspaper, new radio and the new "pub" for sharing ideas and expressing one's opinion. The government and any of it's agencies needs to steer clear of monitoring the internet.

Comments provided by :
Arnett, Nellie

I DO NOT WANT YOU TO REGULATE MY INTERNET. WE ALREADY HAVE ENOUGH INTERFERENCES
IN OUR LIVES FROM THE GOVERNMENT AND OTHER AGENCIES.
ENOUGH IS ENOUGH.
LEAVE OUR INTERNET ALONE... MEANING AS IT IS.

Comments provided by :
Arrington, Ann

- 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 :
Ash, Ron

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 :

Ashe, Gary

Since when do we live in a communist country.

Get a clue about the oath you took, ie, protect the constitution, not shred it.

You should be ashamed of yourselves!!!

Comments provided by :

Askew, Daniel

Do not regulate my internet!

Comments provided by :
atkins, barbara

I am strongly opposed to your new position of regulating and fining messages sent online. It will cause much frustration of those effected by this besides being very costly for everyone. Many, many would have to be employed to accomplish this huge task and we are already taxed into poverty and can't afford additional costs to our monthly shrinking incomes. Besides I see this as just another one the Obama schemes to control the internet to his advantage to make sure the Democrats add to their power base in controlling Congress in spite of his great failure to keep control of the Senate and losing seats in the House. This, as I see it, is just another attempt for you to become even more powerful in your attempt to completely destroy this the greatest nation the world has ever seen to plunge it into the wasteland of socialism with you at the head as ruler. One of your minions has expressed his opinion that the American people are 'stupid', but he said it before they got smart enough to defeat your corrupt disciples at the midterm vote. May you continue to keep losing your power rather than gain more. Almost every piece of legislation you passed, and usually by illegal executive order, has created a scandal that you and your 'minions' are still trying to cover up. You are not only a disgrace as a president, you are also a disgrace as an American or are you really a natural born American?

Sincerely,

Earlene Babcock

Comments provided by :
Babcock, Earlene

To whom it may concern,

do not allow any regulations on the internet, this is free speech & must remain as such as the first amendment states.

Darryl Bailey

Comments provided by :

Bailey, Darryl

We have enough idiots in office now, making stupid decisions for a Nation founded on Godly principles and freedom. This is why we left England and started our own Nation in the 1st place. If people don't like it after 200 years, then let them leave and go some were that believes the same garbage. The liberals and there communist trash, need to leave America alone and find a place were people want to hear there trash - they might like Russia or Korea. We stand for freedom and against tyranny - that is foreign and domestic.

Comments provided by :

Bailey, Mark

To whom it may concern,

The FEC should be worried more about matters that actually matter. Instead you are bothering with what I say politically. Poor things are you so afraid that you might actually have to see and hear what the people really think and feel. The people have a right to free speech I do not ever remember seeing any thing that states free speech except when it comes to politics. I am sorry that is when we need our free speech the most so that what the people want and need gets taken care of.

Comments provided by :
Bailey, Stephanie

Leave our internet alone!! For heavens sake, can't you government people leave us alone? Is no area of our lives to be free from your snooping and control? Does the 1st Amendment, or the entire Constitution for that matter, mean nothing to you people? LEAVE OUR INTERNET AND US ALONE FOR ONCE IN YOUR LIVES, I BEG YOU!!

Comments provided by :
Bales, Walter

Democrats in the FEC are attacking the First Amendment. They're trying to regulate the internet. They're trying to regulate our free speech.

Three Democrat FEC Commissioners want to regulate your online posts and conversations. They're trying to control any political speech on the internet.

FEC, YOU MUST NOT REGULATE OUR INTERNET

Comments provided by :
Balgemann, Elaine

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.

Therefore, the FEC should not regulate the internet.

Comments provided by :

Balsam, Gerald

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 :

Barber, Aurelian

I don't think the FEC has right to regulate the internet. It is one of the few places can go and exchange ideas and have discussions about everything going on in the world. So I don't think any one entity should control it.

Comments provided by :
Barker, Cathy

?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 :

Barman, Jason

We do not need any one person or persons trying to regulate what has been given to us in our Constitutional rights! More regulation is not the answer!! Who are you to tell us what we can and can not do. I do bot believe that this was in your job description when you were ELECTED TO REPRESENT THE PEOPLE AND NOT YOUR OWN INTERESTS!

Comments provided by :
Barnes, Deborah

Please no more new regulations. Please let us keep our freedom of speech & thoughts. It is starting to get scary

Comments provided by :
Barrett, Thomas & Terri

I feel this ought to be free. Leave the internet alone and our free speech.

Comments provided by :
Barrett, Thomas

The Internet IS NOT BROKEN! It works just fine, but will NOT if the federal government takes it over as a utility. This is nothing more than a means for more taxation and control.

IF IT AIN'T BROKE, DON'T FIX IT.

Comments provided by :
Bartholomew, Jean

The Internet has been working fine. The FEC could NOT improve it in any way. The Feds will only mess it up and try to strangle free speech, our rights under the first amendment. In addition, the Feds will try to capitalize on it if it is treated as a utility and try to tax us more.

Comments provided by :
Bartholomew, Jean

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 :

Barton Jr., Raymond

Dear Sirs:

It has come to my attention that the FEC intends to regulate political speech on the internet; this, of course, would endanger speech that is protected by the First Amendment -- meaning that such regulation would be illegal.

In addition, even if implemented, it would pose an undue burden upon small businesses and individuals.

All of the pales compared to the biggest flaw -- that it is impossible to objectively determine the real identity of people on the internet.

Consequently, Democrats could pose as Republicans and vice versa -- resulting in innocent people being severely penalized for comments that, in fact, they did NOT make.

Consider the following: Joe Smith purchases a domain name (call it SOMETHING.COM); just as AOL.COM and YAHOO.COM are not responsible for comments that their users make, SOMETHING.COM claims the same cloak of protection.

Suppose, further, that various users of SOMETHING.COM establish accounts using fictional information (e.g. an address of 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, Washington, DC).

When FEC asks for user information, POTUS ends up being implicated.

Even worse, innocent civilians may have their address used without their knowledge.

There is no objective way to determine online identity; thus, there is now way to know who could be regulated.

Clearly, then, this proposal MUST NOT BE IMPLEMENTED.

Very truly yours,

Jeffrey Basch

Comments provided by :
Basch, Jeffrey

The government has no business regulating the internet and "protecting" people from themselves (which means protecting cronies who have paid for the favor). Stay out of our business for a change.

Comments provided by :
Basham, Donna

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 would also say this is nothing less than dictatorial action Please do not let politics ruin every branch of government because that is what is happening,thanks

Comments provided by :

Bateman, Raymond

The First Amendment says, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech,?"

I don't know of any powers delegated to the Executive Branch nor the FEC to do that in the Constitution. Or, by any law which created the Federal Election Commission.

This is an outrageous attempt to abridge freedom of speech. No censorship, no censors of political (or any speech), no rules or infringement upon the rights of the people should be tolerated.

Be that speech on street corners, in the press, or on the internet. I agree there is a lot of garbage on the internet. But I certainly don't want a government censor to decide what is garbage and what isn't. That is tyrannical suppression of ideas.

This proposed rule should die. Instantly; as well as the idiot "thought process" that went behind it, seeking to create it.

Comments provided by :
Bates, Bill

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 :

Bates, Charles

Keep your hands off the internet.

Comments provided by :
Beach, James

Regulating the free speech of citizens on the internet is blatantly unconstitutional. 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.

Comments provided by :
Beaman, Tabitha

These new regulations would be too costly and too difficult to enforce.

Comments provided by :
Beard, Jane

Please consider the following points regarding the regulation of political speech on the internet as it relates to the First Amendment:

- 1) The regulation of political speech on the internet is a direct violation of the First Amendment and can only be seen as an attempt to silence the opposition.
- 2) The FEC is tasked with regulating money spent on elections, not political speech.
- 3) Reversing the exemption for free postings online would have dangerous ramifications for constitutionally-guaranteed free speech.
- 4) 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.
- 5) This will place an undue burden on small groups and individuals.
- 6) These new regulations would be extremely costly for taxpayers, difficult to enforce, and (again) a violation of our Constitutional rights.

Comments provided by :
Beck, Joliann

I do not want this government to have power to infringe, restrict, or have any control over a free Internet. We are under the protection of the First Amendment of the Constitution of the United States of America.

Comments provided by :
Beebie, Mary

There are many ideas in the world, some good, some bad and some more or less in between. Curiously, you are now considering a very bad idea, regulating the internet. I have a fairly good idea how it will go?badly?so, for goodness sake, leave it alone. Forget it, drop the matter, pick up your toys and go home. This is a terrible idea!

Thank you for your consideration.

Comments provided by :
Beemer, Chris

Please do NOT regulate the Internet! I value my First Amendment rights and I EXPECT YOU TO DO THE SAME!! The Internet is, in my humblest opinion, the LAST PLACE OF TOTAL FREEDOM ON EARTH. Meaning, the freedom to speak as I wish, do business as I wish and the ability to do so WITHOUT the fear of government reprisal.

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.

Failure to abide by this request WILL RESULT IN POTENTIALLY SEVERE CONSEQUENCES FOR OUR NATION AND HUMANITY AT LARGE!! I speak on behalf of myself and on behalf of the General Public at large.

Comments provided by :
Beets, Stephen

Do not restrict our Liberty, but expand our LIBERTY.

Comments provided by :
Beighle, Don

Regulating what I say on the Internet is a violation of the first amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

Comments provided by :
Bendick, Robert

Less regulation, not more. That's the way to open up competition and increase choice, freedom of speech and quality of service. Creating a monopoly by introducing government regulation is not what the American people want. Make no changes.

Comments provided by :
Benitez, James

Please leave the internet as is currently exist. Any new regulation my complicate the system. Thank you.

Comments provided by :

Benke, Steven

I am very much against Reg 2014-01 earmarking, affiliation, joint fundraising, disclosure, and other issues for the following reasons.

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.

It is obvious that these regulations will infringe upon our freedom of speech and should not pass. This would be a total travesty against the American people.

Comments provided by :
Bennett, Barbara

Stay out of the internet. You have no business regulating any part of it. Keep it free. Keep it a free market. Stay out of it! My constitution says I have freedom of speech. you have no right to infringe on it!

Comments provided by :
benson, brendan

Please leave our Country alone, have you the "Democrats" pushed and shoved enough !!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Comments provided by :
Berry, Emmett

The internet is one of the great success stories of all time. It is a great democratic phenomenon which should not be subjected the self serving desires of special interests. It started and grew without government regulation. Government interference will only stifle its unbounded potential. Do not attempt to fix something that is not broken.

Comments provided by :
Biggins, Peter

As a Government employee myself, we are held at a higher standard to do our job's in an unbiased manner. When we politicize our office and act in favor of special interest we should personally be held accountable. I don't believe the F.E.C. should be involved in campaign speech. The people spoke out quite clearly in the midterms, we are not happy with the administrations policy's. We want less Government intrusion into our freedom and will go to added lengths to expose those that use their position in a biased manner.

Concerned Citizen
Michael Garcia Biglay

Comments provided by :
Biglay, Michael Garcia

The FEC is not authorized to control free speech in any format. Please stick to your mandate.

Comments provided by :
Birdwell, James

Didn't you leftist thugs learn anything from the IRS scandal and last week's elections? Keep your stinking Karl Marx hands off our constitutional rights or we the people will haul your sorry asses in front of a congressional committee like we did to Lying Lois Lerner and her corrupt cohorts. Except that this time (after 1 January) a Republican-controlled Senate will participate also. The game is up. BACK OFF!

Comments provided by :
Birkland, Ole

Please do not step on our first amendment rights trying to police the Internet! As a tax payer and American I believe deeply in our Constitution and isn't that the job of our government, to uphold the Constitution?! First amendment rights should never be compromised or trampled on, and this is exactly what you would be doing. The astronomical cost to monitor the Internet is another concern. Please stop invading our privacy, spending our money on nonessentials and trampling the Constitution of the United States of America. This is exactly why the democrats lost control of the Senate. We the people will no longer stand for intrusive government! We are ready to take up the fight! God bless America!

Comments provided by :
Bishop, JoAnn

The Inter-Net Works FAR Better than Any Government Regulated agency. Those Who Want to Increase their Inter-Net Speed Can, And, Do So By BUYING Faster Inter-Net Speed.

I Survive on Under \$25,000.00 A Year. I Have Never Had A Problem Getting What I Want, Need and CAN AFFORD.

Federal Government INTERFERENCE ("Regulation") Is NOT WANTED Or NEEDED!!!!

Comments provided by :
Bishop, LJ

Do not regulate the Internet. It does not need regulating. It will not need regulating. Our country is one of free speech. Free speech only needs to be protected when it is contrary speech, therefore the only reason you could have in wanting to regulate it is to put down contrary opinions to your own.

Comments provided by :
Blackburn, Philip

I'm in agreement with this

Comments provided by :
Blair, Paul

Do not mess with the internet! Trying to control the net is exactly what dictators do, this is a free country, lets keep it that way!

Comments provided by :
Bliss, Ralph

Do you Democrats, Republicans, Libertarians & Independents want Liberty or Tyranny? Because I KNOW that my God, the Father of my Lord and Savior Jesus Christ can and will give you Liberty (freedom from the penalty of sin, and freedom to serve Him in righteousness and sanctification) if you will only believe and receive the gospel of Jesus Christ by faith. He will wash away your sins, cleanse you and make you whole. THEN instead of going about trying to bring everyone else into the bondage of sin & death, you'll actually be seeking to LOVE GOD with all of your heart, mind, soul and strength and LOVE your neighbor as yourselves.

Sincerely,

Jan K. Blodgett

Comments provided by :
Blodgett, Jan

Dear Sirs: I feel that the proposed regulation of the internet by the FEC is inappropriate in this case because the FEC is charged with regulating the money spent on elections--not political speech. Also, i feel that the proposed regulations interfere with First Amendment rights. Thank you.

Mary Blue

Comments provided by :

Blue, Mary

I am writing this request to you to stop any actions on your part dealing with the internet or anything or anyone who uses the internet either for business; fun; or information for others. I DO NOT WANT THE GOVERNMENT OR UNITED NATIONS TO HAVE 'ANY' CONTROL OF ANY KIND WHEN DEALING WITH THE INTERNET. It is nothing more than another way the present government is trying to seize control of FREEDOM OF SPEECH or freedom by association when it comes to the use of the internet. Also I feel with government controls comes taxation !!!!

Comments provided by :
Bohlke, Gerald

FEC,

What is wrong with all of you? Are you all communists and fascists?

We are not China! China has censorship because it's afraid of China's people. Are you afraid of the American citizen? Well, you should be, but that does not give you the right on this earth to censor us, to moderate us, to eavesdrop on us or to decide for us and certainly you should have zero say and zero power over our individual lives and the lives of all of us collectively.

What the American people should do is to censor the FEC into the ground and start over with a group of people who are Americans and have the common sense to make equitable decisions as well as the sense of FREEDOM!

You forget, it's the freedom that America affords you to be communists and fascists and still live in America and to even have the opportunity to attempt to take away our freedom which is just one step closer to enslaving all of us.

The American citizen is paying attention to your hate for American Freedom.

Why don't all of you decide to become Americans again, or for the first time if you have never been. Or maybe you may choose to move to China.

Al

Comments provided by :
Bojorquez, Al

? The FEC is tasked with regulating money spent on elections, not political speech.
Do not become another government department that is overstepping the authority that was entrusted in it.
Can you not tell by the last election and recent events that the people of the US have about had it with
government intrusion into our rights ...

Comments provided by :
Bolte Sr., Keith

The FEC does not have the right to regulate the internet. The first amendment clearly states "Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech." There is no question regulating internet is an abridgment of these rights. Let all Americans exercise their rights. My enemy's rights and my own are one in the same. None should be limited. It would be unjust :) Thanks!

Comments provided by :
BONDS, ERIKKA

Mr. Chairman, you yourself called this "nothing short of Chinese censorship". Please don't let this happen!

Comments provided by :
Boomhower, George Wilson

Federal Elections Commission should not pass regulations which hinder political speech on the internet. The internet is an affordable tool for individual citizens to speak out on political issues through blogs, bulletin boards, comments to articles and email. It is where we citizens who cannot afford media advertising can make political speech to a wide audience. It's the modern equivalent of the street corner speech maker.

The FEC must not make regulations which effectively give the FEC or any government agency power to limit free speech. Postings online should be free of regulations. The Internet is a great leveling field where individuals and small groups can respond to the media ads of the rich and powerful or well funded PACs. The Internet is a great tool for grassroots democracy. want

We do not want speech police roaming the Internet. I urge the Commission to vote "No" on FEC regulations of Internet content.

Comments provided by :
Borgarding, 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.

?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 :

Borkowski, Carol

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.

An American for the constitutional rights of citizens,

Clelie Bourne

Comments provided by :
Bourne, Clelie

The FEC has no business regulating political speech. We have first amendment rights to speak our thoughts and opinions.

Comments provided by :
Braddock, Steve

Keep the Government out of free market trade.

Donald Braden

Comments provided by :
Braden, Donald

We do not need or want any rules made by our government that go against ANY part of our Constitution!!! This includes ALL Amendments!! Especially the First and Second Amendments!!!

Comments provided by :
Bradley, Jeffrey

China uses these kinds of controls, no liberal can support this

Comments provided by :
Bradshaw, Jess

To whom it may concern

As a private citizen and veteran I would recommend any documents or laws that would limit free speech on the internet or any device be condemned by any person or persons that are capable of making or voting on laws of this once great country. As a veteran i would advise everyone to remember that a lot of veteran who fought for the constitution please don't let there deaths be in vien no one should ever vote to take away any of our constitutional rights.

Yours Truly
Paul

Comments provided by :
Branch, Paul

The U.S. Constitution was created to protect basic human rights. You need to stop trying to subvert our Constitutional rights, you do not have the right or authority to stop any kind of free speech, including political free speech. We as a free people have the constitution to protect our rights and the only way to change those rights is by amendment, which needs to go through congress. With the majority of Americans demanding protection of their rights no amendment will ever pass congress.

Comments provided by :
Brice, Kevin

Why are we trying to fix something that isn't broken? The Internet is working just fine and free enterprise is shining. Leave the Internet alone. I do not now nor will I ever favor regulating the internet. Obama's comments that you have to regulate the Internet to make sure it keeps working, make no sense at all. It's about the only thing left in this country that is still working correctly. Everything that has been regulated no longer works right if at all...

Comments provided by :
Briggs, Randi

No on Internet Neutrality. Governmental oversight and control will stifle this dynamic portion of the free enterprise system that has been the driving force in development of the US. Even though it's predecessor was a DARPA project, the enterprise of the designers created this as individuals, not a government controlled effort.

The French government developed their own national data network before the internet was operational. Because of government control, they were unable to match the new technology which replaced the entire system. In the early days of cable providers, making them quasi utilities have caused America to lag in high speed internet access in a great part of the geographic areas outside metropolitan cities.

Government control stifles innovation and expansion, while protecting the present internet service providers from competition. However a more sinister and greater threat is the controlling the content and delivery of data, which can readily become a method to control speech for political purposes.

Free competition developed the internet, keep it free for all.

Vote NO ON INTERNET NEUTRALITY.

Sincerely,

Arlen Bright
Wallace, MI

Comments provided by :
Bright, Arlen

No FEC control over speech on the internet. What do you not understand about the Constitution and FREE SPEECH ?

The fact that you would even consider this threat to free speech is unbelievable and dismaying.

Shades of Orwell.

You should be ashamed for this. Have you no decency? Have you no COMMON SENSE? I think not.

I would like to say respectfully, but I do not want to lie.

Arlen Bright
Wallace, MI

Comments provided by :
Bright, Arlen

Regulation of the internet by the government is a violation of my free speech. The internet does not belong to the government and they have over regulated everything they get involved in. Government has become too big, too demanding and too controlling. This is suppose to be a Republic and the government needs to reduce its size and scope and stick to the powers the Constitution has afforded it and no more than that. It has already been proven that most of the departments are full of corruption and power grabs. Enough is enough. The American people are ready to take back their Republic and remind the government that you work for us NOT THE OTHER WAY AROUND. The voting should have made that perfectly clear.

Comments provided by :
Brooks, Lesa

Monitoring and regulating the internet for political or religious censorship or just plain looking at what Americans are ready or sending is against the 1st Amendment of the Constitution and not furthermore a waste of the American taxpayers money. This is suppose to be a free country, not Communist China or Russia or Korea.

Comments provided by :
Bross, Phyllis

Please do not regulate the internet.

Comments provided by :
Brown, Calvin

I am opposed to the FEC regulating free speech on the internet, especially political speech.

Comments provided by :
Brown, Richard

Please do not regulate the internet. Regulation will stifle free speech, fair trade, and free enterprise. Let's keep the internet free.

- ? 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 :
Brown, William

Do not regulate the internet at all NEVER. No rules should be put in place to regulate the internet EVER. Do I need to say more.

Comments provided by :
Bruce, Charles

Please Do not interfere with our first amendment freedoms. Internet or otherwise.

Comments provided by :

Bruce, Reggie

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 :

Buennagel, Micah

I deeply resent any attempt on the part of the government at any level to even attempt to limit political discourse. This country was founded on the principle of individual freedom, and one of our most basic freedoms is the freedom of speech. No unit of government should be working to limit that freedom in any way, and this is especially true of the FEC which should be regulating the integrity of our election process, but NOT the speech of citizens.

Comments provided by :

Buha, 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 :

Bullock, Sue

ABSOLUTELY NO!!!

THIS IS AMERICA, NOT CHINA OR GERMANY UNDER HITLER! NOR SHOULD IT BE.

WE WILL REMAIN AMERICA AND AMERICA IS GOD
GIVEN FREEDOM!!

WE ARE THE SAME AMERICA THAT WAS FOUNDED ON GOD, REGARDLESS OF WHAT A FEW
DEMOCRATS (or what ever they call themselves) WOULD LIKE TO BELIEVE!

Sincerely,

An American that will forever love God and the freedom God has given us!

Comments provided by :
Burkhart, Brandy

In light of the fact that our constitution grants the right of free speech I would urge the commission to stop all actions to monitor or regulate our rights of free speech on the internet. Do you not understand that we are American citizens and it would be wrong to abridge our rights.

Comments provided by :
Burkholder, James

Please do not sensor free speech on the internet or anywhere else. This is one of our most basic rights as a free people and unconditionally protected by our Constitution, which so far stills happens to be the law of the land.

Thanks.

Comments provided by :
Burton, 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. This would not result in "Net Neutrality" but rather it would limit freedom of speech, stifle access to content, increase cost of services for all users and slow the innovation of new technologies that is a benefit of the current free-market approach.

Comments provided by :
Burwell, Julie

Why are our first amendment rights being attacked? The internet is working fine as it is. Why "fix" something that's not broken? Of course, we all know the real reason. Democrats in the FEC want to regulate our free speech over the internet--especially our political speech over the internet!

This is unconscionable and this kind of politics does not belong in the United States of America! While I might not agree with everything someone says, we all know that men and women have died to protect our right to speak freely...and that right to speak freely should always be a part of this great country!

To even suggest that we should be "policing" the internet and judging what people can say, is completely ludicrous and un-American. Aside from that, it would take an army to do it and the last thing we need is another agency made up of unelected bureaucrats who can control our free speech and spend billions more dollars that we don't have!

Leave the internet alone! We have problems in this country that we NEED to discuss and try to fix. The internet is not one of them.

Comments provided by :
Butler, Sue

Why do the Democrats in the FEC want to regulate the internet? They'd like us to believe that they're "fixing" something that's broken, but the internet is NOT broken--so why mess with it? The real reason is that they want to regulate our political speech on the internet. Why would any American want that? Free speech is something precious to all Americans--or at least it should be, because American men and women have fought and died to protect it for us. And now these people want to allow an army of unelected bureaucrats to "police" our speech on the internet? This is unconscionable! It's ludicrous to think that this would be an improvement! What it would do is destroy one of the basic freedoms of this great country--because demolishing free speech altogether begins with a step just like this. We can't allow that to happen! If something isn't broken, there's no need to fix it! The internet is working just fine as it is so it should be left alone. We don't want an army of unelected bureaucrats telling us what we can and cannot say. Period!!

Comments provided by :
Butler, Sue

"If you like your doctor you can keep him"-Obama- of course there never needs to be any truth telling going on.

Comments provided by :
byrd, charles

I would urge you NOT to regulate the internet. Keep it free and open with regard to our free market system (at least what's left of it). Thanks.

Mike Byrne

Comments provided by :
BYRNE, MIKE

The FEC is responsible for regulating money spent on elections, not free speech on the Internet. Money spent on elections is out of hand and needs to be shored up: FEC needs to spend more time on that. Keep your hands off the Internet.

Comments provided by :
Cafaro, Kathleen

The FEC is tasked with regulating money spent on elections, not political speech. How about you do your real job and stop trying to regulate and monitor innocent citizens thoughts.

Comments provided by :
Caffrey, Jaron

the fec is tasked with regulating money spent on elections not on political speech. reversing the exemption for free postings 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 on line. 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 :
cagle, bob

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 :
Caldwell, 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 :

Callahan, Ann

If I am not able to express my opinion freely than what would bring new ideas and continued culture alive? This country was once known and still dwindles a hope of freedom and liberty and the ability to have your own beliefs. If you begin to regulate even the smallest amount then where would it stop? The same as some people abuse their freedom of speech they will certainly abuse the right to be offended by some ones speech. If we don't have our own opinions to conversate about and debate then we won't understand how to disagree without violence or crying hate crime or let alone be offended by any single statement made. This is an absolute terrible idea and the reason people are so easily offended by others opinions is because of not having to conversate their opinion because now they have an outlet to cry wolf. This bill will only bring the emotional security, maturity, and growth to an all time low

Comments provided by :
Campbell, Cody

This will place an undue burden on individuals and cause too many problems!

Comments provided by :
Cannon, Jerry

The Internet constitutes today's virtual Town Square, where historically colonists, Patriots and citizens were allowed to speak freely - the basis for the 1st Amendment! Suppressing Internet speech is nothing short of tyrannical censorship of political speech.

Comments provided by :
Carboneau, Jeffrey

We do NOT need nor want any agency to regulate the internet. It is not a public utility. To regulate is to censor my free speech.

Comments provided by :
Cardwell, Joyce

The government should not be regulating internet content in any way! Any controls once started will be abused and altered for the benefit of the party / group in power or with the most influence. The system and internet are operating as they should be without your or any other government regulation or interference!

Comments provided by :
Carey, Edwin

There needs to be no cesorship of the internet.

Comments provided by :
Carpenter, Thomas

- ? 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.

DON'T DO IT. THIS REGULATES YOUR INTERNET AND YOUR FAMILY'S AS WELL. THIS WILL IMPACT LEARNING ACTIVITIES IN SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES ACROSS THE US. THIS COULD ALSO IMPACT BUSINESSES THAT HAVE CONTRACTS OR SEEKING CONTRACTS WITH THE US GOVERNMENT. FREE SPEECH IS AFFORDED TO EVERYONE IN THIS COUNTRY. WHY DO YOU WANT TO IMPOSE YOUR OPINIONS ON WE THE PEOPLE, INSTEAD OF EVERYONE BEING CENSORED FOR POLITICAL OPINIONS AND MESSAGES. SHALL WE THE PEOPLE CENSOR YOUR INTERNET FOR YOUR ABILITY TO SEARCH AND GAIN INFORMATION ON THE 'NET AS WELLL?

WE HOME SCHOOL, SO YOUR CENSORSHIP WOULD LIMIT OUR ABILITY TO PRESENT UP TO DATE INFORMATION ON POLITICAL ELECTIONS AND OPINIONS OF ANALYSTS COMMENTING ON ELECTIONS AND OTHER MAJOR EVENTS. WHY WOULD YOU WANT TO DEPRIVE PEOPLE OF FREE NEWS SOURCES.

AS FOR THE MONEY ISSUE, EVERYONE HAS INTERNET AVAILABLE TO THEM FROM VARIOUS SOURCES. LIBRARIES, SCHOOLS, FRIENDS, BUT NOT EVERYONE HAS A TV, RADIO OR OTHER MEANS OF COMMUNICATION. STOP TRYING TO LIMIT INFORMATION TO THE PUBLIC. IT ONLY CREATES ANGER, CONFUSION, AND DISTRUST OF OUR GOVT. DON'T YOU POLITICAL FIGURES HAVE ENOUGH OF THAT TO DEAL WITH? WHY ADD MORE?

YOUR CONCERNED CITIZEN,

ANNA C. CARTER

Comments provided by :
Carter, Anna

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 :

Carter, Debra

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 :

carter, jeff

Veterans Day was celebrated yesterday & today I find out you are threatening our freedom of speech. Our Veterans have bled & died to protect the very freedoms that you are trying to take away. There's enough for you to oversee without policing our Internet conversations. Ever heard of the first amendment? STOP TRAMPLING OUR CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS!

Comments provided by :
Caruthers , Donna

Please keep all political hands off the internet.
Let it be free to serve and evolve as freedom indicates.

The internet should not be taxed or regulated.

The FEC should have nothing to do with the internet and its providers!

Regulations would adversely affect individuals and small groups - more than large organizations.

Comments provided by :
Case, Carl

I spent 20 years in the military and swore to uphold the Constitution. That oath does not end with my retirement and I fully expect government officials to do the same as long as they are employees of the U.S. Government (and thus, the people). This comment is specifically in regard to the proposed "censorship" of our Freedom of Speech through the regulation of the internet. Control of this sort clearly is in direct opposition to the First Amendment which guarantees our Freedom of Speech. I will never support any regulation, "law" or agency that goes against our Constitution!

Comments provided by :
Case, Debora

I do not want the Internet taxed in any way by our Government.

Comments provided by :
Case, Ward

Ladies and Gentlemen of the FEC,

Do not pass this REG 2014-01 Earmarking, Affiliation, Joint Fundraising, Disclosure, and Other Issues (McCutcheon)

Allowing the FEC to regulate online post as the FEC see's fit is communism.

Your commission exists to serve the citizens of this great country.

Your personal beliefs and views do not trump constitutionally-guaranteed free speech.

Stepping in the path of Free Speech is a direct violation of our First Amendment Rights.

Best Regards,

Jeffrey G. Casto

Comments provided by :

Casto, Jeffrey

Regulation of public communication. Hm. This is The United States of America, where freedom of expression has been protected since the 1780"s. I may not agree with what anyone states in any shape, way, and form. Some may not agree what I state publicly or privately. But that is the mark of a democratic republic that thrives: Protected freedom. Anyone who wants to monitor what I express and decide its acceptability or unacceptability is taking the role of an authoritarian thus giving him/her/themselves the right to infringe on my right of expression. That is nothing short of tyranny. Every country where I have lived in that was a dictatorship did/does control individual rights, the freedom of expression. Freedom of expression is the number one enemy of a dictatorship/tyranny - Cuba, Venezuela, Iran, Generalissimo Franco's Spain, are all examples of what monitoring of expression, both private and public, does. Any representative from any of the three branches of our government, from top to bottom, who wants to bring The United States of America down to the level of the nations mentioned below, I will fight against for the freedom of expression, and even promote any representative wanting to monitor what any American expresses to leave my beloved country to any other country of the world that monitors expression. I love freedom. I love the protection of everyone's freedom of expression. This is what makes The United States of America different and singular from any other culture, society, and country in the world. I want to keep it that way as this is what makes our nation thrive.

Monitoring the expression of individuals and groups is anti-american in character, it is against everything that all of our fallen brothers and sisters fought for in the past and the present, it is a mockery to every american, and we the people will not stand idle when we are threatened by individuals or groups who compromise our guaranteed freedoms. You are now on notice.

MAY GOD BLESS THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TODAY AND FOREVER!!!

Comments provided by :
Castro, Gabriel

This proposed regulation amounts to nothing but a costly attempt to censor political speech the commission disagrees with and is beyond the scope of the authority of the FEC. Specifically, the Commission is chartered to regulate the funds spent on Federal elections, not to regulate the political speech of the candidates, advocacy groups, and private citizens. This proposed regulation is therefore both beyond the scope of the authority of the Commission and in direct violation of the 1st Amendment of the U. S. Constitution.

Any attempt to regulate political speech requires a large increase in the staff of the Commission to do this; said increase obviously being costly in and of itself. Further the Commission will find itself embroiled in costly lawsuits and individuals and advocacy groups challenge this regulation in court.

Further, this regulation will impose serious costs of individuals and groups both to comply with the regulation, to prove compliance, and to defend themselves from Commission charges.

This regulation is unsound, un-Constitutional, and an imposition of Federal power. It needs to be removed/revoked.

Comments provided by :
Caswell, F. James

I do not want you regulating my internet.

Comments provided by :
Caudle, Elizabeth

None

Comments provided by :
Caufman, Linda

As a US citizen with the right to vote, I oppose any regulation on my First Amendment rights by regulating the internet.

Comments provided by :
Chako, Larry

To Whom it May Concern:

It is our understanding that you are considering a regulation concerning internet posts, You-Tube and so forth regarding political speech during elections. We are absolutely opposed to any more regulation like that or in that area. I realize you are to watch carefully and monitor the monies spent during campaigns. That is not limiting our thoughts and the speaking forth of or our thoughts. Please do your own job nothing else is required of you. Thank you for the service you do preform.

Comments provided by :

Cheek, Earl and Myrna

Please allow me to formally request to stop the proposed action of the FEC which is tasked with regulating money spent on elections, not political speech.

Exemption for free postings online would have dangerous ramifications for constitutionally-guaranteed free speech. Please reconsider this action of regulating the internet and stop any further action that would muzzle the free speech we have in this great country.

Anytime you remove any fence always pause long enough to ask yourself why it was put there in the 1st place. Lastly my hope is that your commission will seriously consider the unintended consequences of regulating this medium of communication.

Thank you for allowing me to voice my personal feeling about a matter as serious as this.

James Chicosky Sr.
JMJD

Comments provided by :
Chicosky, James

I am deeply concerned that the FEC is looking at stifling free political speech online especially since it appears to be one-sided in it's goals. The FEC has no business taking political sides when it comes to deciding what kind of speech should be allowed and what isn't. If an individual or a corporation decides to speak up for one candidate or party in general, that is their Constitutionally guaranteed right. Why go after a few conservative leaning websites such as Drudge Report when there are several more liberally biased ones including the main stream press? Attempting to control political speech would be a costly endeavour and potentially open the government to expensive legal battles that taxpayers cannot afford to pay for. Please reconsider any such attempt to discriminate against view points you do not agree with.

Comments provided by :
Childress, James

I am totally against FEC REG 2014-01. This would be a direct violation of the First Amendment's guaranty of free speech. It is not the FEC's job to monitor and/or regulate posting on the internet. I will be contacting my senators and representative to advise them to fight this with everything they have.

Comments provided by :
Childress, Keith

To propose reversing the exemption for free postings online and therefore causing dangerous ramifications for us, the American people, where our constitutionally-guaranteed free speech is involved, would be an unconscionable act against the very people you, as an agency of the government, are supposed to be protecting.

I, as a citizen of the United States, am against FEC regulating the internet. You are an agency whose job it is to regulate money spent on elections, not political speech. We, the people, have a right to speak our minds, and our constitution guarantees that right. The government has no right to control our speech on the internet, or otherwise. To propose that it does, is to go against the United States Constitution.

As if that were not enough to deter such a proposal, there is the additional cost to us, the taxpayers, in supporting such regulators as would be required in order to police the internet every day, in search of the potential violators. During a time when the economy is bad, the taxpayers should not be saddled with more extremely costly regulations, particularly since it will be difficult to enforce these regulations.

Therefore, as one of the people for which you represent and work, I urge you to consider the people of the United States in this instance, rather than those of special interest groups.

Comments provided by :
Chumney, Bonnie

Please reread Amendment 1: "Congress shall make no law...abridging the freedom of speech."

Now that you've got nothing to do, please get a real job in the private sector and quit wasting my taxpayer dollars.

Comments provided by :

Clark, Alan

I would like to know what country the Democrats think we are living in and whose Constitution they are trying to dismantle.

Our fore-fathers, in their wisdom, somehow saw ahead to these times and the hearts of men and how power corrupts mens' hearts and made provision in our Constitution for protection against such misguided, power hungry people. From the day this administration took office they have systematically taken away our freedoms one by one, GOD HELP US. When will true Americans stand up and say enough is enough? I think we are seeing the beginning with these November elections.

I, personally, do not want to see any more of freedoms taken away especially our freedom of speech.

My prayer is that America will last until the current administration is history!!!! We are the last country on the planet that enjoys the freedom we have, that is why so many people are trying to get in instead of out.

STAND UP AMERICANS, FIGHT FOR YOUR FREEDOMS! Yesterday we honored our veterans who gave everything to defend the freedom we now enjoy, don't let them down.

Comments provided by :

Coberly, Andra

You BIG GOVERNMENT BULLIES need to BACK OFF!
You have ZERO business attempting to police the Internet.
You were put in your position to SERVE, not RULE and REIGN, and RUN
ROUGHSHOD over the CITIZENS of these United States.
Ask your friends at the IRS how that's working out for them.

Why don't you clowns grow up and get a life.
You are most welcome!

Roy Coble

Comments provided by :
Coble, Roy

I do not want the FEC regulating my internet.

Comments provided by :
Collier, Dawn

as an American I will not hold to any federal agency trying to curtail my first amendments rights in any kind of form of speech or trying to regulate the internet for this purpose this is about politics to try to give an advantage of one polical party over another this is unconstitutional would be challenged in court which it would be defeated and you know it we have a bill of rights in this ountry and I suuggest you abide by them

Comments provided by :

collier, robert j

In the spirit of the First Amendment I urge you (do not) pass any regulations restricting the Right of Free Speech on the Internet.

Comments provided by :
Comisford, Richard

Dear FCC Members:

The Internet has been growing under private stewardship for decades and has benefited from private capital and intellectual advancements far beyond what a centralized government agency could attain. I consider any attempted to control the free enterprise aspect of the Internet equivalent to a repudiation of the 1st Amendment. The FCC and/or the Federal Government does not need to control the electronic highway; there is no benefit or return on investment under government controls no matter how well intentioned they may seem to those in Washington DC. The Internet does not need feckless oversight.

Regards,
Ken Compton

Comments provided by :
Compton, Kenneth

FEC The purpose of my email is to let you know that I do not approve of any internet restrictions that involves ordinary people communicating with each other or commenting on blogs. However, I do not object to restrictions on people who post pornographic comments, animal abusers and other vile disgusting things. Some censorship is needed but, not for ordinary law abiding citizens. Thank you, Patricia Compton RN

Comments provided by :
Compton, Patricia

To all three members of the Democratic Party, I'm asking you not to regulate free speech on the internet. Because it will shut down our voices indefinitely. Let's keep an open and free internet, so everyone can say what's on their minds in elections.

Comments provided by :
Cooper, Joe

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 :
Corbeil, Catherine

PLease do not allow them to regulate the internet.

Comments provided by :
Corgard, Tirrell

NO to FEC censorship.

The FEC is not supposed to be an enforcement arm of the power-mad executive bent on silencing free speech, surveiling all our communication and squashing dissent.

There are already quite enough agencies of the American Stasi State doing just that.

Comments provided by :

Coski, John

I see no reason, other than complete control of my life,
for the FEC to regulate what I say on the Internet.
As far as I know all you are tasked to do is regulate campaign finances.
Do not try to regulate our First Amendment RIGHT of free speech.
This is not a third world dictatorship or a Communist country.

Comments provided by :
Cotter, Timothy

As a law abiding patriot, I firmly believe in up holding the constitution as the law of the land and that this is an attempt that would violate the first amendment. The FEC needs to get a grip on voter fraud and see to it that ALL states have an updated list, as well as a valid photo ID system.

Comments provided by :
Coulson, Neil

DO NOT REGULATE THE INTERNET.

The FEC is tasked with regulating money spent on elections, not political speech. Any new regulations would be extremely costly for taxpayers, difficult to enforce. and against our first amendment rights.

Comments provided by :
Countryman, Nancy

This is unconstitutional and on many levels. This is nothing more than an erosion of freedom and truth protected by the 1st Amendment and simply because you the regulators don't like what you hear, see and read. I find it interesting that the panel members who desire to regulate free political speech are all democrats (little "d" intentionally presented). Despicable. What is in the best interest of the American people is freedom, not protected political speech for the Left or the Right.

Comments provided by :
Courson, David

The FEC is tasked with regulating money spent on elections, not political speech. No one has the right to control speech. I think it is absurd that the FEC is trying to take away free speech! Stop over reaching!
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 :
Covello, Robin

To whom it may concern,

Regulating free speech on the internet is against the constitution and free liberties of all Americans. To do so equals communism! Quit telling us what we can't do when the powers of Washington D.C. don't abide by the same laws.

Comments provided by :

covert, chris

No more eroding our rights please.

Three Democrat FEC Commissioners want to regulate your online posts and conversations. They're trying to control any political speech on the internet

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

Comments provided by :
coville, jon

The idea of regulating internet communications of words and ideas is completely unconstitutional and a travesty.
The American public will not stand for this intrusion into private life!

Comments provided by :
cox, diane

I refuse to have the government take away my freedom of speech. I am an intelligent human being and can competently make decisions for myself. I do not appreciate anyone being so arrogant as think they know better than me as to what I should and should have access to. I have already listened to Mr. Gruber and Obama lie and lie and lie and lie. They believe their own lies. Dear God, help these people see the truth and the way. The truth will set you free.

Comments provided by :
Craft, Julie

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

Comments provided by :
Craig, Deidre

We should respect each other freedom of speech.As a citizen of the United States this is a personal right.To have freedom to speak your mind .Without being regulated by the government.

Comments provided by :
Crawford, Sheila

the freedom of speech is not to be censored by Democrats Republicans or independence if you do not like what is said about the political standpoint then perhaps those concerned should start doing their jobs to represent the people vice themselves and quit worrying about light lining their pockets with money that isn't theirs the government is for the people by the people because of the people not Democrats not Republicans not independence and the sooner all the deceived little maggot start doing their jobs and that Republicans Democrats and independents this country will be a whole lot better off and quit spending my damn money

Comments provided by :
crosby, thomas

To Whom This Concerns, Freedom of the press, thought, comments, reading material, taxation,are all parts of the Bill of Rights. Taxing the population to death and controlling them has been tried before, it does not work. The internet must stay free and without taxes! You do not own it, but it is a way for us "little people" to read and discuss issues that are not presented by the main stream media. Leave it alone.

Comments provided by :
Cullen, Elizabeth

This is a complete invasion of privacy and cannot be allowed to happen! What is happening to our country?

Comments provided by :

Danch, Hilary

The FEC is not tasked with regulating political speech. These new regulations would be difficult to enforce, costly to tax-payers, and would have dangerous ramifications for constitutionally-guaranteed free speech.

Comments provided by :
Daniel, Jessica

Leave the internet free and open respect the first amendment of the U.S. constitution.

Comments provided by :
Danielsen, Steven

I do not want to see the internet regulated. Freedom of speech is too important. The internet should remain free of regulation and free of taxation.

Comments provided by :
Darragh, Curtis

I am completely against any regulation or law that legislates Internet use or regulates communication online. This law opens the door to other restrictions regarding my first amendment right to free speech. Do not promulgate this rule!

Comments provided by :
Davis , Rachel

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. Rather, hold politicians accountable to their false ads and false statements, and regulate that they can only use information which is proven to avoid outlandish demonizing of our fellow americans. How about regulating commercials better to remove conflicting allowability to be shown in commercials of any type. how about regulate teh type of cartoons people can air or show, to limit the useless knowledge our children learn on a daily basis, take intentional non moral actions out of the main characters. Do something worth making America better and stop trying to rape the american dream

Comments provided by :

Davis, Joshua

Keep the government out of the internet and do not monitor what people post.

Comments provided by :

Davis, Norman

WE THE PEOPLE WANT OUR BORDERS SECURED! WE WANT OUR ELECTED OFFICIALS WORKING FOR WE THE PEOPLE!

WE THE PEOPLE WANT OBAMA IMPEACHED AND IN PRISON FOR THE CRIMES AGAINST THE USA.

WE THE PEOPLE WANT OBAMACARE DEFUNDED AND THROWN OUT!

Comments provided by :

davis, randall

I DO NOT THINK THAT IT IS RIGHT FOR THIS IRRESPONSIBLE PRESIDENT TO TAKE THE PEOPLES RIGHTS AWAY ON WHEN AND HOW TO USE THE INTERNET. PLEASE DO NOT LET THIS HAPPEN TO THE PEOPLE. I AM SO TIRED OF WATCHING THIS DUMB STUPID, INCOMPETENT PRESIDENT DESTROY THIS COUNTRY BY THE STUPID THINGS THAT HE IS DOING TO IT WHICH DOES NOT MAKE ANY SENSE WHATSOEVER. I FEEL LIKE I DO NOT LIVE IN THE UNITED STATES ANYMORE BUT INSTEAD A THIRD RATE FOREIGN COUNTRY INSTEAD. WHEN WILL IT STOP, WHEN WILL SOMEONE IN THE CONGRESS OR HOUSE SAY ENOUGH AND DO THE RIGHT THING FOR THIS COUNTRY AND THE PEOPLE. THANK YOU.

Comments provided by :
DAVIS, SHERMAN

Do not take ANY ACTION which has the effect of regulating our free speech.

Comments provided by :

Dean, Thomas

I am against the FEC regulating the internet. The internet is working fine and does not need censorship or regulation. Political speech is protected under our Constitution, so the FEC has no place in this area. The proposed regulations are costly to taxpayers at a time when money is needed in other areas.

Leave the internet and our political speech free and open.

Comments provided by :
Decker, Christina

The proposed regulations to censure internet political speech will turn the United States , home of the free, into a third world dictator type country where freedom of speech is totally suppressed. What happened to the 1st Amendment? I am strongly opposed to any type of internet regulation whatsoever.

John L. DeLancey

Comments provided by :
DeLancey, John

Leave our Freedom of Speech alone!!

Never has it been so painfully obvious that we need an informed electorate than in the last 6 years! That is exactly why you want to keep us from speaking the truth about our elected official & those running for office!

Back off!

Comments provided by :
DeMichele, Gilbert

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.

Whatever happened to the First Amendment? Or perhaps you think you are above the First Amendment and can control what we say and think.

Comments provided by :

Dietz, Thomas

REG 2014-01 Earmarking, Affiliation, Joint Fundraising, Disclosure, and Other Issues (McCutcheon) must not pass. 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 :
DiGiovanni, Joseph

The FEC is becoming the KGB. The FEC's mission is to insure fare and honest elections, not regulate our freedoms away.

Comments provided by :
Dinubila, Robert

I do not want my free speech on the internet interrupted.Reversing the exemption for free postings online would have dangerous ramifications for constitutionally-guaranteed free speech and would be extremely costly to the taxpayers.

Comments provided by :
Divet, Theresa

Leave the Internet alone! The world uses the internet, and the Federal Government has no business getting involve in the Free Speech of the internet or passing any laws or having any Presidential Executive Orders to regulate the Internet. In other words, **KEEP YOUR HANDS OFF THE INTERNET!**

Comments provided by :
Doerner, Timothy

freedom of speech, do not allow gov't to regulate the internet

Comments provided by :
dougherty, william

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 :

Douglas, Bruce

To many people have die for our rights. I see this as a way to stop the truth getting to all the people. The only reason for this is to keep the truth about things going on in Washington dc It's a wolf in sheep clothing

Comments provided by :
dreyer, bob

I am against any regulation of the Internet. It has served me well for the last 25 years with only self regulation.

Comments provided by :
Duckworth, Thomas

Reversing the exemption for free postings online would have dangerous ramifications for constitutionally-guaranteed free speech. The Internet represents a threat to those who willingly ignore or attempt to regulate and change the First Amendment or any part of the Constitution. This attempt to regulate free speech via the Internet and target political content is blatant censorship. Communism or Fascism or any form of dictatorship must be countered. The very fabric of our society is in peril. I pray for common sense and those who have the courage to embrace our Constitutional freedoms.

Sincerely,

Morton Glenn Dudley
Libertarian and Tea Party Member

Comments provided by :
Dudley, Morton

Please do not try to "improve" the internet by adding any beurocratic nonsense. I do not want the government to become bigger nor interfere with what it already a very good product. Thank you.

Comments provided by :
Dudzinski, Chris

What part of the First Amendment were you unable to read? Your job is to regulate money spent on elections not political speech!

Comments provided by :
Duffau, Sara

Please consider the following factor concerning additional regulation of 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.

The internet has served the public well since its inception without politically motivated regulation. It seems that these additional regulations are aimed at silencing liberal dissent plus these new regulations would be extremely costly for taxpayers and difficult to enforce.

Comments provided by :
Duffey, Sr, Willard

Government needs to stay out of the Internet. There's true freedom on the Internet and it's not our fault that WE (America!) invented it. We don't charge anyone else for usage now!
Get out of our lives!

Comments provided by :
Duffy, Julia

To Whom It May Concern,

I Understand that The FEC is trying to control any political speech on the internet.

I am opposed and offended by ALL government overreach, which is exactly what this is!

I am an American citizen and have as much right to my political opinions as you do, and the government has no right to regulate those opinions nor police my postings expressing those opinions.

This is America, not Nazi Germany!

Sincerely,

Pastor Steven R. Dunning

Comments provided by :

Dunning, Steve

No more Government regulation of the Internet is needed.

IP should offer their highest speed and compete with other IPs on price. No more slow speeds and buffering should be allowed.

Comments provided by :
Eaton, M Kenneth

I like to see the FEC stay away from regulating my online posts and conversations. The people that are put into government need to enforce the constitution at all cost not be involved in proposals that weaken it. The First Amendment lets anyone says what they like to say on internet and there should be no politicians discussion of anything else.

Comments provided by :
Ebner, Robert

It is an infringement on my Civil Liberties to listen or read my e-mails and should not be done. I am a true American my Grandparent came here in the late 1800's to get away from peopel who did not respect their religion - they became proud American Citizens and it is not right do scan my website accounts.

Comments provided by :
Eisen, Myra

There is no need for the FEC to regulate anything but the money spent on elections.

Why not look at the money that is sent into the Democratic party that comes in at exactly that highest spent without having to give donor information?

Comments provided by :

eldredge, peter

It is my understanding that the duties of the FEC deal with regulating how money is spent in regards to elections, not with the freedom of political speech. Furthermore, we taxpayers are over-burdened as it is. How can we afford to hire a slew of employees to police the internet and social media. If we as a nation start regulating what one can say politically we will be no different than the other communist countries of the world.

Therefore as a citizen and a taxpayer, I urge our legislators to gaurantee our freedom not police it.

Comments provided by :
Elgar, Shirley

Censorship has no place in the United States. Please stop any and all attempts to regulate speech on the internet and allow the USA to remain the free country that it is.

Comments provided by :
Elkins, Dave

This is asinine! How dare the government take away MY right to Free Speech! This is WAY Out of hand! Go to Mexico, Iraq or ANY other 3rd World Country to Live if YOU refuse to Abide by the Constitution of the United States of America! You each Represent The Proud Americans of the United States of America! Don't you dare read between the lines of what Our fore fathers built this Country on and for! You each that want to do otherwise should be relieved of your duties and stripped of your citizenship regardless if born here on US soil and forced to live else where of The US! No retirement much less further pay! Accounts emptied in the US, including stocks and bonds etc. You have simply gotten Power Hungry and taken your position in the US Government the Wrong Direction! Such followers and NOT Leaders for the Good of the people of the United States of America! Wake UP Socialist Traitors!

Comments provided by :
Ellington, Elizabeth

I beleave in the constitution, that is what makes our country great however I feel the government is doing everything possible to eliminate our rights and freedoms that were and are the basis of the constitution. Our right to freedom of speach is now under Attack, and I am personally fed up with the government thumbing its nose at our rights as legal citizens of this great nation. Stop and re-read the constitution, I think you have forgotten what is written and what our fore fathers fought so hard for!

Comments provided by :
Elliott, Dianne

Your Job as the FEC is tasked with regulating money spent on elections, not political speech.

I do not want you regulating the internet.

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

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

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

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

We do not need this unnecessary burden. Thank you for listening.

Comments provided by :

Elliott, Michael

The Government must keep the Internet open as it is, no regulations at ALL.

There are TOO MANY regulations already, besides the cost to be incurred by the "little people".

Comments provided by :

Ellis, Kenneth

The first amendment of the Constitution which is the supreme law of the land, says in part, "Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people to peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government." That seems really clear to me that regulating or restricting people's right to speak, in person or on-line is clearly unconstitutional and a violation of our rights as people.

So I am adamantly opposed to these regulations.

Furthermore, the FEC needs to be an impartial group that is fair to all. Such broad regulations cannot possibly be evenly enforced, and I am sure this will lead to political targeting of particular groups or voices that the government finds troublesome. This would violate another fundamental principle that all men and women are equal before the law.

The current administration has a track record of doing exactly this, so why should I expect better behavior from future administrations with even more power?

I've said a pledge to "liberty and justice for all." That is one of the things that makes this country great--Liberty and Justice for ALL. These regulations will limit or perhaps eliminate people's Liberty, and that will only harm our great country.

Comments provided by :
Ellsworth, Aaron

REG 2014-01 is a direct attack on the First Amendment. This proposed rule regulates content on the internet. In effect, it regulates free speech. The FEC has no legal right to regulate online posts and conversations. This proposed rule controls free political speech on the internet, in violation of the Constitution's Supremacy Clause. The broad scope of the proposed regulations here are limitless, and to enforce these new rules the government will have to appoint censors who monitor online political communication every day. Even the Chairman of the FEC called this proposal "nothing short of a Chinese censorship Board." The FEC is tasked with enforcing Congressional law related to money contributed by donors to campaign PAC's, not political speech. Regulating online political postings would have highly dangerous ramifications for Constitutionally guaranteed free speech. The FEC would have to unleash an army of regulators to police YouTube, Twitter, Facebook and other internet sites on a daily basis to look for potential violations, and subject websites and their users alike to inquiries and penalties simply because they posted opinions online that the federal government doesn't "like." This will place an undue and unconstitutional burden on both internet web site owners and individuals who use their sites. These new regulations would also be extremely costly for taxpayers due to the onerous enforcement expense that will be required. If these new regulations go into effect, the internet will cease to be a venue for the free exchange of ideas, and will devolve into a propaganda arm of the federal government. I strongly urge the FEC to drop all further consideration of enacting REG 2014-01.

Comments provided by :
Engelman, Stewart

Don not regulate our free speech on the internet for your own political gain. If anything the people of this great nation should monitor the government online after what happened with the Irs...

Comments provided by :
English, Tom

The FEC is tasked with election oversight, not the censorship of free speech on the internet or anywhere else. Monitoring political speech on the internet will be too costly to maintain and the risk of mistaken identity is greater than the citizens of the USA will accept. Keep your hands off the internet and political commentary!

Comments provided by :

Eno, Doug

Dear Sir/Madam:

As you are well aware, it is your duty to preserve and enforce the rights of the people of these United States of America under the U.S. Constitution.

So be reminded once again. Your duty is to regulate money spent on elections, not political speech on the internet or anywhere else.

Be advised that I personally oppose all regulations and money spent towards regulating free speech on the internet; particularly free political speech on the internet.

I will ask my State and Federal representatives do to whatever it takes to oppose, reverse, and defund any attempts to regulate free political speech on the internet; including relieving the people responsible for this effort from their positions/duties for not upholding our values and freedoms under the U.S. Constitution.

Sincerely,

Mike M Enriquez

Comments provided by :
Enriquez, Mike

LAUS DEO

The job of the FEC is to regulate money spent on elections and not on political speech.

We do not need the FEC taking over the internet. Free enterprise is alive and well and is doing just fine; I wish that I could say the same for the government, which is broke and getting broker day after day, month after month, year after year.

Net neutrality - we don't need no stinkin' net neutrality.

E PLURIBUS UNUM

Comments provided by :
Erlewein, Joseph

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.

There is no reason to add to the budget and payroll that come out of the taxes of hard-working citizens, forcing them to pay to have their freedoms abridged.

Comments provided by :

Ernst, Ann

All I have to say this America and remember what applies to us applies to you, your party and your family also.

Comments provided by :
Escobar , Bonnie

I am opposed to any kind of restrictions to free access to the Internet, and don't want the government trying to regulate the Internet in any manner.

Respectfully submitted,

Henry E. Ethridge, Jr.

Comments provided by :
Ethridge, Henry

The internet should remain free of government rules. To create rules that limit use of the internet is unconstitutional as it restricts our free speech.

Comments provided by :
Evans, Judith

Please, Please, not another one again. we appreciate your help, but NO Thank you!
No more Regulation, Leave the Net alone, we like it as it is.

Comments provided by :
Evra, David

We need do not need government oversight of the internet. Giving the government oversight is the same as giving it control. Control leads to restrictions. Restrictions lead to abuses. Abuses lead to harassment. Hopefully, you can realize that is just another to further control the lives of the American people. Government control over life and death from the cradle to the grave.

Comments provided by :
Eyler, Allen

Your job is to investigate funds on elections not to regulate the Internet from speech you don't like. Only a government that wasn't unquestioned power would do such a thing as this. And besides the amount of man hours and resources to regulate such a task of Internet censorship would be a heavy burden on the tax payers. The amount extra laws itself would be a burden on the free speech of people. I pray the God gives you the faith and wisdom to know what you should do and the courage and convictions to follow through for liberty, freedom, and a smaller and decentralized government.

Comments provided by :
Faber, Alek

What gives the United States government the right to regulate the internet?
They are like one of many individuals and groups who use it and benefit from using it. Because none of us signed a disclosure agreement saying the United States government is welcome to our information, they have no rights to use it.

They also have no right to tax it. They already know the America people would never agree to this.

Stop trying to get personal information you do not need.

Move to China and work for their government if any of you want to control people. There are many problems in the United States already please spend your energy fixing them. Start with Obamacare that you put into place. You've had years now.

Reduce our energy and food bills, etc. Too many people still live in poverty in the United States. Look at the food stamp rolls. Help those in poverty get decent jobs, work on the economy, so many need or have food stamps. The number of recipients certainly doesn't say "success" or "recovery". Focus on the problems at hand, and stop trying to think of ways to focus on other things that are not a problem for the average low to middle income family and leave the internet alone.

Help stop ISIS. I can't believe we did so little for all those women and children. What about Ebola?

Otherwise you are just showing us you cannot relate to us and our day to day challenges. You may think food, energy and even your new healthcare prices are good but you probably use 10 times more electrically than I do in a winter. Your healthcare is covered by your job. My hours were already cut due to Obamacare. Let me save money to fix my house, maybe someday get new windows or a new roof, or even a furnace. I currently can only use electric. (which is so overpriced). You already over tax the second job I took. You already benefit and you aren't the ones working every weekend and night.

Most respectfully,
Annette
a citizen of the United States who
doesn't want to live in China and
loves her freedom.

Thanks for listening.

Comments provided by :
Faccini, Annette

What gives the United States government the right to regulate the internet?

They are like one of many individuals and groups who use it and benefit from using it. Because none of us signed a disclosure agreement saying the United States government is welcome to our information, they have no rights to use it. They also have no right to tax it. They already know the America people would never agree to this.

Stop trying to get personal information you do not need.

Move to China and work for their government if any of you want to control people. There are many problems in the United States already. Please spend your energy fixing or repealing the Affordable Care Act that you put into place. You've had years now. It has so many problems and is still not affordable.

Too many people still live in poverty in the United States. Help those in poverty get decent jobs. Work on the economy. People are on food stamps in record numbers. The number of recipients certainly doesn't say "success" or "recovery". It says failure.

Reduce our energy and food bills, etc. My electric, gas, water, trash bills, not counting food, insurance, phone and internet are over \$500 per month in winter. And I have a small house. Electric is especially high at close to \$300. Reduce these rates.

Start fixing the areas you already regulate, ...

focus on the challenges at hand and leave the world wide web ALONE.

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. The internet should remain free and unregulated!

Comments provided by :
Fandel, Richard

I am against this so called Net Neutrality effort. It is not the FCC's job to regulate speech, forcing me to pay to post online will surely open the path to violations of free speech laws, it will require more taxes to finance the (internet cops) to search for alleged violations, it will open up the possibility of harassment of small groups as we have seen with the IRS besides being difficult to enforce. The free market is perfectly capable of making the internet work well for all as we have seen since its inception. It ain't broke so leave it alone as it will surely be broke if you mess with it.

Comments provided by :
Fay, Dennis

Please abandon your attempts to regulate Internet-based campaigns and videos. The FEC is only supposed to regulate money spent on elections. Your attempts to regulate speech is not in your charter and is a violation of the First Amendment.

There are too many of you people in the Government who are unelected, unaccountable, don?t know me, don?t want to know me, and don?t care if I live or die because of your decisions. Back off!

Dale Ferguson

Comments provided by :
Ferguson, Dale

Do NOT implement these proposals to regulate the Internet. Any time the government gets involved in regulating, ultimately what happens is that a few favored companies (through heavy lobbying) get advantages, and the others suffer. It ultimately ends up where competition is driven off. Let the market decide - without government intervention!

Comments provided by :
Ferguson, Michael

Dear FEC,

Stay away from regulating the internet. This is the power of free speech. We do not need the government censoring our communications. Lay off!!!

Comments provided by :

Fialkowski, Daniel

Time for the FEC to go.

Comments provided by :
Fields, Jack

I believe the FCC has absolutely NO business getting involved with and individual comments made via the internet.

Comments provided by :
Finkenbinder, Kermit

I expect you as our representatives in our Government to abide by the US Constitution , and by doing so , you leave all ammendments alone including Right to Free Speech even on the internet , as well as our rights to bear arms. We expect you to honor and abide by our US Constitution 100% . Nothing more , Nothing Less.....

Comments provided by :
Fisher, Andy

Reversing the exemption for free postings online would have dangerous ramifications for constitutionally-guaranteed free speech. The FEC is tasked with regulating money spent on elections, not political speech. This will place an undue burden on small groups and individuals. Trying to implement NEW regulations would be extremely costly for taxpayers and difficult to enforce and it is unconstitutional and infringes on ALL Americans FREE SPEECH RIGHTS. DO NOT let FEC Commissioners regulate my online posts and conversations in the future AT ALL.

Comments provided by :
Flemming, Roger

I am against the FEC's attempt to regulate free speech.

The FEC is tasked with regulating money spent on elections, not political speech. If these regulations are allowed 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 which would be extremely costly for taxpayers and difficult to enforce.

Comments provided by :

Flores, Georgina

You are there to serve the People of the United States of America. You are NOT there to serve your political party. You took a oath, to serve the people, not the party's. Your job, is to do the best thing in the interest of the United States, not the Progressive/Socialist/Democratic Party or the Republican Party.

Obama is not a KING, DICTATOR, DUKE, EARL OR ANY ROYALTY. He is the president and HE WORKS for all AMERICANS. You have forgotten that, you need to look into a mirror and re evaluate your moral, values, ethics and self-less service to out country. So do what is in the best interest of the Nation, stop your lying, deception and despicable behavior, and serve the PEOPLE..

WITH MUCH ANGER, FRUSTRATION, AND TOTAL DISRESPECT FOR YOU AND YOUR,AMERICAN HATING PARTY

DAVID FORLER
SSG USA(Ret)

Comments provided by :
Forler, David

Don't regulate the internet don't take our First Admendment rights

Comments provided by :
Fortner, Jenny

Greetings,

On regulating online posts, the following is said:

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 see no reason at all to doubt the above comments, and firmly oppose any government restriction or monitoring of speech anywhere at all in the public arena. The business of the government is to protect the freedom of the public arena of open discussion of any and all issues. The government has no place in restricting freedom of speech other than in cases such as threats of violence, inciting a riot, or slander.

It is becoming increasingly clear that it is the government itself which needs the monitoring by we the people.

Yours truly, Earle Fox

Comments provided by :
Fox, Earle

Regulating the internet is the same as regulating free speech. I would rather know truthfully what a person thinks and have a choice to avoid it or not than to regulate their expression of thoughts and be standing amongst them and not know it. To regulate internet, who decides what should and shouldn't be acceptable? A fascist or a saint? Who decides or dictates who the fascist or saint is? That is why it must never be regulated because then it will only be free speech for the ones who regulate it.

Comments provided by :

Frail, Julie

Regulating the internet is regulating free speech. Who has the right to dictate what is and is not appropriate? A fascist or a saint? Then I ask who determines what defines a fascist and a saint? Hitler decided the Jews were the bad guys leading to the deaths of millions. This is why you can not regulate free speech or free press because everyone must have a voice! Freedom of speech is how we exchange ideas and innovations. I would rather know the truth about who everyone is anyway and the choice to go on their site or not.

Comments provided by :

Frail, Julie

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 :

Franks, Joia

Dear Sirs:

As an American citizen, I do not want my internet communication monitored or censored. It is NOT in the jurisdictional realm of any agency to do so. Please read the First Amendment to the United States Constitution, which, in case you have forgotten, guarantees the right of free speech.

J.F.

Irvine, CA

Comments provided by :
frejek, james

Considering all the messes this administration has created to date, there seems only one cogent comment necessary.
LEAVE THE INTERNET ALONE. IT IS WORKING JUST FINE WITHOUT YOU!

Comments provided by :
Fritz, John

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 :

Fudge, Anthony

I do not want the FEC or anyone monitoring or censoring my online communications in any way, shape or form without due process of law and a specific court order.

I am not a criminal or a terrorist in any way. The Government has no business looking over my shoulder just because someone believes the First Amendment means nothing to them. No one in this country, regardless of their job, appointment or election is above the law of the US.

Leave my comments and internet searches alone.

Thank you

Comments provided by :
Gallagher, Tina

Re: Internet Regulation

As a Libertarian, I ask that you not enact this proposal.

Because...

I do not want free speech to decrease.

I do not want the cost of government to increase.

I do not want the scope of government to increase.

I do not want the government attempting an impossible task.

I want government employees spending all of their time on current tasks, so they can be more efficient and effective administering them.

Comments provided by :
Gannon, Jack

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.

Comments provided by :
Garant, Adam

"or abridging the freedom of speech" is sacred. Keep your hand of of our RIGHTS.

Comments provided by :
Garlikov, Mark

Our freedoms have been curtailed enough all ready. No further need for additional regulation. Leave us alone.
cve us alone.

Comments provided by :
Garry, Leo

Concerning your attempt to regulate political speech (or any speech) on the internet I suggest you become familiar with the constitution. Passed by Congress: 25 September 1789 Ratified: 15 December 1791 Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

Comments provided by :
Gawchik, William

I wish you people would please leave me and my internet alone. Free speech is a part of my rights given to me in the Constitution and I wish that you people would stop trying to control everything.

Comments provided by :
Gaylor Jr, Tom

This is all about the enemy within trying to distroy this country. They will not get away with it.

Comments provided by :
gehres, rand

Too many of our men and women in the service have died protecting our freedom to let a group of people take it away from the very men and women who still protect it.

Comments provided by :
gentry, roger

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

The first amendment to the Constitution guarantees the right to free speech and unless those words can be shown to be co-ordination for violence than it should not be regulated no matter how incendiary they may be!

Comments provided by :
George, Mark

Simple. Leave the 1st Amendment (as well as the others) alone and do not pose or pass any laws/legislation that regulates the internet.

Everything the government gets involved in they ruin. Don't screw up and or limit the internet in any way.

Comments provided by :
Gerber, Ray

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

I disagree with the federal government getting involved in our free speech by monitoring the Internet.

Comments provided by :
Gibson, Ann

Regarding the proposed rules to regulate free speech on the internet, I think it is appalling that any government agency takes liberties with the First Amendment. I do not agree with any internet regulations and request that this idea be scrapped. It is obviously an attempt to limit free political speech and ideas by people who are afraid of anything that opposes them and their beliefs.

Comments provided by :

Giel, Robert

I absolutely DO NOT want the government regulating the internet.

Comments provided by :
Gilbert, Patricia

We are against government INTRUSION to monitor our opinions and comments on/via the internet! If one needs to monitor anything- go monitor the filth put out to the public by movies!

No, FREE SPEECH is a freedom that our men and women- including my Dad fought and died for...it is in our much proved and tried CONSTITUTION.

No one nor party nor political ideology should be given the right to curtail or to stop, regulate, penalize, intimidate, bully and control this most precious freedom! I already am feeling the noose tightening on people who want to even share the CONSTITUTION among the American people. Like so many other moves that this government has recently made and hidden from the American people (so-called "stupid" people) enough is enough and we are fast becoming "educated"!

NO to any Congress person or Obamaian Administrator who thinks this control is necessary...it IS NOT!

If the last election tells the liberal/Progressives to lie and to overrun our Constitution, NO- we will not be driven by crisis nor emotions...right is right ...freedoms being UNALIENABLE means it is NOT government- given but GOD - given! Leave our freedoms ALONE!

Patricia and Cliff and every Patriot we know!

Comments provided by :
Gillette, Patricia

Leave the internet alone, What we say on here is no ones business except who we send it to. We are already being taxed enough.

Comments provided by :
Gilliam, Camille

There is a proposal to "monitor" political speech on the internet?

As an American, I am against it.

Someone has a lot of arrogance to take away our right to free speech!

Does anyone there have a copy of the constitution? I could send you one!

Comments provided by :
Gilligan, Arend

I do not want the USA Government to regulate or control my freedom of speech in any way that I may use to communicate with anyone and that includes the internet.

Comments provided by :
Ginter , Jewell

I do not want the USA Government to regulate or control my freedom of speech in any way that I may use to communicate with anyone and that includes the internet.

leave my internet alone do not take away my free speech right

Comments provided by :
giordano, mike

This nation was founded with freedom of expression as one of its core beliefs and rights. There is only one reason to stop the flow of ideas and silence we the people, from political speech and commentary, on one of the most important and widely used communication resources, such as the internet, which is control of the populous by political take over through tyrannical corruption. The internet is one of the only ways that the general public can share ideas and beliefs with the rest of the nation, leading to a true representation of the beliefs of the populous, and not the distorted agenda put forth by career politicians, on both sides of the isle, worrying more about keeping their precious jobs and the millions in kickbacks from lobbyists, rather than truly representing the wants and needs of the public. DO NOT SENSOR POLITICAL SPEECH OR IDEAS ON THE INTERNET, IT WOULD BE UNCONSTITUTIONAL AND TYRANNICAL!!!!!!

Comments provided by :
Gish, Jeremy

The Internet is a freedom of speech right and NO federal controls should be imposed or regulated.

LeRoy Gloria
Texas

Comments provided by :
GLORIA, LEROY

I am **STRONGLY** opposed to the FEC getting involved this way, you are overstepping your bounds and leave our 1st amendment intact. The following are only a few of my concerns:

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 take heed, do not indulge this lightly, you have a responsibility to only act within your guidelines, nothing more!

Sincerely,
Rick Gomes

Comments provided by :
Gomes, Rick

We don't need more government control or regulations. Freedom of Speech!!

Comments provided by :
Gonzalez, Gerardo

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 :

Goode, Jeremiah

The Constitution of the United States of America is clear on free speech:

It guarantees freedom of expression by prohibiting Congress (and governmental unelected entities) from restricting the press or the rights of individuals to speak freely.

The proposed FEC regulations are an unmistakable and overt attempt to regulate FREE SPEECH. An undoing of the exemption for free posting online will have perilous ramifications.

In addition, the very policing of these regulations would take an army of investigators/enforcers.

This would be a ridiculous and unconscionable use of taxpayer funds and is unwieldy, illegal, and wholly unacceptable.

The FEC burden is to regulated MONEY spent on elections, not political speech... PERIOD.

Comments provided by :

Goodnight, Kristin

**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.

** 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.

***The government should not be trying to increase the bureaucracy in Washington and In my opinion that is all this will do. Get out of our lives and stop attempting to control our thoughts and actions...

We see enough of this across the world and America

was founded for the many freedoms that our ancestors did not have...and

GOD saw fit to us form the greatest country on EarthIt is not up to a bunch

bunch of Washington Bureaucrats to take it upon themselves to change this

Freedom Loving country for your benefit...Get off our backs.....Thank You

Comments provided by :

Gordon, James

One of the basic freedoms of American citizens is the right to free speech. Efforts to regulate what is posted on the internet, excepting those posts specifically against existing laws, flies in the face of that freedom. Neither the FCC or any other government agency or commission has any business infringing on our first amendment rights. I oppose any and all efforts on the part of the FCC to this rule making based on the following:

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.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

Comments provided by :

Gore, Barry

It has come to my attention that some FEC Commissioners have proposed regulations that will control posts and conversations on the internet. I am opposed to these proposed regulations because:

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 :
Goyen, Pat

The Internet is an open and free place for everyday United States citizens to make comments for or against their government. When the founders of the United States formulated the Bill of Rights they identified that every citizen has the right to the freedom of speech. The FEC's purpose is to regulate money for federal elections not the mouth of Americans. Do your job not the job of Congress.

Comments provided by :
Grace , Rosemarie

No way, no way, no way.....NO MORE GOVERNMENT.

Comments provided by :
Grandgenett, Don

You need to leave the NET alone so that the AVERAGE populace may continue to receive equal services to all others as planned originally.

Please do NOT screw this up like everything else Gov't touches !!!!!!!!!!!!!

Comments provided by :
Graves, Charles

Regulating the Internet when it's already free would be unconstitutional, this would violate our first amendment rights. This is being done under the disguise of treating it as a utility so that it can be taxed. This would limit free speech which is a guaranteed right under our constitution.

Comments provided by :
Grebosky , Lois

The FEC is tasked with regulating money spent on elections, not political speech. Our freedom of speech is constantly being harassed and as an American and parent I do not want this modified! It's imperative we are able to give our opinions without being "watched" by our government.

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. I believe the tax payers money can be used ore effectively helping people not monitoring us.

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

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

Carla

Green

Comments provided by :

Green, Carla

Hey, bureaucrats, keep your hands off the internet! And go to hell!

Comments provided by :
Green, Ed

My wife and I are outraged that the FEC could possibly control our online comments. Such a practice would be unconstitutional. We have a right to free speech.

Please do not allow this.

Sincerely,

Harold Green

Comments provided by :

Green, Harold

I am writing today to express my opposition to the proposed regulations of the Internet. I oppose these regulations on the Internet because it has the potential to restrict free speech guaranteed by the First Amendment of our Constitution. I feel that these regulations would give the government too much control over the Internet. These regulations could easily be abused since they would be extremely difficult to enforce. Finally I oppose these regulations because they would place an undue burden on small businesses and individual citizens. These regulations would be extremely costly to enforce and result in higher costs. These higher costs would make the Internet more expensive to access which would negatively affect low income people who could not afford to pay these extra costs. These regulations would mean they could be denied Internet access since they would not be able to afford it.

Sincerely,
Kimberley Green

Comments provided by :
Green, Kimberley

We don't need or want more government police. This action would hamper local political races and certainly limit who runs in those races. Candidates with limited budgets would not be able to compete. Also, we don't want or need more bending of our rights guaranteed in the Constitution.

Comments provided by :
Grempe, D M

I do not want the FCE or any part of the U.S. government to regulate the internet for these reasons:

- 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.

I am weary of sending government officials & agencies messages to get their noses out of Americans' lives & the free market. The government never stops at the minimum amount of regulation they say they intend to impose. In the end the government always abuses the people which is exactly what is going to happen with the FCE regulating the internet. The internet allows liberty that is beneficial to everyone. Leave it alone & go regulate something else. Don't give Americans another reason to wake up everyday and wonder, "What is my government doing today to mess up my life?"

Comments provided by :
GRINDROD, KETRA

FEC Personnel,

Free speech is free speech. I did not spend 23 1/2 years defending our Constitution and way of life to have our First Amendment rights monitored, curtailed, etc. I always believed that there were 2 fundamental things that I could control as an individual. One is my vote and the other is where I spend my money. I would think that the Supreme Court would rule that this is a form of speech and thus would be protected from government intrusion. If burning our American Flag is a form of speech, then surely posting your opinions and donating \$\$ to those that represent your beliefs should be considered speech also. Stay out of the business of monitoring U.S. Citizens without an appropriate court order.

Respectfully,

Comments provided by :
Grise, 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 and I believe this act would be against my First Amendment rights to free speech and I appose these regulations being implemented

Comments provided by :

Griseto, Cynthia

I am quite distressed to learn that some at the Federal Election Commission want to regulate free speech on the Internet.

I had been informed that we were beyond such a thing in these progressive times. There was to be no more bans on flag-burning . . . no more oppression of people like Lenny Bruce . . . but apparently political speech on the Internet doesn't quite meet the modern criteria of protection by the First Amendment (which seems to apply primarily to the "f-word").

Is the sarcasm coming through?

Good.

I hope you realize that any board of censors you create, any regulations you write, will eventually be used by your political opponents as well. How would you like to live in such a country?

Neither do I.

Why is it that the more we hear about "freedom," "liberty," and even "abolition of the state as a coercive institution," the less free we seem to become?

Comments provided by :
Grissom, Roy Neal

I am opposed to the FCC regulating the content of what I or anyone else posts on the internet. All Americans have a RIGHT to free speech weather I agree with or oppose what they say. Here are my reasons:

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.

Thank you,
Wayne Gross

Comments provided by :
Gross, Wayne

To whom it may concern: In regards to the Obama administration trying to put a tax on the internet now, I am against this is the most utmost way. The internet should be free for all to use, besides the money we pay the appropriate internet provider. All they want is more money out of hard working Americans pockets and to bleed us dry. We have had enough of inappropriate taxes which just fills their pockets and they laugh all the way to the bank. I urge you to help us protect the internet at all costs and keep it free of any taxes or intrusion of privacy.

Comments provided by :
Grunewald, Ryan

The FEC is tasked with regulating money spent on elections, not political speech. Americans do not need this creeping power-grab by the government.

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.

Less government; more freedom.

Comments provided by :

grunweald, matt

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.

Further, should the "weaponization" of government entities continue at its current pace, any political speech unflattering to the party in power would become "illegal" - at least until the other party gains control.

Comments provided by :
Guzman, Lesley

I strongly urge you to adhere to the constitution and not pass a law that violates the rights of the citizens. Any law that monitors or tracks internet communication of private citizens is wrong. Remember it is a government of the people, by the people and for the people. Government works for the citizens and protects the citizens and is not allowed to illegally monitor their internet or other private conversations for any reason.

Thank you,

Dale Haaland

Comments provided by :
Haaland, Dale

Unfortunately we are becoming more like a totalitarian/socialist state every day and there are too many citizens that refuse to recognize what that means eventually. The complete domination of every thing we hold dear by the government that we voted for. There must be a stop to the underhanded way our oval office sitter gets around the Constitution and laws that have been previously passed to suit his own philosophy of a Democratic Republic. As long as there are more and more hand outs to more and more lazy people we will continue to get what we vote for. But we know who is still on The Throne and we know that one day He will return to establish His Kingdom here on earth. Until then, we need to keep in prayer praying for The Rapture.

Comments provided by :
Hague, Thomas

Stop trying to regulate free speech.....this time on the internet.
Reversing the exemption for free postings online would have dangerous
ramifications for constitutionally-guaranteed free speech.
The FEC is tasked with regulating money spent on elections,
not political speech.

Comments provided by :
Hall, Louise

Enough! Silent the people. Isn't that what the government wants?
You work for us. It is about time you actually do.

This is America. Land of the Free. Why don't you all spend as much time trying to hush the people, to try to help the people.

Freedom of Speech, is a freedom.
You can not take it away in voice, in print nor in the cyber world.

Period.

Comments provided by :
Hall, Steven

First and foremost, these regulations are unnecessary. Even if they were, the stated goal would never be achieved through this kind of regulation. The harm and costs to the people far outweighs any perceived benefit. The internet is already free and unrestricted, except for highly criminal enterprises. LEAVE IT ALONE!

Comments provided by :
Hall, Temple

Let's maximize our freedom and keep government, especially at the federal level, intrusions into commerce and other areas at a minimum!

Comments provided by :
Halverson, Peder

Regulating online posts is a blatant violation of the First Amendment. The purpose FEC is not to regulate free speech. Not only that, but it will be extremely costly to taxpayers and very difficult to enforce.

Comments provided by :
Hamilton, Kevin

Speaking as one of the tax payer's that help pay your salary. The American people can not afford to pay more taxes for the new regulations you want to put into effect that will infringe upon our 1st amendment rights.

Comments provided by :
Haney, Terri

I use the internet on a daily basis and find no problems getting my word out or finding something needed. The internet is a way to share information and should be left alone. Net neutrality is just a way to shut down free speech. I am not going to go on and on about all the reasons it should or should not because it doesn't take a genius to figure out that the way to stop free discussions is to regulate the internet. I believe that nothing should be done to change anything about the internet because when government gets involved, nothing good comes from it. If you think the VA hospitals, Obamacare, etc. are doing a good job or providing a quality product, then you need to look at just these two programs to see government only makes things worse and that is what will happen to the internet.

I say leave the internet alone to us to improve because there isn't anything that is wrong with it. Don't try to fix something that is already working fantastically.

Richard A Hankins

Comments provided by :
Hankins, Richard

The FEC is tasked with regulating money spent on elections, not political speech. The internet has nothing to do with regulating money for elections.

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

If free Americans cannot have the ability to speak their minds, this country was founded on nothing. Once this body of regulators has this power, it will probably be up to their discretion to choose what is on the internet and what information is available. A very slippery slope would happen.

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. Who then chooses what is a violation? Our tax money does not need to regulate a freedom protected by the constitution.

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 :
Hansen, Jackie

These new regulations would be extremely costly for taxpayers and difficult to enforce. Our internet and its conversations should remain free and government should abstain from interfering with it. We already have too large and complex a bureaucracy without adding more needless regulations and positions to enforce them.

Comments provided by :
Harman, Paul

I do not want you regulating free speech on the internet. It smacks of of "Big brother" totalitarianism!

Comments provided by :
Harmon, Tom

In regard to the administration's proposal on so-called "net neutrality" regulatory action, I think that the very notion is blatantly absurd and counter-productive for the following three reasons. First, the internet in it's current, unencumbered form, could not possibly be more free and more accessible to all than it is at this moment. Any government intrusion takes everything in the wrong direction. Second, the mind boggles at the gargantuan size of the government agency that would have to be created in order for the government to monitor internet activity, censor what they find objectionable and promote their own propaganda. The last thing America needs is bigger government. Third, this concept would serve to make the internet a political tool (or weapon, perhaps) for whatever group or ideology that happens to be in power at the moment. The internet is NOT broken. It doesn't need to be fixed.

Comments provided by :
Harrison, David

I do not wish to have any more regulations imposed on the freedom speech

Comments provided by :
Harrison, Thomas

Just who the [delete expletive] do you people think you are? (!)

This (once) GREAT country was founded on Liberty and the FREEDOM OF SPEECH!

Those of you who think you can control what we say, think, do, (whatever) are sorely mistaken and shouldn't be allowed to exist in nature (or anywhere else).

PISS OFF! Go crawl back under that rock from whence you came! We AMERICANS won't have any of that here (EVER)! Not while we breather air!

You keep trying to clamp down on us - inch by inch - little by little and you think we aren't paying attention - YOU'RE WRONG!!!! (the November election results should serve as an example...)

Knock it off!

You're about to awaken the sleeping GIANT (and I don't think you'll like the consequences of that). You are trying to take away out GOD GIVEN rights - (NOT Government given). Keep that in mind when you're messing with us!

Remember what happened to the British when they messed with those who wouldn't have their rights stepped on!

The Government is supposed to PROTECT us - not control us (it CAN'T so stop trying!).

I would suggest that you (each of you) go READ THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES and whenever you want to try to regulate someone or something, ask yourself "Is it in the Constitution? If the answer is "No", then LEAVE IT ALONE!!!! It really is that simple!

Comments provided by :
Hartman, Dan

Please do not regulate the internet posts. Free speech is important.

Comments provided by :
Harvey, Michael

I am speaking out because public officials seem to take silence as consent. I passionately feel the FEC is going against our US Constitution and Bill Of Rights. The 1st amendment guarantees the right to free speech and the right to redress wrongs with our elected representatives. Do we want to live in America or China where everything released to their citizens is censored. For ex: China just removed President Putin putting a jacket on the first lady of China. The internet is a modern form of free speech which is protected from the government. We the people also have the right to redress wrongs done by our elected representatives which should include the FEC. So I would suggest that the FEC leave the internet as is. The internet is a fundamental right that Americans. If the changes are put in to law you see a great backlash from the people. Many courtcases have also upheld our rights to free speech. I want a free internet and stand by my 1st Amendment rights which I expect the FEC to uphold also.

Comments provided by :
Hay, Patricia

Freedom of speech can never truly be arrested or silenced. Laws of man are insufficient tools against the laws of nature. I ask that Congress forget about making any laws that limit free speech, for their own sake, history has always cast a dark shadow over those whom seek to silence others for political gain and power. Remember the oaths of office recited by each of you upon becoming a representative in a free society and, let freedom RING upon this earth!

Comments provided by :
Hayes, Mickey

The FEC is tasked with regulating money spent on elections, not political speech. Democrats in the FEC are attacking the First Amendment. They are trying to regulate the Internet. They are trying to regulate our free speech. With these new regulations, the government could control our speech on the Internet.

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

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

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

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

The broad scope of these proposed regulations is limitless, and to enforce these new rules the government will have to appoint censors who monitor online political communication every day. Even the Chairman of the FEC called this proposal "nothing short of a Chinese censorship Board." Thank you for considering these points to protect our Constitutional Rights.

Comments provided by :
Haynes, Cory

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.

Do not try to regulate the internet.

Comments provided by :

Hazen, Mark

My country tis of thee sweet land of Liberty of thee I sing. Land where my fathers died, land of the pilgrims pride,
from every mountainside LET FREEDOM RING!!! This is America isn't it? It's getting hard to recognize. keep The
Internet Free of government control!!

Comments provided by :
Heany, Frances

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. It's what communist nations do.

This is unethical and would 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 :
Heins, Jill

To the FCC: I request that you do not regulate the internet. I feel that it is working great without government regulations. Regulations will do more to slow the growth of the internet as companies will hesitate to invest in increasing broadband service. Private sector companies hesitate to invest because regulations create uncertainty in the market. Although regulations start with good intentions, there are always unintended consequences. The internet has seen increased growth because the government has not been involved, and I feel that it should stay that way. Thank you. Sincerely, Barbara Heintz

Comments provided by :
Heintz, Barbara

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.

This is just another attempt by you leftist commies. trying to control the populace. I will fight to the bitter end to support my freedom of speech.

Comments provided by :

Hendrix, Rick

"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." ~First Amendment to the United States Constitution.

Regulation on free speech concerning the internet is a violation of the First Amendment. Not only that, but you would have to commission close to an army of people to police YouTube and other internet sites for potential violations on a daily basis. Lets protect free speech not destroy it.

Comments provided by :
Hensley, Caleb

As a democratic citizen of the United States of America I am in agreement in upholding our First Amendment in which we are entitled to free speech with out censorship.

Comments provided by :
Hernandez, Carmen

The First Amendment - Freedom of Speech. Stop bullying the American people These new regulations would be extremely costly for taxpayers and very difficult to enforce. Please stop!

Comments provided by :
Herrera, Linda

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 :

HIATT, NYLA

Please do not create regulations or laws that will infringe on our rights to free speech. It is against the US Constitution.

No government wing should have the right to limit political speech or any other free speech.

We have laws against defamation of character. That should be enough for limiting bad speech. Let it do its job as designed.

Comments provided by :
Hickok, Charles

Please stay out of our lives. Please stop trying to control our lives. Please stop taking our money. could you please get a Real job out of the public eyes.

sincerely,
Pete H

Comments provided by :
Hicks, Pete

It is not the the purpose of any government on the earth to control freedom of biblical doctrine...only God has that power according to the Bible...

Comments provided by :
Hill, Leo

These new regulations would be extremely expensive for taxpayers and difficult to enforce. Also, the FEC 's job is to regulate money spent on elections, not political speech.

The FEC would have to hire an army of regulators to police YouTube and other internet sites on a daily basis to look for potential violations, and generate inquiries simply because people posted opinions online. Reversing the exemption for free postings online would stifle our constitutionally-guaranteed free speech.

Comments provided by :
Hill, Paul

The First Amendment is one of our most sacred rights.
The Internet is one of the greatest venues of free speech ever.

I vigorously oppose any and all attempts at regulating or restraining free speech, either over the Internet or anywhere else.

Comments provided by :
Hills, Samuel

I am strongly opposed to any organization--especially one made up of non-elected officials like the FEC--trying to control political speech on the internet. This is against the rights guaranteed citizens in the first amendment. In fact, it is exactly the type of action our founding fathers foresaw and were trying to protect us from by writing the free speech clause into the Bill of Rights.

The broad scope of these proposed regulations is limitless, and to enforce these new rules the government will have to appoint censors who monitor online political communication every day. Even the Chairman of the FEC called this proposal "nothing short of a Chinese censorship Board."

As a voter who is well aware of the over-reach of our federal government I demand that this action by the FEC be nipped in the bud!

Comments provided by :
Hinojosa, Marie

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 :

Hobson, Jonathan

I don't think the F. E. C. has any business or authority to regulate FREE speech. The internet and social media are free to voice opinions to family and friends, and complete strangers. They are opinions and not political advertisements, just my opinion while it is still free.

Comments provided by :
Hoffman, Lestrer

I am very disturbed by the proposed regulation of the internet by the F.E.C. First of all, this is by no means the function of the F.E.C. and expanding their function would be costly to the taxpayers and an infringement on my first amendment rights. I strongly object to this proposal as it is yet another attempt by our government to alter the intent of our constitution. Our constitution is not a living document, it is the rule of our country and to change it without due process is a violation of it. It represents what makes our country great; the freedoms that our veterans fought to protect. The F.E.C. does not have the authority to change those rules.

Comments provided by :
Hogan, Jane

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 on line.

You have no business attempting to censor, curtail, or violate the First Amendment.

Comments provided by :
Holder, Henry C.

SERIOUSLY? It's not bad enough that the once free and great country is being turned into Nazi or Soviet America, but you now want to ignore and virtually destroy our Bill of Rights. ENOUGH Government interference! The internet MUST STAY FREE and unencumbered; leave it alone.

Comments provided by :
Hollman, Hank

- 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 :
Holmes, Steve

I do not want you to regulate the internet. Here is why:

- 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 :
Holznagel, Chad

Dear Sirs, the very idea that the government is interfering with my internet content is unconciable and unconstitutional. The government has a negative effect in all that it becomes a part of. This will be just one more instance of their bumbling interference on something they should not have any control over. Isn't there enough problems that you could direct your time and energy to that needs the dire attention of the government? I believe so and I might add that whomever plays a part in this transgression against the citizens will certainly become aware of our total displeasure of your actions at the polls.....Robert Hook

Comments provided by :
Hook , Robert

The FEC is tasked with regulating money spent on elections, not political speech. Please stop internet regulation plans.

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 :
Hoover, David

Dear Sirs,

I am concerned regarding certain FEC Commissioners recent proposals to regulate American citizens online posts and conversations. I will not stand by and let non-elected FEC Commissioners trying to infringe on my First Amendment Constitutional rights by their efforts to control free speech or any political speech on the internet.

Sincerely,

Bruce H. Houff

Comments provided by :

Houff, Bruce

Self absorbed politicians are destroying the greatest nation that ever was America is doomed if we do not honor the Constitution and revert to the principles and teachings of our founding fathers that made this country great and revered worldwide!!!

IN HOC SIGNO VINCES

Comments provided by :
Howard, Will

do no reg free speech on the internet and stay away from our First Amendment

Comments provided by :
howell, ron

Dear FEC Commissioners,

There is no constitutional grounds for government regulations of political free speech. Please stand up for the freedoms granted to America by our Constitution.

Sincerely,

Thomas H Hoyle

Comments provided by :
Hoyle, Tom

To whom it may concern:

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

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Tom Hrinowich

Comments provided by :
Hrinowich, Thomas

I agree with ALL of these statements!

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.

Respectfully,

Jerald Humes Sr.

Comments provided by :
Humes, Jerald

Good Afternoon,

I petition my government as I disagree with your opinion and thought that the United States Government should regulate free speech and or regulate on line freedom of speech.

Please defend the Constitution of the United States and my First Admendment Rights.

Do not infringe on my right to freedom of speech and or freedom of the press both on line or in Writting.

Please STOP trying to Censor the American Citizens.

STOP restricting freedom of speech and stop restricting the on line sharing of political truth !

God Bless America !

Miss Jan Hunt

Comments provided by :
Hunt, Jan

Stop the FEC war on free speech. The 1st amendment gives all United States citizens the right to say or write what they desire. Any government regulation of this amounts to government censorship.

Comments provided by :
Hunter, Jeffrey

Keep the internet free from controls of content or speed.

Comments provided by :
Hunter, Larry

No one has the right to regulate anyone's right to free speech. It would be the earmark of a tyrannical society for only certain thoughts or ideas be allowed to be presented because they do not represent the views of those that oppose free speech on the internet.

Comments provided by :
Hunter, Russell

Gentlemen, I do not want Government regulation of the Internet. Government, though often well meaning, only makes things worse and instead of fixing a problem, they all too often make things worse. PLEASE, NO GOVERNMENT REGULATION OF THE INTERNET!

Comments provided by :
Hurlburt, Terry

Political speech is my 1st amendment right. The FEC & any other government agency has no business regulating the internet which includes political speech. How many dollars would you waste reading every news outlet, website, blog and advertisement? This government is truly becoming tyrannical. Knock it off.

Comments provided by :
Husselbee, Susan

I address these short comments to the FEC: The FEC is tasked with regulating money spent on elections, not political speech. Political speech is a fundamental essential for this republic to function. Reversing the exemption for free postings online would have dangerous ramifications for constitutionally-guaranteed free speech. The FEC, as a regulating agency, would have to unleash an army of regulators to police internet sites on a daily basis to look for potential violations, and subject them to inquiries simply because they posted opinions online, which are not supposed to be restricted under our constitution, that is if you believe in the principles outlined in said document. This regulation will place an undue burden on all citizens and would be extremely costly in taxes and difficult to enforce. In closing, this direction that is under consideration is not beneficial for the United States or the citizens which comprise it.

Thank You for your time and consideration.

Shan Hutchison

Comments provided by :
Hutchison, Shan

Quite your crap. YOU go move and be under Communism and good luck staying out of jail and alive.They got the system you stupidly want.

Comments provided by :
Ingoldsby, Bill

The FEC is tasked with regulating money spent on elections, not political speech. STOP ATTACKING THE FIRST AMENDMENT!

Comments provided by :
Ingram, Kim

Since the "Net Neutrality" bill is just another move to TAX the use of the internet, and is not intended to protect anyone except perhaps the government. I feel that this maneuver by the "liberals(and mr. obama)" to be not merely unnecessary, but offensive to the people of america)The correct way to "protect" consumers is to keep the government out of it, and let "Free Market" model control the "SUPPLY AND DEMAND".

Comments provided by :
Ireland, Theodore

Please quit interfering in areas of the public arenas. The internet is doing fine without the government.

Comments provided by :

Isaacson, Charles

To the Federal Election Commission:

It is imperative that our first amendment rights be preserved. It is totally inappropriate for any body to move to limit those rights. Those who intend to commit acts or to forward legislation that limit our rights should be held as being traitors to our constitution and so, to this great land. Those traitors should be tried for their actions and should receive a traitor's judgment.

Sincerely,
Richard Isaacson
1802 Z Avenue
La Grande, Oregon 97850

Comments provided by :
Isaacson, Richard

I was born a FREE American, I intend to die a FREE American
attempt to spy on and control the FREE SPEECH OF IT'S CITIZENS!

Only a Hitleresque rectal orifice would

Unfortunately we have such a person who has been working hard for the last 6 years to follow in the footsteps of Adolph Hitler and become America's Dictator. The big difference is that Hitler never had the tools to spy on and control the masses, like the NSA, the CIA, the IRS and other agencies to make spying on everyone so complete... Can you say "1984"? How about "Thought Police"?

Why have we been losing our liberties one at a time for the last six years? Why did Obama bring in people with a deadly disease - Ebola? Why does he insist that illegals flood into this country - some carrying deadly diseases - and the Border Patrol has it's hands full babysitting countless unaccompanied children - some of whom are infested with...? (And now they are preventing the Border Patrol from driving to crossing points, AND are taking their rifles away so they cannot defend themselves against drug-smugglers who are heavily armed!) I don't understand why so many can't see it, it is totally obvious to me! There can only be one reason: "Someone" wants very badly to be dictator. Guess who - I'll give you three guesses - and the first 27 guesses don't count.

Comments provided by :
Iverson, Ivy

Sirs: I am requesting that you do not change our internet status. This is a power grab, for more governmental control. You folks do a very poor job trying to control it all. We were founded on the idea of capalitism, not government control!

Thank you for your time and allpwing me to voice my opinion.

Comments provided by :
jacobs, Katherine

Dear FCC Chairman:

Stop NET regulation!

Over the past two decades, the Internet has flourished and revolutionized our lives precisely because it has remained free of government overregulation. The proposed Federal Communications Commission (FCC) new rules that could reclassify broadband Internet as a monopoly-era plain old telephone service of decades past (aka common carrier telecommunications service) under Title II of the Communications Act, will almost certainly kill job creation, harm consumers and bring investment and innovation to a screeching halt.

Simply put, the federal government micromanaging the Internet is a dangerous scheme, and one the FCC must abandon. As a concerned citizen, I urge you to do everything in your power to stop any and all efforts to reclassify broadband Internet under Title II of the Communications Act.

In addition, there is simply no evidence to back claims of disaster if internet is left unregulated. The unregulated internet is probably the greatest success story of the century. Tens of billions of private dollars pour into its networks every year, even in a bad economy.

Stand up to special interests and support the free-market internet.

Sincerely, Mrs. Joan Jacobson

Comments provided by :
Jacobson, Joan

This is just another ploy for the government to get it's hands on something so it can find a way to start taxing it. The internet is working fine without the government sticking it's nose in everyone's business.

Comments provided by :
James, Roshawn

Any effort to regulate political speech flies in the face of the United States Constitution, particularly the First Amendment. Also, it reeks of the tools used by communist and fascist countries throughout history. Free speech means what it means. Please avoid any rule or policy that would be offensive to and contrary to the United States Constitution.

Comments provided by :
Janis, Brian

You must not be aware of what we call our constitution. It has a law called freedom of speech. Messing with the free speech on the internet would be breaking that law which you can therefore be prosecuted for doing! Keep the gov. out of the citizens private lives!

Comments provided by :
Janssen, Lyman

The FEC should not be involved in "regulating" the internet. Any such attempt would be a violation of my right to free speech - especially political speech. 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 - to say nothing about the army of enforcers required to monitor the internet every second of every day searching for potential violations.

Comments provided by :
Jaskowski, Tim

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 :

Jensen, Ryan

As a taxpayer I am concerned about FEC resources spent monitoring online political conversations. I believe the FEC should focus its efforts "following the money" to insure that our elections are not subjected to corruption and that voter contributions are not being used inappropriately. The FEC should not monitor, record, or restrict political speech, its efforts should support the freedoms our electoral process seeks to guarantee and protect.

Comments provided by :
JIMENEZ, JOSE

I oppose to the passing of this regulation on the ground this will affect my 1st Amendment rights.

Comments provided by :
Jimenez Mercado, Jose

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

Comments provided by :
Johns, Beverly

I'm sorry,I meant to say 1st amendment rights also. If you can add that to my last entry I'd be grateful. Thank you.

Comments provided by :
Johnson, Jimmy

I believe that I can speak for a majority of those who, like me, are regular people, not wealthy businesses, who mainly use the internet to keep up with friends and family, have access to breaking news, make purchases and for entertainment purposes. We should not be inconvenienced simply because there are those who mean to make a profit.

Comments provided by :
Johnson, Lee

PLEASE LEAVE THE INTERNET ALONE!

Comments provided by :
JOHNSON, LINDA

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 :

Johnson, Tim

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 do what you can to stop this.

Enough is enough.

Something has got to be done.

Comments provided by :

Jones, Brian

I do not want my Internet regulated!

Comments provided by :
Jones, Elizabeth

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

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.

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

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

Comments provided by :

Jones, Mark

Leave my internet alone!!!

Comments provided by :
Jones, Morgan

Dear FEC:

Since your clearly stated purview is oversight of federal, not state, or local elections, to determine all is in order, and no fraud has taken place

it seems to me your agency has no reason whatsoever to interfere with internet communications, transmissions, commerce, or any other purpose for which the net is designed.

It would behoove your agency to maintain a closer watch on its stated jurisdictional area, and refrain from attempting to involve itself in that for which there is no legal constitutional justification so you can effectively eliminate all the dead persons, illegal aliens, and duplicate voters who poison the results of our current system, and stay clear of things that don't concern it, as stipulated clearly by federal statute.

A nation, and its, government, and all the agencies thereof works best, for all concerned when it allows legal means to define its purpose, and stays clear of violating such means; or interfering with other similar ones, who already are tasked with that oversight.

If you'd like to respond to my message, I'd be certain to discuss all my points with you gladly.

Thank you for your consideration.

Cordially yours,

Richard J. Jones

Comments provided by :

Jones, Richard J

The internet must remain protected by the First Amendment. Government control of political speech on the internet as enabled by the proposed regulation directly violates First Amendment protections, and represents an unacceptable overreach of the authority of the Federal Election Commission. The FEC is within its limits only when it regulates political spending as related to elections; it is beyond its limits when it intends to regulate political speech in any fashion that is not directly related to election spending. Making second and third-hand connections between unrelated business practices, eg. internet provider "speed," etc. is an invalid extension of influence and a dangerous overreach.

The proposed regulation to remove the exemption for free postings on the internet has serious implications for potential FEC/government overreach. The FEC does not have authority to control free speech, and should not be given any authority in this regard.

Comments provided by :
Jordan, Jeffrey

stop negating our constitutional rights! we object totally! stop the spying on us to control us! first amendment rights are foremost in this country! you took an oath of office to protect the constitution! I personally hold you to it! braking it is arbitrary & unlawful, honor the will people! We are the ones that pay you! keep the first amendment! I adjure you by all decency to give the people a break! stop the spying & braking the constitution! that is your charge! be responsible!

in the love of God & country & what is decent

Elmer June

Comments provided by :

June, Elmer

Freedom of speech should not be regulated by ANY government, especially the United States Government!!

Comments provided by :
Kain, Derie

The internet is a free enterprise that needs to remain free. Major changes in its governance need to be established by Congress and debated so that they protect the people - not enable the rulers. There is no urgency to decisions about the internet because most of the time it doesn't involve people's safety or national security. Therefore, regulations established by the executive branch should be minimal to prevent the power of the internet.

The executive branch should not be able to regulate internet speeds. We can't have people capable of deciding who will have internet - whether high speed or slow speed - and who will not. If the IRS targeted specific political groups what's to stop the government from targeting the internet service of certain news channels or the websites of specific political organizations? The Internet is the world's last line of defense against tyranny. Leave it alone, period.

Comments provided by :
Kammerman , Trenten

NO to FEC regulation of the Internet!

Comments provided by :
Kariya, Mark

Forget regulating the internet. We have enough government in our lives.
Do your jobs and let us enjoy our 1st Amendment rights.
Besides how could you justly enforce such laws?
Marie Kastenbauer

Comments provided by :
Kastenbauer, Marie

Government should NOT try to regulate the internet! I oppose any attempt to regulate and/or tax the internet.

Comments provided by :

Katwijk, Linda

Given the fact that the FEC is tasked with regulating money spent on elections, not political speech, it is inappropriate that the FEC take actions to reverse the exemption for free postings online. This infringement have dangerous ramification for constitutionally-guaranteed free speech. In order to accomplish such an undertaking the FEC would have to employ an army of regulators to police the internet. Such action will place an undue burden on small groups and individuals. New regulations to force such regulations on the US populace would constitute a heavy tax burden on tax payers. This burden would be very expensive.

Comments provided by :
Keate, K. Craig

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 :

Keel, Theresa

The FEC is tasked with regulating money spent on elections, not political speech. Our constitutional First Amendment grants us the "Freedom of Speech". The government is of the people, for the people and by the people. A politician is a "public" figure that tells "the people" why they should be voted for. It is our constitutional right to air our opinions about the politician to anyone, including the politician. Please stop trying to quash our "Freedom of Speech" and stick to your current FEC job description. Let's stick to FAIR and HONEST for once.

Comments provided by :
Keller, Mary

The internet was originally developed under an open, "transparent" ideal. Namely to allow any person, with the capability, to access any and all information that they desired through this vehicle. Any attempt to "regulate" or dilute "net neutrality" is an affront to all peoples. The internet has flourished without government intervention and oversight. Please allow this system to continue unabated! Keep the government out of the internet systems! Small business and free markets promote a healthy economy and society! Not large corporations / monopolies and governments!

Comments provided by :
Kelling, Bruce

Free speech is guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution. If you reverse the exemption for free postings online, you are violating the Constitution.

Think of how many staff it would require to police the internet. It would cost the taxpayers a fortune and it would be almost impossible to enforce. Also, it is a fascist measure in the sense that people could be questioned just for posting their opinions online. This would be particularly unfair to small groups and individuals.

Comments provided by :
Kelly, Sean

I don't want the FCC regulating the Internet. This is war on the first amendment.

Comments provided by :
Kerns, Ursula

My internet is just fine. Keep your regulators out of it!!!!

Comments provided by :
Kerr, Roger H

Government keep your hands off the internet!!

Comments provided by :
kerstetter, carl

The FEC is tasked with regulating money spent on elections (and not doing a very good job with that) in my opinion, not political speech and opinions , FREE SPEECH is a right that should not be regulated by anyone.

Comments provided by :
Kimball, Terry

To whom it may concern: You are overstepping your boundaries by trying to regulate free speech and thereby go against our Constitution and our rights!!! This is not acceptable and illegal! The government of the United States has NO AUTHORITY to regulate our free speech via the internet or any other means!!!

Brian King

Comments provided by :
King, Brian

The FEC needs to worry about 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.

Do not mess with my first amendment rights as an American citizen.

Comments provided by :

King, Rhonda

How Orwellian can you get than to regulate free speech for what is "appropriate" and what is not. Who is to determine what is allowed? How can you regulate speech and maintain any semblance of our constitutional free speech.

These would be costly and difficult to enforce. How would you avoid IRS-style targeting of "unfavorable" political groups.

This must not be allowed to happen!

Comments provided by :
Kingsley, Bruce

Short and DIRECTLY to the point! Taxing of the Internet will once again only help big business and hurt small business and individuals like myself bring retired and disabled! In a time when almost all business are hurting and jobs are not being reported correctly as they should be at the lowest in my 71 years this is not the time or place to put additional burdens!

Respectfully,

Donald Klapproth

AMERICAN VETERAN

Comments provided by :

Klapproth , Donald

As a citizen, I request that , as representatives of the government, you please stop trying to find ways to invade my privacy and personal space, and to limit my free expression of my beliefs. Please just leave us alone and respect our privacy.

Comments provided by :
KNABLE, LEONARD

Freedom of speech is essential to our country. Freedom of stpeech is what everyone who has ever served in the military put their lives on the line to defend. And the internet is no exception for free speech. The first amendment says FREEDOM OF SPEECH SHALL NOT BE INFRINGED the argument ends there. You cannot subject the constitution to a poll of what the government likes or dislikes. The constitution isn't there to protect the government because the government doesn't need its speech to be protected it is there to protect the private ordinary citizens and their right to voice their opinions. In a country where we have the right to vote the rght to free express said opinions of whom they're voting for or against cannot be compromised. Free speech in every aspect needs to be upheld

Comments provided by :
Knapp, Kristopher

We do not want or need any more rules or regulations strangling our freedoms, The beauty of the internet IS the freedom for anyone to post what they choose to where and how they choose. The last thing we need is any more meddling with our freedoms! We cannot afford the regulations the control freaks in DC now impose on us, we certainly do not need more efforts to control our free speech and considering our politicians are not even capable of balancing a budget they clearly do not need to be spending more money!

Comments provided by :

Knorr, Duane

To Whom It May Concern:

The objective of the Federal Election Commission is to regulate money spent on elections, not to regulate speech pertaining to elections. This clearly goes against the constitutionally guaranteed freedom of speech. With further regulations imposed on elections comes the burden of additional expenses to taxpayers, as well as the potential for abuse of power. The internet is not a public utility or a given right to all people. A individual's purchase of the internet is to choose freedom. Thus there is no reason or mandate for the FEC to consider imposing a speech regulation on the internet.

Comments provided by :
Kohlbacher, Diane

I do not believe in any type of censorship, information is a condition of learning, you can't believe everything on the internet, books, or people, but you can get information which you can evaluate, without interference from someone that wants to control your way of thinking and acting.

Comments provided by :
KOLLINS, STEVE

There is no legitimate need for the FEC to become involved in the internet. This is not a necessary function of the commission. The internet is working just fine and does not need interference and heavy-handed regulation from the government. Stick to your original purpose. Thank you.

Comments provided by :
Koons, William

Really bad idea based on the following:

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.

John Kopplin

Comments provided by :

Kopplin, John

To whom it may concern:

Please do not regulate/censor internet content. I believe it to a violation every American's 1st amendment right to free speech.

Comments provided by :
Kott, Ralph

I would like you to reconsider the planned regulation of political speech on the internet. I believe this is an infringement on the 1st amendment and free speech.

Comments provided by :
Kozak, Thomas

Under the socailist direction of our so called president the FEC is over stepping their boundaries. Maybe a job in China would be more suited to your liking.

Comments provided by :
Krause, Aaron

I do not believe the US Government should be involved in regulating the internet. I definitely feel that such a step is a clear violation of free speech and should not be undertaken by any branch or department of our government.

Comments provided by :
Krepel, Michael

Leave my internet alone. We have too many regulations already.

Comments provided by :
kruse, harry

I am opposed to the proposal for the FEC to regulate the internet.

It is a violation of my free speech rights to restrict the content of the internet, especially regarding political issues.

Comments provided by :
Kuhn, Cecil

Regarding the use of any publicly available communications system:

To include broadcast, print, and internet -

I fully disagree with the idea, concept or any action that would censor my right to freely express myself and to engage in free speech as relates to any subject.

To wit, I include in this list of subjects anything that may relate to persons or issues that are to be decided via an open election process - hence political free speech.

For a person or persons to propose that speech of any kind should be censored if communicated via the internet, is a clear violation of the 1st Amendment Right to Free Speech.

As is common today on internet forum sites a user acknowledges and is regulated on most internet forums, a laundry list of the kinds of speech that will get a person/user kicked-off of such forum are clearly laid out ahead of time so that potential users of said service can make a decision and accept responsibility for their speech/words.

But the concept that, for example, explaining the consequences of some proposed legislation, which may be negative, as being censorable as political speech is anti-free-speech and pro-communist-dictator like.

Count this comment in the ANTI-Proposal Reg 2014-01

Comments provided by :

Kuhn, Mi

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 :

Ladmirault, Sheila

The internet was developed by the US military but was taken over by the citizens of the U.S. and it has grown successfully without government interference or oversight or governance. It needs to remain free of government involvement so that Americans can freely express what they think and feel without having government imposed restrictions.

What site citizens choose to visit, what we choose to buy online, what citizens choose to say regarding politics or policy is of no business of the government.

Leave the internet alone!

Comments provided by :
Lambe, William

The regulation in question seeks to impose certain controls on speech. It does not matter whether speech is on a microphone, on the TV screen, or on an Internet site, it should never be controlled in any fashion. (obviously, speech promoting danger or harm is, and should be, controlled) Any such control will bring up a question regarding its constitutionality.

Most humans, and almost all organizations see "growth" as a laudable goal. For the FEC, that usually takes the form of increased regulation. The regulation proposed by 2014 ? 01 is directly attacking free speech. It should be withdrawn, and such attacks resisted in the future.

Comments provided by :
Lambert, Alan

I do not want the FEC regulating the internet. This is not the FEC's job.

The FEC is tasked with regulating money spent on elections, not political speech and these new regulations would be extremely costly for taxpayers and difficult to enforce.

Comments provided by :

Landrum, Troy

The regulations in this country are taking away all the rights of the people and putting them in the hands of the government on which this country was not founded according to the constitution. Enough is enough if you let this happen your apart of the problem not the solution.

The price to do this would be a big burden to the taxpayers of the country and little good to help the individual or other small groups.

B.Lane

Comments provided by :

Lane, Betty

I DO NOT want the FEC to regulate the internet. One of the many things that makes this country great is our freedom of speech, including on the internet. Regulating the internet is a dangerous path our government should never go down.

Comments provided by :

Lantry, Tony

To Whom it may concern,

I would only hope that you are all aware of the first amendment . It never ceases to amaze me how many people attempt to circumvent the very principles that give them the right to deny what is written. What are they thinking? To me it's unthinkable that there is ever ink or breath given to this argument.

Thank you,

Dave LaRoche

Comments provided by :
LaRoche, Dave

Why does the government try to regulate everything? The Internet does NOT need government control and regulation!
Why should we trust the government? This current administration has lied to us time and time and time again!!

Thank You!

Comments provided by :
larson, kevin

I do not want my free speech regulated online! This is not China. This is the USA where we have free speech to criticize the government or the politicians who work for us!

Comments provided by :
Lastoria, Philomena

I feel this move to regulate free speech about our political opinions is a violation of the First Amendment rights guaranteed under the Constitution.

We are still a Constitutional Republic, and as such do not want or need someone telling us what we can say on the internet.

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 do not consent to these rules that are being proposed.

Comments provided by :

Lavender, Shell

I want the FEC to stop trying to regulate free speech and the internet.

Comments provided by :

Law, Tom

Leave our free speech alone!

Comments provided by :
lawson, charles

This is not similar to the phone company. There is wire tap capabilities to a phone, but there is not censorship. With FCC control of the internet, there could be censorship - just as we have seen with Obama Administration who has bullied networks and journalists who speak. What is fed to us from the networks is controlled - the internet should not be.

This is so ironic as the Democrats were so against the Patriot Act. This is just as bad.

NO CENSORSHIP OR CONTROL OF THE INTERNET BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT!!!!

Comments provided by :
LEAHY, ANN

Please do not try to regulate free speech on the internet. I was under the impression that we still live in the United States. Land of the free and home of the brave. Let's not let this be taken from us by someone that wants this country to be run by a dictator. Dave L.

Comments provided by :
Leapard, David

Please do not regulate the internet or tax the internet for conversational type posts. Please do take down from the internet all websites that instruct on any type of harmful activity such as bomb making terrorist activities. Also, take down and/or monitor all terrorist chat rooms and promotional websites. This is where your attention needs to reside. Not with ordinary Americans who discuss varying political and issue differences.

Comments provided by :

Lee, Clayton

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 :
Leeper, Janis

I do not believe anyone has the right to view what I put on line, especially the government. This takes away my 1st amendment rights. I think this is bullying when being told what I can, or cannot say online regarding my political beliefs. We never had to worry about this until Obama took office.

Comments provided by :
Lennon, Irene

The latest proposed regulation to restrict free speech will most certainly be voided by the courts. If the FEC pursues this action which has no basis in any law or the constitution which the FEC can point to, you may risk a ruling that everything the FEC does, including its sole legal authority to monitor money flow in elections, might possibly be ruled unconstitutional, thus putting the FEC out of business entirely.

It seems more prudent to avoid an attempt to restrict the free speech of individuals and groups on the internet or elsewhere. To avoid a major court and possibly legislative defeat which might terminate the FEC, the proposed internet regulation should be immediately and permanently withdrawn.

Comments provided by :
Lenz, Kenneth

Dear Sirs of FEC,

You are a police action for elections ,you have no right to stifle free speech on the internet.

-Steve Leonard

Comments provided by :
Leonard, Steve

I feel the same way I do about the 2nd! I will fight as hard for this as much as possible! These fools would have to KILL ME first!!! We need to tell these A--H---- to keep their F----- hands off!!!
That's how I feel. And that's all I'll say.

Comments provided by :
Leverich, Lee

This proposal violates the First Amendment, therefore unconstitutional.

Comments provided by :
Lewis, C J

The FEC is tasked to regulate money spent on elections. not political speech. Limiting free posting online would dangerous to freedom of speech. (AKA China) The FEC would have an army of regulators checking postings and subject people too inquires simply because of the posted opinions. We do not want Obamacare Internet.

Comments provided by :
Lewis, Lyle

I am opposed to the FEC's proposed regulations because its scope is basically aimed at declaring war on my First Amendment rights are being threatened. It's my belief that when I left Socialist Cuba over 40 years ago, I wouldn't have to EVER face the threat in our Republic of having to be subjected to threats of new rules the government aimed at monitoring online political communication every day. It is a sad day in America when even the Chairman of the FEC called this proposal "nothing short of a Chinese censorship Board."

Under the First Amendment of the United States Constitution, I should NOT have to worry that our government would have the power to control my speech on the internet the same way oppressive regimes on our planet do. And if my free speech is threatened, so is everyone else's. I urge you to oppose the current regulation to regulate our internet; our freedom as we know it is at stake. Vote NO!

Comments provided by :
Liciaga, Miriam

More of our God given rights are being taken away.Obama can do whatever he wants or wants to vote. Then goes on vacation to Camp David. We do not have that option. Let us express our views only to have them completely disregarded. I suppose that is what happens when your dad not to rely on. History repeats itself. He no longer gives a hoot since he is not coming back. Keep me up to date as to what he is not doing or refuses to do. I wish he had a mind of his own. I hope and pray he gets a pair and uses them.

Sincerely,

Virginia L. Liford

(407)381-4992 landline

Comments provided by :

Liford, Virginia L.

I will not stand by and watch you destroy what this country was founded on.
You people have done enough to my ancestors Native Americans.

If you do not like our constitution then leave and find another country you can try to manipulate!

Comments provided by :
Liles, Brandon

Greetings,

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.

Freedom of speech is a basic right. Be very prudent in any action you legislate. Only enhance each person's ability to speak freely.

Regards,

Brad Lindborg

Comments provided by :

Lindborg, Bradley

Government intervention in the internet will be costly for taxpayers and hard to enforce. Our right of free speech will be harmed by government regulation, or "net neutrality". Please leave this alone.

Comments provided by :
Linder, William

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 :

Lindstrom, Marion

No only violation of free speech; This will place an undue burden on small groups and individuals. These new regulations would be extremely costly for taxpayers and difficult to enforce. Keep the internet free of government oversight on the basic free speech. That is POLITICAL SPEECH and unfettered control of what we the people think.

Comments provided by :
Linehan, George

With regard to regulation of the Internet. Freedom of speech is a right in this Country. Any attempt to regulate the Internet, can be used to interfere with the right of free speech. Please stop all attempts to insert Government into the process. When and if at some future time we lose our freedoms, perhaps you can revisit this issue. In the meantime, please keep Government out of the process for all of the right reasons.

Comments provided by :

Little, Thomas

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 :
Lizotte, Anna

Please do not regulate the internet. Let freedom of speech continue.

Comments provided by :
Lloyd, Geoffrey

As an active voter, I ask that you not pass REG 2014-01. Laws like this keep me from considering voting for any politician associated with the Democratic Party that runs for office. Just take a look at the last elections to see the proof.

Comments provided by :
Lloyd, Jon

Respectively, I conclude the FEC has no business in regulating free speech.
The FEC regulating speech can easily be misused. Anyone who disagrees with the political arm in power, at that time, can be censored.
It has the potential, essentially, to be used as a gag order!
Free speech is an American right, and in the American Constitution, and must be upheld.
It is also a waste of tax money we all have to pay.
I hope the FEC listens to the public (that's us), rather than a personal bias other than the masses.
Thank you for your time.

Comments provided by :
Lo, Lee

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 :

locke, john

It is highly irregular that ANY government entity should seek to control or limit the viewpoints of the citizens that it was created to serve by any means necessary.

This includes, but is not limited to the use of communication through the Internet.

There is no way that you can spin this and not have it a clear violation of my first amendment rights! It is high time that the government start SERVING the people who elected it and stop trying to CONTROL AND SUPPRESS them.

Comments provided by :
Lockhart Sr, Jason

Your responsibility is to regulate money spent on elections, NOT censorship of the internet. Your attempt to monitor free speech is unconstitutional, and would require yet AGAIN, to expand government spending on agencies that would cost tax payers money. STAY OUT OF MY LIFE and do what you were HIRED to do!

Comments provided by :
Lockwood, William

This is another inane government attempt to control free speech and is completely unwarranted. The government has no business trying to control the internet and should not waste taxpayers money on this.

Comments provided by :
Loes, Steve

We are a free nation! Many have given their lives for your freedom as well as mine. Don't allow their blood that was shed be done in vain. The majority of Americans still desire to be free! Stop! Let us keep the airwaves free! FEC created to keep a standard of integrity of the airwaves, not control! Freedom still exists in my country!

Comments provided by :
Logan, Patricia

The internet works well as it is. YouTube and other sites are doing just fine policing themselves. Down the road, we will see the FEC grow it's powers and degrade Free Speech. I have kids. I will supervise their use of the internet. Governing powers should not have control over any site's content. The FEC should first look at what they are tasked with, money spent on elections, and see if they can do a better job with that.

Comments provided by :
lommen, David

Please keep the internet open and unregulated.
Don't let politicians regulate it or tax it for their own purposes.

Comments provided by :
Long, Jim

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 en

Comments provided by :

Lopez, Matthew

I am against any action by the FEC to regulate any aspect of free speech on the Internet or elsewhere. Free speech is a natural right as specified in the Constitution. There is no money donated to candidates with any expression of opinion on the Internet. The FEC needs to limit its regulation to that chartered by Congress.

Comments provided by :
Losik, Charles

The government should upkeep our roads, bridges, interstructures, they should protect our borders and that's about it. Stay the f out of our business. Its we the people, not we the slaves to the alphabet agencies created by big brother. This government is now tyrannical and have no doubt, we may seem like sheeple running around just trying to keep our heads above water, our families fed (stop poisoning us with gmos) and a roof over our heads; but very soon we will all wake up and take the government on full force with no mercy. This government is run by soros, Carlos slims, bill gates and Monsanto. That will soon end

Comments provided by :
loy, bradford

Main stream media is run by the government. If our voices are taken away and only the msm is left, we are no different than communist china
do not try to take away first amendment rights

Comments provided by :
loy, rhonda

--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 :

Ludwig, Steven

The roll of the FEC is regulating money spent on elections, Not on Free Speech ! More undue burdens on taxpayers. This is not right to pay for more people to work in a government just to tax more taxpayers for something that is our right.

Comments provided by :
Lunemann, Vincent

Please leave my Constitutional rights ALONE once and for all! Especially my freedom of speech and right to bear arms!

Leave the internet alone. This is a great space in the world for people to share their political opinions and ideas. ANY effort to squash that is ludicrous and evil!

Comments provided by :

LUNNEY, PAUL

It is wrong what yal' are doing and shows how evil the Federal Government can be in times of great success for America. TPP is threat to our internet freedom. You should be ashamed of passing such a bill.

Comments provided by :
Lutfy, Stephen

I am going to lump you guys together. The guys who fight so hard to not have voter ID, but you are willing to take the free speech rights away from everyone who uses the internet. You need an ID to do just about everything why don't you help those who do not have one. And while you are busy doing that maybe you will leave us alone with our free speech internet.

Comments provided by :
Lutgen, Roger

regulating the internet is not necessary or needed, especially by a government tempted to abuse its authority to serve itself and a desire to pick winners and losers..(see Solyndra, GM Bondholders).The internet left alone will eliminate efforts to control it via the free market...users will simply start using a different service provider..bad ones will fail.

DO NOT INJECT ANOTHER GOVERNMENT BURACRACY INTO A WELL FUNCTIONING SYSTEM.

VOTE NO ON NET NEUTRALITY!

Comments provided by :

Lutz, tim

Government regulation of the internet is totally unnecessary and beyond what the government is allowed to do.

Comments provided by :
Lyden, Bob

The internet which is another tool of free speech works well without government "assistance." Any government involvement in the internet, regardless of whether that involvement has a disarming and deceptive name such as "net neutrality" or not has nothing to do with First Amendment rights or neutrality.

Steve

Comments provided by :

Lyle, Steve

The Internet is a forum of free speech on many subjects including politics.
The FEC was created to regulate the money spent on elections.
Most Internet postings are free of cost and therefore not subject to FEC rules.
The size and scope of the internet would require huge numbers of inspectors to look for violations.
This concept is flawed and would not yield any benefit, just more unnecessary regulations and red tape.
Please deny the request for another waste of Taxpayer resources.

Thank you!

Comments provided by :
Lynch, Donald

To the FEC: Hands off the Internet and political speech!! This is not within your scope of activity. It's this simple-- NO ONE wants MORE government interference in their lives. So don't touch my ability to communicate. DON'T! (and I do not care WHAT excuses you give--none of them matter.)

Comments provided by :
Lynch, Jacqueline

To Whom It May Concern:

Please keep the Internet free of government regulations. It is the one thing that government should never control! The first amendment truly exists on the Internet without any censoring. Too much in the newspapers, TV channels, etc. is being slanted. The Internet is a source for getting another point of view. More such sources are needed. Not less.

A. J. Lyon
Reno, NV 89523

Comments provided by :
Lyon, A. Jane

Please do not start regulating the internet. This wil take away our freedom of speech and will place an undue burden on small groups and individuals.

Comments provided by :
Macomber, Elaine

I do not want the FEC limiting the First Amendment right of speech on the internet regarding Political Speech. This is Orwellian ! The FEC's sole function is to track money donated to various campaigns NOT to REGULATE the Internet and First amendment. What they propose is tyrannical and contrary to our rights as enumerated in the Constitution. Stop this nonsense NOW !

John E. Macrini Sr.
Hitchcock, Texas 77563

Comments provided by :
Macrini, John

I do not want the United States Government (FEC) regulating free speech on the internet -- political or otherwise. The broad scope of these proposed regulations is limitless, and to enforce these new rules the government will have to appoint censors who monitor online political communication every day. As a free country we do not need or want this kind of oversight; nor do we need to spend the large amounts of money needed to enforce this regulation.

Comments provided by :

Magdal, Irene

To Whom It May Concern,

The FEC is tasked with regulating money spent on elections, not political speech. Reversing the exemption for the 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. That will place undue burdens on small groups and individuals. These proposed regulations would be extremely costly for taxpayers. The proposed regulations are a very bad idea. Thank you Tina Mahoney

Comments provided by :
Mahoney, Tina

Leave our amendments alone

Comments provided by :
Malek, Marianne

One of our constitutional rights is freedom of speech. It is our constitutional right to speak freely, and it reflects a totalitarian government that wishes to control speech of citizens of the United States of America.

Thank you.

Comments provided by :
Males, Marilee

The FEC is not empowered to regulate free speech or the internet. Regulating on-line posts and conversations is nothing short of censorship and is a violation of our first amendment rights. The FEC should stay out of censoring the internet.

Comments provided by :
Mandler, John

I do not want the FEC to try to regulate speech on the internet. They are not elected officials--this is why we have a House and Senate.

Comments provided by :
manesis, john

Any of your efforts to limit the use of our internet rights is un American and an infringement upon our freedom of speech and only supports those who would limit our freedoms. You do not have the authority to limit our freedoms in such a manner without the approval of those you would limit. I do not grant you that freedom.

Comments provided by :
Mann, Ray

Online opinions and commentary are NOT funds spent on elections, and therefore, none of the FEC's jurisdiction! There is no funding or desire for ever-more bureaucrats, appointees, monitors, underlings and censors to make sure that groups and individuals (i.e., citizens) are in compliance with ever-more bureaucracy, red-tape, regulations and heavy-handed meddling! You people are literally shitting up everything you touch!! Leave your hands off of online discussion and commentary. Thanks, and have a swell day!

Comments provided by :
Manning, Brian

?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.

Protect citizen's internet rights

Ryan Marks

Comments provided by :

Marks, Ryan

Did someone miss the line in the Declaration of Independence that states
"...Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from
the consent of the governed,..." When we the people (governed) say NO we don't want the government(elected
representatives) to do what "they" please, not what the majority of voters want.
DO NOT let the government "rule what we look at on the Television or or what we want to listen to on the radio.
Why did we fight WW2 and the COLD WAR ...to have our liberty taken away by
power hungry politicians? NO. No, NO!!!

Comments provided by :
Marlow, Jeannetta

Free speech is what protects us from tyranny.

It allows the world to know how select individuals are grossly being mistreated and intimidated into complying with the surrendering of their rights against their will and while under threat (terrorism).

Comments provided by :
marotta, anthony

ONLY A PERSON (GROUP) WANT TO CONTROL FREE SPEECH....

LEARN HOW TO SAY NO, NO WAY, GO FAR AWAY, STOP BOTHERING THE PEOPLE.

STOP INTERFERING WITH AMERICA

Comments provided by :
Martens, Dudley

I am totally and vehemently against the idea of another government intrusion into the civil rights of American citizens with this latest proposal, by the Communists in the Democratic party, to once again infringe on our liberty.

Please do not allow the government to control another element of our society in its efforts to systematically impose on the fundamental rights of citizens to freely express themselves on the internet. Facebook, etc already has its crew of censors at work.

Instead of scheming for more intrusion into the lives of honest American citizens, government bureaucrats should be searching for ways to do away with all the corruption and fraud going on.

Thank you!

Comments provided by :
Martin, Deryl

Please do not regulate free speech here on the internet.

Comments provided by :

Martin, Jim

FEC is attacking the First Amendment. You're trying to regulate the internet. You are trying to regulate our free speech.

Stop doing this Now

Comments provided by :
Martin, Sandra

I, and all others that cherish free speech as guaranteed by our Bill of Rights, am offended and angered that the U.S. government is so afraid of losing power- which is SUPPOSED to be that of the PEOPLE- that they feel they have to regulate everything that citizens say and do! This is nonsense! The government has and continues to vastly overstep its boundaries. The FEC is tasked with regulating money spent on elections, not political speech. Freedom of speech and the free exchange of ideas is what makes this country the envy of all others. Reversing the exemption for free postings online would have dangerous ramifications for constitutionally-guaranteed free speech.

We are in such a monetary crisis now that we will be lucky to ever pay the national debt down, and the government continues to spend and think of new and totally unnecessary ways of wasting money, such that it boggles the mind! 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. These new regulations would be extremely costly for taxpayers and difficult to enforce.

This will also place an undue burden on small groups and individuals that is totally unnecessary. People need to grow a backbone and not let every little thing that is said that we don't necessarily agree with bother us enough to want to shut everything down! Keep America FREE by not censoring political opinions!

Comments provided by :
Martin, Suzette

Although the FEC is tasked with regulating money spent on elections, it does not regulate political speech. Reversing the exemption for free postings online would have dangerous ramifications for constitutionally-guaranteed free speech. And should not be done. We have seen the effect of IRS on the free speech of Americans. We do not need to unleash the FEC 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 do not support any regulation to limit free speech, political or otherwise by any Federal, State or Local agency.

Comments provided by :

Marzoni, Jim

I am opposed to the proposed FEC regulation of the Internet. They are tasked simply with regulating election spending, NOT POLITICAL SPEECH WHICH IS CONSTITUTIONALLY PROTECTED! The plan would place a burden on individual rights and small groups. The expense to the tax payer would be enormous to attempt to police countless sites and platforms which invites selective persecution with political motivation, i.e., THE IRS VS. CONSERVATIVES. And furthermore, if undue persecution and defense of The Peoples liberties were not enough, the idea would create an unnecessary expense to internet commerce which would invite additional oversight and regulations that would result in TAXES! on our public internet property and private, creating greater cost burdens on consumers.

Sincerely,

Shane M.

Comments provided by :
mascherini, shane

Dear FEC members as a United States citizen.
I feel that is my right and my duty,
to speak on net neutrality
I strongly feel that this is a violation
of the First Amendment.
I feel it is no one's right or responsibility
to try to regulate speech on the Internet
at any place or any time.
If you are an adult over the age of 18
then there should be no regulation at all on opinion
issue speech or anything along these lines.
It is not for the federal government to monitor speech
if we are a free nation I cannot stop your speech
or anyone else's the minute that I try to do this
I am allowing a form of censorship,
which I feel is strongly against our constitutional right.
It is not at any time the government's job to regulate speech
that means to listen to read e-mails or social websites.
It is also not my job to tell someone they cannot speak
or that I don't like their speech or that their speech is offensive
to me it is my responsibility if their speech is offensive
to me that I leave where the speech is taking place
but only if I choose to do so you only regulations
on speech on the Internet on opinion on the Internet
should be done by parents of children who are under age.
So I encourage the Federal elections commission board
to scrap this regulation I do not want to violate your speech
political opinion or any other speech I encourage
and ask you not to violate my thank you for your time,
and consideration sincerely Bryce Mastro

Comments provided by :
Mastro, Bryce

Do not regulate the internet.

To do so is a violation of our first amendment rights. It is sad that i need to make this request. Americans should not turn against their own people.

Comments provided by :

mathias, randy

Do Not Stifle Free Speech

Comments provided by :
Matrona, Tony

Our Freedom is precious to the citizens of the United States. This includes freedom of speech, which in the age of technology, includes the internet. Please prevent porn, identity theft and international fraud. But other than this, the internet has become a vital tool. I use it for business and pleasure. In addition, it is a great educational forum. It is our right per the Constitution for "freedom of Speech". Stand by the Constitution and defend our Freedoms. This is what made America Great!

The Land of the Free and the Home of the Brave.

Comments provided by :
mattix, Patricia

The FEC is tasked with regulating money spent on elections, not political speech. Or the internet. Reversing the exemption for free postings online would have dangerous ramifications for constitutionally-guaranteed free speech. Amendment I: "Congress shall make no law... ABRIDGING THE FREEDOM OF SPEECH (emphasis mine), or of the press... (the relevant portion)". The FEC is not Congress, nor is it Constitutionally authorized to regulate the internet. 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 a violation of both Amendment I and Amendment IV. This will place an undue burden on small groups and individuals. These new regulations would be extremely costly for taxpayers and difficult to enforce. When in fact these regulations, outside of being un-Constitutional, are unnecessary. Thank you.

Comments provided by :
May, Michael

Dear sir or madam,

I am very disturbed by the potential restrictions being currently proposed abridging the first amendment rights of American citizens regarding the freedoms of political speech on the internet. ALL public forums are constitutionally protected for citizens to voice their opinions on governmental action, policy and shortcomings. This is not a "grey" area. Both individuals, and groups comprised of individuals, are equally entitled to this right through the extraordinary thoughtfulness and foresight of our founding fathers as well as recent Supreme Court rulings. Please consider carefully the long term impact of what is being discussed in this legislation. Political parties gain and lose power through election cycles. This is how a representative republic functions. If a person, or group of persons, does not have the ability to express their opinion on what they believe to be relevant and important information, the entire system will be perverted in a way that can lead to the destruction of our entire, beloved system of government.

Thank you for your time,
Tausha Maze

Comments provided by :
Maze, Tausha

I do not understand why you wish to try to regulate my use of the internet. It is mine as I pay to use it just as I do my telephone.

The internet is citizens one open method for expressing, freely, our opinions and our opinions are protected from government intervention by the First Amendment.

Please abandon any attempts now, or in the future, to impose bureaucracy into its operation.

Comments provided by :

McCorkill, Thomas

Sirs,

My comments and concerns are a simple statement: I do not want any government intervention requiring the use or taxation of the internet.

Focus on immediate needs such as closing our borders and deporting illegal aliens. Another area that needs attention is a government downsizing and reduction of taxes and repealing Obamadon'tcare. Your own citizens need your help in these areas.

Thank you

Comments provided by :

McDonald, Stan

I feel the government's continued attack on our freedoms outlined by the US Constitution is fraudulent and just another way to control free speech, acquire another avenue of taxation, and to gain overall control over the American people.

Comments provided by :
McDonald, William

I believe the FEC is in charge of Federal Elections regarding financial matters. Elections themselves are run by the individual states. Why does the FEC think these duties give them the authority to oversee any speech over the internet or any other means of communication?

Powers not given the to Federal Government are reserved to the states.

If the people of the states don't cede those powers to the state they remain with the People.

The People aren't quite sure what the FEC does AS OUR FEDERAL ELECTIONS ARE BASICALLY A MESS! But local and State elections seem to run just fine.

The Constitution is very clear on this matter The right of free speech is absolute. If the FEC feels it is necessary to monitor political speech wire tap both political parties at every level. I'm sure you will have enough to keep you busy. The FEC can always be defunded. It certainly is not a vital function of the Federal Government.

Comments provided by :
McDonough, John

Sirs:

I oppose the FEC reversing the exemption for free posting online because it would restrict free speech. It would also place a heavy burden on small groups and individuals. This new change would also be very costly and hard to enforce. After the way the IRS has acted over the last few years, I can also see this federal agency (FEC) using its power to go after political speech it does not agree with (depending on which political group is in power at that time.) Many Americans get much of their news off the internet. This news and information should not be restricted in any way.

Sincerely, Constance McGowan

Comments provided by :
McGowan, Constance

I want government intrusion to stop.leave my internet alone

Comments provided by :
McGuire , Greg

Do not regulate the internet.

Comments provided by :
mcgunagle, william

The FEC has no business regulating any part of the internet. Any regulation of the internet would be censorship and a violation of free speech under the First Amendment.

Comments provided by :
mchugh, tim

To the Federal Elections Commission;

Gentle people, I implore you all to strongly think and analyze what the undertaking you have proposed will do to the First Amendment rights of the American People. I know you don't care about the Constitution or the Bill of Rights, so it is absolutely no surprise to me and to millions of other Americans that believe in and live by Our constitution and bill of rights. It is also clearly apparent that You People, the handful of people you are, 5 or 6 or 7 of you, have the audacity to think that YOU can curtail Free Speech in any way. Being Democrats, that apparently, at least in your small capacity brains, seems to make you think that you can actually take away something "God Given", Our Rights as spelled out in the Bill of Rights and Constitution of the United States of America. This is not the Soviets Russia nor the Communists China, where there are no Rights. You have NO right to just make up some proposal and think that the American People are going to willy nilly just going to go all g with your Brain Dead thinking. Yes, as of the date of this comment, 12 November 2014, there are 801 days left in the Obama Administration, you likely feel gives you free reign over whatever you want, well it doesn't, yes you were appointed by Obama and or Clinton, but be certain, that you can just as easily be replaced by a Republican or Republicans that will just as easily replace your regulations or edicts with realistic and responsible oversight of campaign speech that You All are going to attempt to do to completely destroy the American People's Rights to Free Speech. This is not China and the censorship panels where they have made it impossible for real conversation and speech to take place. We are not going to have a Tienmen Square event in this country thanks to ish and power hungry people like yourselves.

Comments provided by :
McILROY, James

We need to keep the internet free of government overseers before we end up in a communist country like China. Read the bible and live by the laws of GOD. And we will all be better off in the end.

Thomas McIntosh

Comments provided by :

McIntosh, Thomas

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 an around the clock basis to look for potential, so called violations and subject them to inquiries and persecution for no other reason than stating an opinion.

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

These new regulations would be EXTREMELY costly to the taxpayer, not to mention UNCONSTITUTIONAL, and very difficult to enforce.

DID I MENTION THAT WHAT YOU ARE TRYING TO DO IS SUBVERSIVE AND UNCONSTITUTIONAL ????

You 3 Demoncrat commissioners must have lost what little minds you possess if you think the American citizens will stand for this sedition you propose

Comments provided by :
McKissack, Tom E.

I am writing to emphatically urge that the FEC not adopt new regulations that would regulate and censor the internet.

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.

It is not and should not be the job of any government agency to censor speech on the internet and I agree wholeheartedly with the FEC Chairman when he called this proposal "nothing short of a Chinese censorship Board."

Comments provided by :

McLean, Brad

I am against the federal government regulating the internet. This is a free speech issue and the feds need to stay out of internet regulation.

jb

Comments provided by :
mcmeans, jeffery

Government regulation of the internet is unnecessary and will cost the taxpayers even more money. It will inhibit honest opinions and interfere with free speech.

Comments provided by :
McNamara, Jean

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.

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

Comments provided by :

McNeiland, Jeff

To Whom It May Concern,

My comments are as follows with respect to proposed regulation that would effectively regulate the first amendment right of free speech:

- ? 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.

The proposed regulations are unnecessary and a violation of our constitution and basic freedoms. Please do not enact them.

Scott McQuinn

Comments provided by :
McQUinn, Scott

It is important to keep politics and government out of the intranet as it is an infringement against the citizens of this country allowing the government too much power. Look at China and Russia as prime examples.

Under freedom from regulations we have prospered and the system has worked as it should. Government and politicians create havoc and ruin. Leave the intranet along and let freedom reign.

Thank you.

Comments provided by :
McReynolds, Joyce

WHAT happened to FREE SPEECH?

Comments provided by :
Meadowcroft, Lisa

The FEC trying to stifle our freedom of speech on the internet runs counter to American principles. It strips away American freedoms and puts us on the same level as the communist Chinese government. The FEC's desire to regulate what is acceptable information to disseminate to the public is an affront to American values.

Comments provided by :
Medley, Robert

1 st amendment period freedom of speech zero tolerance for others ideas of how it should be get tough quit feeling start thinking

Comments provided by :
meegan, daniel

- ? 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 :
meehan, tim

This is typical of an out of control, dare I say fascist, government.
It is also an indication of the broad sweeping powers that governmental agencies possess. I would like to see a law passed that would provide criminal prosecution (Conspiracy to Commit Treason) for those Congressmen or Agencies that propose anything counter to the guaranteed rights provided by the Constitution.

Comments provided by :
Messimer, Thomas

Concerning government (FEC) "regulation" of the internet (don't do it)

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.

No regulation or monitoring of internet please. "Regulation" would allow the internet to be used for corrupt political purposes. Also, please remember that Republicans are likely to have the House the Senate and the Presidency beginning 2016. Be careful of what you wish for.

Thank You,
Eric Meyer

Comments provided by :
Meyer, Eric

We do not need to regulate anything more on the internet!!

Let the internet remain free, it is working just fine, ENOUGH GOVERNMENT CONTROL!!

Ms. Cory Miedema
Nine Mile Falls, WA 99026

Comments provided by :
Miedema, Cory

The Internet should be free speech as any other form of communication. George Mikesich

Comments provided by :
Mikesich, George

The following I defer to Alex Epstein's editorial on "The Market Oracle" website:

Part of what makes the United States of America exemplary, unique, capable, adaptable and a leader in the world, is the "Freedom of Speech" within the US, as protected by the First Amendment to the United States Constitution. America was founded as a constitutional Republic - a political structure under which the government is bound by a written constitution to the task of protecting individual rights (additionally, according to the Google definition, a "republic" is "a state in which supreme power is held by the people and their elected representatives, and which has an elected or nominated president rather than a monarch").

As an example, what makes America (The US) unique is not that it holds elections - even dictatorships hold elections - but that it's elections take place in a country limited by the absolute principle of "individual freedom". From our Declaration of Independence, which upholds the "unalienable rights" of every individual, among which are "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness", to our Constitution, whose Bill of Rights protects freedom of private property and freedom of speech, respect for individual liberty - These Individual Freedoms are The Greatness of The United States of America; They Need To Remain Legally Bound and Enforced, As Our American Founding Fathers Established; And Finally, The Individual Liberties Should Be Held as Sacred By Every Individual Citizen of The US, The US Government in Place, and The US Nation As A Whole.

According to Wikipedia, "political speech" in terms of one of the types of speech protected by the 1st Amendment to The US Constitution, is one of the "most highly guarded form(s) of speech because of it's purely expressive nature and (it's) importance to a functional republic". Moreover, "political freedom" is one of the most important features of highly-functional modern and free societies. According to Wikipedia, "(political freedom) is best described as a relationship free of oppression or coercion" by a free nation's government upon the citizens on that same free nation. Additionally, "(political freedom) is the freedom from unreasonable external constraints on action, the positive exercise of rights, capacities, and possibilities for action, and the exercise of social or group rights". Wikipedia continues the concept of "political freedom" with the "freedom from "internal" constraints on political action or political speech (ie, social conformity, etc; ...)". Finally, the concept of "political freedom" is strongly related to the civil liberties and basic human rights afforded legal protection from the state or federal government in modern free nations.

Martin Luther King, Jr. was able to publicly communicate and deliver his "I Have A Dream Speech" to an audience of over 250,000 civil rights supporters from the steps of the Lincoln Memorial in Washington, DC on August 28, 1963, in a defining moment in America (The US) to call for an end to racism in the United States. He was legally able to do this because of his inalienable right and protected individual freedom as a US citizen to exercise His "Freedom of Speech". Tell them about the dream, Martin!

Comments provided by :
Millard, Justin

I would like to voice my opposition to this attempt to force people like myself to have to pay for using the internet when I am already having to pay the internet provider I use. I also oppose any attempt by the FCC, FEC or any other government entity who wishes to violate my constitutional right to free speech

Comments provided by :
Miller, Charlotte

I don't know how many times I have fax, emailed and written in regards to this Net Neutrality situation and I am asking you once and for all to stop you trying to change the internet.

Comments provided by :
Miller, Lawrence

do no change any part of our free speech. What is the government's problem all of a sudden. This is not the Stalin's government

Comments provided by :
miller, margaret

Leave us alone.

Comments provided by :
Miller, Tim

Free speech is the right of every American. Do not censor it in any way.

Comments provided by :
Millwood, ryan

The FEC should NOT be in the business of anything other than monitoring the cash flows in and out of the various FEDERAL elections. There is already a glut of unnecessary, unneeded regulations put forth upon the population of this country. Any and all laws should first pass muster with the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, and the Declaration of Independence. Further, any laws should be considered practical in nature, cost effective, and be fair and beneficial to EVERYONE, not to a select group or groups at someone's sole choosing. FEDERAL government overreach has been a major problem for a VERY long time now. The role of any government should be, first and foremost, in an oversight and advisory capacity. Even if a serious breach of the law should in fact occur, the FEDERAL government's role should be limited and restrained. Something very important has been lost sight of over the years: The government works for the PEOPLE, NOT the other way around! Going forward, all of us must be mindful of that fact.

Comments provided by :
Minnick, John

Isn't this typical. The Democrats thier rears kicked in the election and now they you unelected unaccountable government bureaucrats to try and change the elction laws. What a crock bull manure. This is so typical of this government under this administration who can never admit they did anything wrong. They can never admit their policied are out of step with the mainstream of America, and then to have people such as the FEC step in to regulate what can and can't be posted to the internet is so typical. Do you really thjink it was political speech on the internet that caused the election thumping? If that's the belief, I suggest the administration and yourselves get off the crack pipe. Besides, where do you unelected, illegally appointed morons get off determining what is free speech and postable and what isn't? I say all Americans should ignore any non-legislative directives. You do not have the constitutional authority to enact or enforce any regulation, or directive. Or is it really about more administration cronyism? What a crock. Obamas preaching in China about a more open internet while his minions in this country are trying to do just the opposite. WHAT A JOKE AND A LIAR HE IS ALONG WITH YOU PEOPLE.

Comments provided by :

Mitko, Frank

To the FEC:

?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 :

Moe, Mark

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed Net Neutrality regulations.

I feel the Internet is working well under our present situation and want to keep the Internet free of regulation by the FCC.

Comments provided by :
Moilanen, William

The FEC has no business even contemplating the regulation of free and political speech on the internet.

Your job is to regulate money spent on elections.

Not only would it be considered a broad overreach of the federal government into the private lives of it's citizenry, but would cost untold millions to monitor such activities plus millions more to enforce a law and prosecute any so call "violators."

All these wasted resources squandered on breaking the law and encroaching on our first amendments rights shall not stand!

Comments provided by :
Mooneyham, Kevin

I am totally against this regulation. Once more it is the government trying to control the people instead of upholding the constitutional rights of the people to freedom of thought, holding a different viewpoint, a right to assembly, a right to differ with the government and hold it accountable for all it's illegal acts and abuses of power especially this current government. The right to share and compare information with others freely and without government intrusion, oversight, censoring or denying outright is part of that basic right of free speech. I am of the opinion that any government agency (commission, department, council, etc) that could be corrupted will be corrupted completely and as such should be eliminated and all their regulations, directives, etc. be nullified. I view your agency as completely corrupted.

Comments provided by :
Moore, James

Stop trying to regulate free speech, political or otherwise, on the Internet or anywhere else. Unless what's written there is threatening or illegal, stop trying to eliminate free speech.

This is The United States of America.

Comments provided by :
Moore, Jim

What you want to do is an infringement on our right to free speech!

Comments provided by :

Morand, Lynne

Keep your hands off our internet

Comments provided by :
Morgenstern, Joshua

I am a disabled VET and have fought and will fight for the Constitution of These here United States of America. Anyone trying to take those from me or any other person is to me a Domestic Enemy and there by are unworthy of living by the rights given forth by said document. To try and take away my Freedom of Speech, Right to Bear Arms, will result in first a legal action as I can afford. Failing that, I shall again take up arms for this Country even knowing it will end in my failure. Alone I but one, I also know there are many that feel the same as I do, this is my country and I will do all I can to defend her until the end of my life. It won't be a remembered fight but I will die free.

Comments provided by :
Morrow, Leonard

Please do not try to put regulations on internet free speech.

Comments provided by :
MORTON, MIKE

From my perspective, The Federal Election Commission, like the Security and Exchange Commission and the Federal Drug Administration to name just three of the agencies set up by Congress to regulate conduct within a given area, have unconstitutionally set themselves up as super-legislators proposing rules that have the force of law. As such, each of you who have never been elected by a vote of the people are doing the work of Congress. We the people have no voice when it comes to your unconscionable behavior. And, what's worse is that you've gone a step further by establishing your special courts where one who is aggrieved by virtue of your unconstitutional directives must exhaust their administrative remedy before that body before being permitted have their grievance heard in an actual court of law. Congress together with the Executive Branch have not only made the pursuit of justice more difficult, they have made it more costly and completely unnecessary. Therefore, if I had my way, I would dissolve and do away with every commission, tribunal or administrative body and require the Congress to do its job which is to enact single purpose legislation that is both doable and comprehensible rather than these unreadable omnibus pieces of what Congress refers to as "comprehensive legislation" but which I call taking the lazy mans way out by transferring the responsibility to some unnamed unknown entity. Take your hands off the Internet.

Norman Moss, JD, retired
Winter Park, FL 32792

Comments provided by :
Moss, Norman

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 :

Mullins, Joanne

Please do not try to deny my first amendment rights.

Comments provided by :
Mullins, Philip

The 1st amendment guarantees me the right to free speech. However it does not empower any power hungry agency or bureaucracy to regulate speech of any kind in any venue. Political correctness and over regulation are stifling not only on the economy but on learning and natural human development. BACK OFF!!!!!!!

Comments provided by :
mullins, Shane

Net neutrality is bad. Cut out the lib bs

Comments provided by :
Munn, Ray

Please DO NOT REGULATE the Internet. It succeeds BECAUSE IT IS UNREGULATED. Government is not the solution for everything. Please take the following into account.

- ? 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.

In the end, we'd just end up with censors like China. I know that's a bad idea, but the problem with government is that it so often creeps into things, when it never should have gotten started on it. This is one of those cases. Don't fix what isn't broken...

Comments provided by :
Munson, Stephen

I was born into this great country and guaranteed a life of freedom. I will fight for my right's as an American. Back off and STOP trying to interfere with my GOD given rights.

Comments provided by :
murphy, colleen

Dear FEC,

Please be advised that I do not wish you or any government agency to monitor any of my communications.

This is still the USA & I wish to remain a citizen with all my constitutional rights.

Sincerely,

Judy Murphy

Comments provided by :
Murphy, Judy

Please let's not forget that despite recent developments under the current "Democratic" administration, the U.S. is still a FREE country. Regulating online speech is WHOLLY un-free, un-Constitutional and downright un-American. This type of oppression of free speech should not under any circumstances tolerated!

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 :
Murphy, Tricia

I don't want the any regulation that infringes the free speech via any medium that includes the internet.

Comments provided by :
Nambiar, Pradeep

There appears to be an over emphasis on regulation right now which if implemeneted, will destroy our 1st amendment right as U.S. citizens; the internet being one main concern. Since morals are not high on the agenda I am still hoping that national and personal security is which should be the top priority for any and all regulatory control. We will remains strong if all freedoms are entact so long as they are used wisely and monitored only for or national security sake. We have an abundance of agencies that need to work together to protect "We the people", not we the legislature, etc.

Comments provided by :
Nardo Jr, Jim

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.

Further, this is just one more attack on our citizens and our freedom and further diminishes American citizens trust in our government and the people who have been elected to protect and represent the will of the people (in case you have forgotten, that means real citizens of this country, not illegals and not corporations). In spite of the fact that democrats now do business as an extremist group who live by the creed "the end justifies the means" and the belief that Americans are stupid and must be ruled, not represented, we DO see these actions as part of a broad based ATTACK on this country, our Constitution and the LAW ABIDING CITIZENS thereof.

More and more Americans ARE waking up and seeing the democrat agenda for what it is. Do NOT take this action. We are watching and will no longer sit idly by and witness our own destruction at the hands of your band of outlaws.

Sincerely,

Tim Nelson

Comments provided by :
Nelson, Timothy

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 Neumerous 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 :
Nesbitt, William

I am against any controlling of the internet. This would be an attack against our freedom of speech. Please keep the government out of my internet. This would just be one step closer to communism. Hitler? remember? History does repeat itself.

Comments provided by :
Newville, Judith

Do not be Obama's lackey. America does not need regulation of the internet, esp not by a group of liberals looking to spy on its citizenry. This is a backdoor to censorship and a trampling of the 1st Amendment.

Comments provided by :
nicolais, linda

?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 :

Nielsen, Robin

Abraham Lincoln is considered by many to have been the greatest American president. Winston Churchill has been regarded as the most inspiring English statesman in history. Johannes Gutenberg has been named one of the most influential men of the last millennium. And Mother Teresa is recognized the world over as an outstanding humanitarian.

What has made the lives of these individuals so different?

What is it about these persons that has set them apart?

Certainly it is a combination of many factors, including passion, determination, faith, circumstances, and a positive attitude. But there is something else - a "something" rare and yet available to everyone in the United States of America who has the freedom of speech as defined by the First Amendment to the United States Constitution that prohibits the making of any law respecting an establishment of religion, impeding the free exercise of religion, abridging the freedom of speech, infringing on the freedom of the press, interfering with the right to peaceably assemble or prohibiting the petitioning for a government redress of grievances.

The art of communication is an art that requires freedom of speech.

With the freedom of speech, a gangly lawyer became a world leader, changed the stuttering adolescent into a catalyst for allied peace, enabled a simple newspaperman to transform the way the world thinks, and helped a frail woman give hope to thousands of people.

A new generation of world-changers is alive today. Every one of us, including you and me, has been placed here on Earth with a special set of talents and insights that can benefit people, add value to others and multiply leadership. Without the freedom of speech, millions of people would lose the best years of their lives drifting of what life "could have been."

With freedom of speech we can communicate our ideas well, our nation and world can improve: more people can find meaningful work that becomes more satisfying, our bank accounts can grow, our minds can be sharper, and our overall quality of life can be brighter.

The freedom of speech must be preserved by leaders. My loan contract for current and future leaders: I can give you a position of leadership. You must earn permission to lead. You must make the best of that opportunity. I can set you up as a leader with potential. You must stay up by fulfilling your potential. I can get people to follow you today. You must get people to follow you tomorrow. My influence to you is a loan, not a gift. Express gratitude - Use it wisely. Give me a return on my investment. Give others a return on my investment. Give yourself a return on my investment. This can be done with freedom of speech. Only tyranny prevails once freedom of speech is taken away or given away.

Comments provided by :
Niemeyer, Bret

The FEC's proposal to regulate the internet would necessitate the hiring of more government workers at our expense to monitor our speech. What for?? This is something done in China - not in the United States of America. I am appalled that the government wants to create extremely expensive and unnecessary regulations to regulate something that does not need regulating!!

Comments provided by :

Niezgoda, Sally

The internet is the last place for freedom pure and simple and it should stay that way; please, no govt. intrusions or regulation of any kind. Keep it free to all who use it.

Comments provided by :
Nikel, Sam

Please consider our constitution. Do not pass laws that adversely effect the 1st a day 2nd amendment.

I support all organizations that protect the Constitution of the USA. Constitutional law has already been written. Leave the Constitution alone.

Comments provided by :
nix, edward

Don't fix it if it ain't broke!!!! Its not broken! if you are worried about some companies making deals with search engines or other internet "suppliers", don't! the free market will settle it out. the only time the government should get involved is if there is illegal activities going on.

Please stay out. Aren't you a citizen also? How much government can YOU live WITHOUT? try it, you'll like it!
Thank you for reading my opinion.

Comments provided by :
Nonnenmacher, Keith

To Honorable Members of the Federal Elections Commissions,

The FEC should not and must not regulate the internet. The 1st amendment solution to speech you don't like is NOT regulation, but MORE speech - NOT LESS! 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.

Most Kind Regards,

George D. Norris
gtnbiz@live.com
425-503-2910

Comments provided by :
Norris, George

This commission is for regulating money spent on elections, not political speech. Stay away from regulating free speech which is guaranteed by the first amendment. Stopping exemptions for free online postings is a bad idea, it would seriously hamper free speech. Opinions of persons and small groups would begin to be seen as "potential violations", putting undue burden on them to defend themselves. Not to mention require a great deal of constant scrutiny of the internet by the FEC at a GREAT COST TO AMERICAN TAXPAYERS. These regulations would be difficult to enforce and therefore would likely be enforced unfairly by the "party in power."

THE FEC SHOULD NOT BE ALLOWED TO REGULATE POLITICAL SPEECH ON THE INTERNET.....or anywhere else for that matter.

Comments provided by :
North, Julie

NO Net Neutrality.

Leave the Internet the hell alone - it's one of the few things that works, and the government doesn't really have very much to do with it.

Private industry developed the 'Net (aside from the protocols) and the government has no right to interfere in it.

If a company treats its customers poorly on the 'Net, they can vote with their feet and go elsewhere. That won't be the case under government control.

The first Amendment issues will be legion if the 'Net is under government control - in case you don't know, that's the Amendment that is paraphrased as "freedom of speech (especially political expression)." The great equalizer, the Internet, will be going away.

NO Net Neutrality!

- Joe Nottoli
Marietta, GA, USA

Comments provided by :
Nottoli, Joe

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.

Because the US media is no longer unbiased, the internet is the **ONLY** way the American public is able to get all the information required to make an informed decision during elections. Politicians are no longer able to hide and cover up their misdeeds, lie about their record, etc.

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.

With the recent scandal at the IRS for targeting opposition political groups, the potential for a similar scandal at the FEC given this power is just too great to ignore. This grab for power over the first amendment right of free speech smacks of the rise of a potential dictatorship.

PROTECT FREE SPEECH!!

Comments provided by :
Noujaim, Lisa

I am a very concerned citizen who does not want government regulation of the internet!
Stay out, Please.
Our lives are over-regulated enough as it is.
Such action would make life more difficult for ordinary individuals!
Please don't try to fix that which isn't broken.
Leave our internet Free.
Thank you,
Matilda Novak

Comments provided by :
Novak, Matilda

I am very concerned about raising the gas tax. A large percentage of our populous use gas driven vehicles almost every day. Whether it is their own vehicle or one that is owned by someone else or a company, the cost of that transportation is somewhat controlled by the cost of running that vehicle. The cost of gas definitely has an impact on that cost.

In addition, part of the cost of running almost every service vehicle from delivery vehicles, to ambulances, to security - like police cars, etc. would be impacted by an increase in the gas tax.

In short, the increase in the gas tax will have a negative impact on almost every person in this country. I can't think of anything that would have a greater negative impact other than an increase in personal taxes.

Please let us get our economy back on track before we make it worse.

Sincerely,

Peter A. Nutting

Comments provided by :
Nutting, Peter

I do not want my freedom of speech taken away in any sort of manner! Our military has fought for our freedoms, and you have no right to take them away!

Comments provided by :
O'Bryan, Katelyn

Do not pass Net Neutrality. I feel it would hinder start-ups and not lend itself to a "level playing field."

Comments provided by :
O'Donovan, kevin

KEEP YOUR DIRTY, CORRUPT,HANDS OFF MY INTERNET

Comments provided by :
Oggioni, John

Stop the nonsense.

Comments provided by :
Olson, Greg

The FEC's job is to regulate money spent on elections, not to regulate political speech. Regulating political speech endangers one of our most fundamental and constitutional rights. What would be the purpose of tamping down free speech in a free and open society? American citizens have the right to post opinions online, and you do not have the right to take it away from us.

Comments provided by :
Opp, Linda

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.

Help stop the chipping away of the freedoms that make this country beautiful. I can hardly recognize my own country anymore. You have an opportunity right now to stand up and say this is the United States of America, the land of the free. That includes freedom of speech! The internet is such a powerful tool for the people to make themselves heard. We the people cannot in good conscience remove any piece of that power. What will it be tomorrow?

Comments provided by :
Orton, Ariana

For the love of everyday freedom, do not restrict or monitor our activities online through the internet.

Comments provided by :
Osborn, Donna

Stop the government overreach concerning the FEC, FCC, VA, EPA and any other department.

Comments provided by :
O'Toole, Dennis

It is not the responsibility of the FEC to regulate the Internet and to violate our First Amendment Rights of free speech. Politicians have done enough damage through the IRS, Obamacare, Fast & Furious, Benghazi, etc., etc., etc. I personally am and will protest against any more government intrusion of any kind. It is time for those in Washington to understand that they work for the American people and they were not elected to dismantle the constitution one amendment at a time.

Comments provided by :
Overstreet, Betty

I am not for internet censorship. The government needs to stay out of the business of the internet.

Comments provided by :
Owens, Deborah

Please do not infringe on my constitutional rights to free speech.

I do not believe in big government as it tends to minimize freedoms.

Our government is already too bloated.

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 :

Owens, 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 enforce.

Comments provided by :

Ownby, Jim

I deserve to have freedom to do what I could say and do using the internet. I am againts Net Neutrality- enough of the regulation and shutting down my rights. I dont want government takeover. Please leave us alone.

Comments provided by :
oyanib, mary ann

This is NOT China. Stop trying to take away our FREEDOM OF SPEECH. We already have monitors, censors & regulators and regulations. STOP TRAMPELING ON MY CONSTITUTION. This is a FREE country thanks to our volunteer BRAVE. You have NO right to even consider censoring ANYTHING we say, think, or write PERIOD PERIOD PERIOD. An no I didnt get to keep my doctor, didnt get to keep my insurance (now I have NO insurance). I'll be dammed to hell before I give up my free speech, my money, my guns or MY BIBLE. Keep your government OUT of my daily life!!!! WE LEFT THE "MOTHERLAND" SO WE COULD BE FREE PEOPLE...

Comments provided by :
Pacheco, Colleen

What has become of our freedom? And you will stand by while all that millions of Americans have worked so hard and gave life and limb to give you a chance to do and be whatever you want, is stolen. Shameful. Stand up and say thank you for your freedom by saying no to this oppression. Protect America.

Comments provided by :

Padia, Catherine

The FEC's task is regulating money spent on elections, not regulating political speech and opinions. It would take an army of regulators to monitor the internet, and they would be enforcing an individual's or group's opinion. DO NOT restrict my Constitutionally protected right to Free Speech.

Comments provided by :
Parrott, Patsi

"We" are guaranteed freedom of speech through the 1st amendment of the Constitution. The FEC should NOT have the right to limit this freedom. Not only do they not have the right to do this, but how do they propose to PAY for the monitoring of ALL the political comments made in such a huge forum? Using tax dollars? Increase our taxes to do so? This seems SOOO ludicrous! It reminds me of what the IRS wanted/tried to do. Thankfully that was stopped! This must be stopped also. I do NOT believe this is justified or warranted & needs to end...NOW. Thank you.

Comments provided by :
Patt, Christine

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

Comments provided by :
Patterson, Pam

I do not trust this government, or any government with the power to control my political thought. Our founding fathers did not trust government with this level power. Most of the problems that our nation faces today stem from the total corruption of the government in Washington DC.

This Stasi style power will be used to crush political opposition.

This is the same style of power corruption which Comcast-Time Warner Cable Co partners with Executives in Government to BAN such networks as The Blaze TV network. Both Obama and Comcast will be stuffing money in the others back pockets. The US government, Democrats and Republicans do not want an Independent news channel.

What I see going on in DC makes me sick.

Comments provided by :

Paul, Gary

The United States of America is the Land of the Free. Government is to be for the People. Not the dominating regulating money machine that is crushing our Country. Leave the Internet for the use of our private lives. All Freedom must be protected. Leave the Internet for the People not the Politicians. Corruption of those in elected offices is overwhelming and out of control. Keep the Internet for the People not the hidden agendas of the corrupt and greedy politicians.

Comments provided by :
pauloo, claudia

The 397-0 US HOUSE VOTE ("House approves resolution to keep Internet control out of UN hands") in Dec. 2012 was meant to send a signal of our official position to all countries meeting at a U.N. conference on telecommunications in Dec. 2012.

US or U.N. regulation of the Internet will nullify our free speech. Why do we press this issue against the past successes of free internet and bipartisan support?

Who drives this issue? What is the interest of driving parties to restrict freedom of speech? Is this in the interest of "WE THE PEOPLE"? It is obvious that "WE THE PEOPLE" do not want anybody to touch the internet.

Hungary:

Updated Oct. 31, 2014 1:46 p.m. ET

"Hungary's leader suspended a controversial plan to tax Internet traffic in the face of mass protests and corporate opposition.

In the biggest demonstrations to hit the country since Prime Minister Viktor Orban took power four years ago, tens of thousands of Hungarians took to the streets this past week to protest the planned tax, shouting "Dictator!" and arguing that the plan threatened civil liberties."

Why do we disturb the US with such ideas?

Comments provided by :

Peana, Daniel

The American people do not want to pay more taxes to regulate our own constitutionally-guaranteed free speech.

Comments provided by :

Pedone, Cheryl

The government should not regulate the internet. I believe this is a direct attack on our First Amendment Rights!

Comments provided by :

Pekol, Thomas

I don't want the FEC regulating any kind of political speech. It would have dangerous ramifications for constitutionally-guaranteed free speech.

Comments provided by :
Perez, David

The FEC shouldn't even be tasked with regulating money spent on elections, much less political speech.

Comments provided by :
perez, javier

Please stop taking our freedoms away from us. We want the government to preform what the constitution states and that only. What's next our homes and property?

God Bless America

Comments provided by :
Perry, Joyce

Regulating the internet is the worst possible idea for freedom and freemarket ever.

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

This is a very communist idea at it's core ... I've spent a long military career believing that I was fighting against communism, not embracing it!!!

Comments provided by :
Perschbacher, Charles

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 :
Petersen, Darwin

i am dead set against any govt regulations for the internet.
leave the free speech alone. we should be able to say whatever
we want on the internet and we don't need any more
govt employees mucking things up.

this is simply a power grab to eliminate dissent and it's
un-American.

please reconsider your stance on eliminationg free speech
on the internet under the guise of campaign reform.

thank you for your valuable time and trouble.
david petraitis

Comments provided by :
petraitis, david

Let's be serious: this is one of the dumbest proposals anyone on any board in any regulatory or government agency has ever heard.

Comments provided by :
Peverly, Ryan

The FEC is charged with regulating elections nor regulating political speech. In addition, these new regulations would be extremely costly for taxpayers and difficult to enforce. Let's keep America a free country.

Thank you,

Dorene Pfeifer

Comments provided by :
Pfeifer, Dorene

The internet works as it exists, Government regulations are not needed or wanted by the american people. Government intervention succeeds only in costing the american people jobs, money and headaches as evidenced by the affordable care act and numerous other regulations imposed by our representatives.

Comments provided by :
pflugradt, james

Please do not start regulating the internet also. This is the last thing that we should have regulated. It seems that the government wants to regulate everything and everyone. There should be less regulations as every time there is a new regulation there is another bureaucracy born and grows the government bigger. How are we going to pay our 18 TRILLION debt when the government just wants to grow and grow. I think it is time to cut back on big government and do away with some regulations instead of getting more.

Comments provided by :
Pherson, Elwood

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 :

Phillips, Bob and Carolyn

Gentlemen:

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.

Thank you for your time,
Tom Phipps

Comments provided by :
Phipps, Tom

The web was never suppose to be regulated and censored or controlled by the government and the Constitution prohibits it.

Why does the government think they have to control every thought and every movement we the people make. There is no reason and no sense.

The USA grew to be a wealthy, strong and powerful country when we had freedom of speech and freedom to work and hire workers and to grow with the freedom of thought and action and with NO GOVERNMENT interference. Now look at our country. It is being dstroyed and citizens no longer have the freedom to work and improve themselves because the government wants to control all. Everything the government touches it messes up. Free enterprise is successful. Do not try to control the internet.

Comments provided by :
Pierce, Charlotte

Regulating political speech online is nothing short of criminal. This is an unconstitutional oppression of freedom of speech and should not be allowed to happen. You need only to look at the November fourth mid-terms elections to understand we as free Americans are sick and tired of our rights being trampled on by an oppressive government.

Comments provided by :
Pinnegar, Michael

Dear Government. Keep your hands off our Internet !!! Government has not proved they can manage anything significant and we do not want you to ruin this too for the American People. Thank you

Comments provided by :
Piz, Rich

I oppose any regulations of the internet.

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 :

Pizzurro, Philip

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 :

Powell, Clifton

Government should not be involved in determining any speech content on the internet. It goes against all we believe in with the 1st Amendment. How can anyone even be thinking about such a restriction? That sort of thing occurs only in communist countries or dictatorships. We, the United States of America, are not one of those. Stand firm.

Comments provided by :
Powers, Allison

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 :

Prentice, Christian

Please don't mess with my internet. Everything is just fine as it stands now.

Comments provided by :
Preston, Mona

Dear FEC, I do not believe that regulating free speech is something that should be regulated by you or any other agency. The limitations that you are trying to enact will infringe on the rights of Americans. I don't want our government to use Federal agencies to bypass the power of legislation by the Congress. The EPA deciding to regulate carbon and destroying coal fired generators is also troubling. Once again, it is another instance of Federal agencies bypassing the job and duty of the legislature. The election of 2014 should have been a bellwether to rein in the plans of more government regulation, but it hasn't been seen as a warning of discontent by the voters. The voters do not want the country to be run by Federal agencies or Presidents who sign carbon treaties or gun control treaties with the UN or China.

Comments provided by :
Prieur, Michael

The FEC does not have any right to regulate my speech regarding my political preferences. Whatever notes I send to my family and friends is no ones business but mine. I am tired of the government sticking their nose into my personal business on every turn. The FEC would have to hire an army of people to regulate this and guess who gets to pay that bill? I do not want to pay more taxes to have my first amendment regulated.

Comments provided by :
Propst, Julie

Keep the internet free, no intrusion by any government branch, hell, they can't even run their own branches. Stop blatant attempts to tax the internet which we all know is the main reason behind attempts to control it one way or another.

Comments provided by :
Przybranowski, Andrew

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 :

Puckett, Anthony

I would not like the government to control my internet

Comments provided by :
putman pearson, linda

I am strongly opposed to any and all regulation or censorship of my First Amendment Right of FREE SPEECH, including that on the internet.

The FEC nor any Government Agency has any right to infringe on MY CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS!

I will support any effort to STOP this, yet another attack on MY FREEDOM!

David M. Raby

Comments provided by :
Raby, 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 :

Raineri-Maldonado, David

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

Comments provided by :
Ramskugler, Marilyn

Contrary to this current governments beliefs we are a free country.
We will continue to fight socialism and communism until we die.

You are in our business too much as it is. Get out and stay out.
This is why the election stomped this current government so badly.
We have had enough.

Comments provided by :
Ratliff, Judy

The FCC needs to understand that the internet works just fine. The FCC needs to accept that they are need to control the writings, thoughts, or development of everyone. The FCC needs to understand that in fact it is another representative of the PEOPLE and the PEOPLE does not need nor want the FCC to control their lives. Yes we (the PEOPLE) understand life is not fair, particularly when the government get involved but life is better without much government involvement. Last STAY AWAY FROM THE NET IT WORKS WELL NOW!!! The old saying "if it ain't broke don't try to fix it" best comes to mind.

Comments provided by :
Reattoir, Sande

To Whom It May Concern,

It would be a terrible mistake for the government to attempt to regulate political speech on the internet. 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. Thank you for your time.

Comments provided by :
Reece, Richard

Dear Sirs,

It is inappropriate for the FEC to regulate the internet in any manner.

1. The role of the FEC is to regulate money spent on elections, not political speech.
2. Reversing the exemption for free postings online would have dangerous ramifications for constitutionally-guaranteed free speech. There would be a huge potential for bias. We have already seen how the IRS has been used against political opponents. This could easily happen with the FEC.
3. The FEC would have to employ a huge 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.
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. We are tired of shoveling an endless amount of money into the federal government. We need less control, not more.
6. We do not need any interference from big business or from the government in how the internet is run. It has been an amazing success in allowing free exchange of information. This needs to continue and should not be curtailed in any way.

Thank you.
Sharon Rees

Comments provided by :
Rees, Sharon

I believe in the second amendment there has been so many men and wemon that lost there lives to keep our freedoms so to change anything about constitution would be a crime to all that lost there lives

Comments provided by :
Reesman, Ricky

Our government has no business in our business. The internet should remain as is. As long as free speech is written into our laws I'll continue to speak out against tyranny and for civil rights on the internet or wherever I choose in this country. We have already had our rights trampled on because of this administration and I say enough is enough. Leave the internet alone. It works just fine for "we the people" as it is.

This is ridiculous to think that anyone but the greedy left would be in favor of. More people want freedom above all else, even many of the left leaning voters. We are not the stupid people you think us to be. Did you happen to notice what happened last week? Only the Progressive left would consider such a thing as denying voter rights to free speech.

Haven't you people done enough damage to this country? But since we are so stupid, we know you will never stop your stupidity of trying to control the masses and force them to do your will. It is not your will but God's will. Do not forget that.

Comments provided by :
Reever, Carolyn

President Obama yesterday proposed that the FEC should increase regulations over the internet, to treat it as a public utility. And as Democrats line up behind the President trying to control what Americans can and can not say over the internet, We the People find this to be a violation of our First Amendment Rights.

Even the chairman of the FEC called this proposal "nothing short of a Chinese Censorship Board"--yet once again the federal government wants a agency of the federal government to over step its authority to control American's speech while ignoring our Constitutional Rights.

The President's proposal is wrong, not only for Americans--but for the internet as a whole, and I ask you to reject this proposal.

Comments provided by :
Renneberg, Ron

The regulation of the internet must stop, it is not for the FEC to say, nor is it for the FEC to regulate!

Our internet must remain free for all American Citizens as it was meant to be by the creators of the internet!

I am appalled that our government is willing to turn over control of our internet to Foreign powers, regulate it, and tax the internet as so many things have been done by other U.S. government agencies!

Just like the stupidity of the TPP that will harm our country & people, selling out the American people so that Foreign powers will dominate our way of life!

Just like the United Nations Small Arms Treaty that imposes rule of law by Foreign powers, selling out the American people as well!

All of these actions listed above are, and should be considered an act of Treason against the American people!

Comments provided by :
Renwick, Roger

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. It would also be costly to taxpayers and difficult to enforce. Under no circumstances do we want internet content regulated.

Comments provided by :
Rhew, Donald

I believe regulating internet is the wrong way to go. It dangerously leads the way for limiting free speech, which violates our first amendment rights. It looks like a Trojan Horse, coming in as a "friendly" legislation, but it's potential harm greatly outweighs it's touted benefits.

Comments provided by :
Rice, Kathy

The FEC was established to regulate money spent on elections - not to police the internet. It is my belief that the internet has performed and developed very well for over a decade without any government intervention. With all due respect - KEEP YOUR HANDS OFF OF THE INTERNET!

Thank you very much.

Comments provided by :
Richards, Donald

I strongly disagree with any regulating of the Internet. This goes directly against our first amendment rights as citizens of the USA. Please leave our internet ALONE!

Comments provided by :
Richison , Darlene

?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 :

Ricketts, Greg

Too many people are hurting and more will be hurting as time goes on. This is not right. It is absolutely not right for a free nation as ours. It is harmful and immoral. Please stop this.

Comments provided by :
Rimkus, Joseph

Please refrain from infringing on our freedoms and liberties which serve as the foundation for American exceptionalism.Thanks

Comments provided by :
Rison, Joe

The internet was devised as a way to exchange ideas without interference. The implementation of a regulation or regulating comity to oversee the internet will eventually stop free speech and the exchange of free ideas.

Comments provided by :
Rissel, Earl

TAKE YOUR DIRTY HANDS OF THE FIRST AMMENDANT AND LEAVE ALONE OUR FREEDOM OF SPEECH.

Comments provided by :
Rivas, Nelida

Hi

Please leave the internet Free of government control - This was a free country before Ombamacare.

Freeman Bob Rivera

Comments provided by :

Rivera, R.Robert

DO not Regulate the internet, thank you.

Comments provided by :
Robenseifner, James

Lawmakers,

All of you need to realize you are in your positions because the People put you there to make a CHANGE for the COUNTRY'S better. More taxes and more REGULATION will not help AMERICA or her people. Stand up for us. Do not impose another tax on the internet or ANYTHING. WE are INUDATED with taxes! Stand up for us or pay the consequences next voting day.

Comments provided by :
Roberson, Calista

?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.

Even an attempt to censor or regulate speech anywhere is a violation of the 1st Amendment and inherently unconstitutional. If the FEC needs a new cause, how about a universal/national voter ID! Something the majority of Americans support and something that would go a long way to eliminate voter fraud.

Comments provided by :
Roberts, Dale

We are regulated to death don't make anymore.

Comments provided by :
Roberts, James

FEC STAFF,

PLEASE DO NOT ENACT ANY LEGISLATION THAT WOULD LIMIT MY ABILITY TO EXPRESS MY FREE SPEECH, ON THE INTERNET OR IN ANY OTHER VENUE.

OUR CONSTITUTION GIVES ME AND ALL AMERICANS THE RIGHT TO EXPRESS OUR OPINIONS WHETHER OR NOT YOU AGREE WITH THEM. THIS IS WHAT MAKES AMERICA THE GREAT NATION THAT IT IS.

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE WILL NOT STAND FOR CENSORSHIP IN ANY FORM. PLEASE DO THE RIGHT THING BY THE AMERICAN PEOPLE. THIS LAND MUST AND WILL REMAIN FREE.

THANK YOU,

PAUL ROBERTS

Comments provided by :
Roberts, Paul

The Federal Government has no business Regulating the free exchange of thoughts and Ideas of a Free Society, We are either a Free nation or we are not. This Country was based on the free flow of information Good or Bad it is up to the individual to seek the truth, not have the Government filter it as in the Novel "1984" printed 1949 or "Brave New World" printed in 1932 perhaps you should take the time to read these as there predictions are coming true.

Comments provided by :
Robertson, Charles

Stay away from our internet! We don't want political speech controlled or regulated!~ We don't want the FEC or anyone trying to outlaw or ban free speech at all! Who do you think you are? I know who you are, commies who would control our 1st amendment rights!

Comments provided by :
Robertson, James

Hands off the internet. We have too much regulation now.

Comments provided by :
Robeson, James

Get out of my internet and leave us alone!

Comments provided by :
robinson, craig

I am commenting due to my strong disagreement with the proposed regulations related to the internet. The internet is the most amazing invention of the past century. It has become a major driver of economic growth and fostered an amazing network of social media. It has accomplished this with hardly any government oversight. The beauty of the internet is that it is unencumbered by government regulation. The proposed regulations will hugely weaken the internet's strengths. The internet functions just fine without imposing regulations on speech content.

I urge the Commission to withdraw the proposed regulations in their entirety.
Douglas b. Robinson

Comments provided by :
Robinson, Douglas

Why are so many dept. of the government trying to infringe on our constitutional rights. We the people are sick and tired of always having to defend the constitution. This move by this dept to regulate free speech is right out of the Chinese play book. This administration is always trying to step on the necks of a free people to express themselves in the political arena. Please cease and desist from this line of thinking and reconsider our rights under these United States Constitution.

Respectfully
Paul E Rodgers

Comments provided by :
Rodgers, paul

WITH THE NATIONAL DEBT GOING OUT THE ROOF,IT SEEMS THE MONEY NEEDED TO DEBATE THIS ISSUE AND THEN IMPLEMENT IT IN THE EVENT OF PASSAGE , COULD BE USED IN A MUCH MORE CONSTRUCTIVE AND LEGAL MANNER.THE CONSTITUTION GIVES US THE RIGHT TO FREE SPEECH.IT'S A SAD DAY IN AMERICA TO EVEN THINK OUR GOV'T IS TRYING TO CONTROL THE AMERICAN PEOPLE TO THE POINT OF TELLING US WHAT WE CAN SAY AS WELL WHAT WE EAT,WHAT DOCTOR WE CAN GO TO AND MANY OTHER THINGS.

Comments provided by :
ROGERS, STEVEN

As a Citizen of the United States I demand that the FCC does not regulate the internet. The job 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.

Sincerely,

Jose Rosario

Comments provided by :
rosario, jose

To whom it may concern:

I am opposed to the FEC Commissioners who want to regulate online posts and regulations. That would be, in my opinion, an infringement on the right of free speech enumerated in the 1st amendment to the Constitution.

Additionally, 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. Do not limit our free speech.

Thank you

Comments provided by :

Rose, Gene

The government of the United States is forbidden from regulating, controlling or affecting the people's, or their representatives, speech. Back off.

Comments provided by :
Ross, Jerry

Above all of the objections and reasoning stated here, I do not want the Constitutional Rights of United States citizens violated; in this instance, the freedom of speech.

The FEC's job is to regulate election spending, not to oversee political speech. In fact, the FEC has no right to take our God-given rights away. We live in America because we enjoy the freedoms that Gestapo-states do not have.

Reversing the exemption for free postings online would have dangerous ramifications for constitutionally-guaranteed free speech. Think about all of the ramifications that many you will not like to live by. Others include the FEC would have to unleash an army of regulators to police YouTube and other Internet sites on a minute-to-minute basis to look for potential violations, and subject people to inquiries simply because they posted OPINIONS online. In turn, this will increase the size of government which I also do not want. Oversight of speech will place an undue burden on small groups and individuals. These new regulations would be extremely costly for taxpayers and difficult to enforce.

Whether you want to think about it or not, there would also be instances of abuse against innocent parties. If this action passes and the freedom of speech is tampered with, by golly those who passed it will also regret the decision. It will impact not only this generation, but generations to come. Children and grandchildren will be forced to withhold opinions. That's not good. That's not freedom.

It should be obvious after the mid-term elections that Americans are watching what political entities are doing and saying. If speech is regulated, Americans would not be able to discern for themselves what is truth and what is a lie. Leave the Constitution be. It was written to protect Americans from abuse of power.

Comments provided by :
Ross, Sharon

Just to let you know my dissatisfaction with the FEC trying to put regulations on internet usage. This is not your place. It needs to be left as it is now.

Thank you

Comments provided by :
Roth, Christopher

I am strongly opposed to the FEC having any regulating authority of the internet. The FEC is supposed to regulate elections, not the freedom of speech. Reversing the exemption for free postings on the internet would have dangerous ramifications for constitutionally-guaranteed free speech.

How would a regulation like that be policed? They would need a huge policing force to monitor sites for potential violations, then subject the people in question to interrogations simply because they posted their opinions. These new regulations would be burdensome, extremely costly for the taxpayers and difficult to enforce.

Comments provided by :
Rotherham, Nancie

Reversing the exemption for free postings online would have dangerous ramifications for constitutionally-guaranteed free speech. It 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 :
Ruml, Susan

The FEC is NOT commissioned to censor speech on the internet! The FEC has no business prying, spying or otherwise monitoring the internet, especially for political censorship!! The federal government needs to learn they need to keep their nose out of private citizens' lives. What is going on in Washington when elitists think they can step outside the constitution??? Stop this insanity! Thank you.

Comments provided by :
Rundall, Lee

The internet is part of our first amendment rights to free speech. The last thing we need is any more regulations from the government. The Bill of Rights was established to expressly limit the power of the government over the people. This is no exception. Please stop trying to take away our freedoms as Americans in some sort of power grab by big government.

Comments provided by :
Rutherford, Alvin

I strongly oppose any attempt to give regulatory control over the internet to a government entity. Leave the internet alone!! It is working fine.

Comments provided by :
Ryan, Michael

I have not read the proposed regulation. However, I have read several summaries from organizations whose opinions I respect. Based on these summaries, I request that the proposed regulation be modified to delete any portion that restricts the citizen's free speech rights.

Comments provided by :
Ryter, Donald

Sirs,
Please do not pursue the regulation to regulate the speech content on the internet.
The open forum for sharing ideas and opinion is invaluable to the general public.
Thank you, Bill Sabin

Comments provided by :
Sabin, William

please do not make the internet a taxing body. Do not have the FCC regulate the freedom of speech that the internet now enjoys.

Comments provided by :
saggers, cheryl

Please leave our internet alone with no restrictions on our freedom of speech and any other rights that may be infringed upon.
Thank you,Sincerely Eric Sailer

Comments provided by :
Sailer, 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

Please stop attacking my free speech. Spending money the Government does not have attacking my free speech rights is getting me angry.

Comments provided by :
Sandford, Tom

It is not practical to regulate speech on the InterNet. There are many people who speak many languages besides English like Spanish, French, Italian and Chinese. Also how can the authorities in Country A enforce the Internet Speech law in Country B? Also my father who is now deceased informed me before he died that Yahoo in Turkey means crazy person. A proper word in English is an insult in Turkish. Could there be other words in English that are proper but is an insult in another language. Also many computers are shared like in public libraries- how can it be determined that John Smith not Bill Doe violated the speech rule.

Comments provided by :
Sayin, Fred

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 :
Sayler, Marsha

Dear Sirs:

I would like you to resist any move to curtail free speech / internet, etc.

Thanks,

Harold Schendel
hschendel4@comcast.net

Comments provided by :
Schendel, Harold

you have not right to interfear with the internet. you just want to be like obama so just leave the internet alone.

Comments provided by :
scheu, ivan

I do not want the FEC regulating the internet to control political speech on the internet. This is an offense to my First Amendment rights. Please stop this action! Here are a few reasons this is NOT a good idea:

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.

Not to mention the cost to tax payers!

Comments provided by :
Schipper, Christina

IS THERE A REASON WHY DEMOCRATS SPEND SO MUCH TIME ON THE FEC AND
OTHER GOVERNMENT AGENCIES ATTEMPTING TO HALT OUR FREE SPEECH ?
WHAT CONVERSATIONS WE HAVE ON THE INTERNET OR ANYWHERE ELSE IS

NONE OF YOUR BUSINESS!

WHAT ARE THOSE PEOPLE ON THE FEC AFRAID OF? WHY IS THIS OBAMA GOVERNMENT SO
FEARFUL OF AMERICANS' FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHTS?

IT'S CALLED DEMOCRACY: DEAL WITH IT, FEC.

FIRST AMENDMENT FIRST AMENDMENT FIRST AMENDMENT

FIRST AMENDMENT FIRST AMENDMENT FIRST AMENDMENT

FIRST AMENDMENT FIRST AMENDMENT FIRST AMENDMENT

FIRST AMENDMENT FIRST AMENDMENT FIRST AMENDMENT

Comments provided by :
Schmalz, Steve and Robyn

It is my firm belief that free speech is protected under the US Constitution and internet speech should also be protected as a first amendment right. I believe that the FEC should not regulate comments or postings on the internet.

Comments provided by :
Schmidt, Patrick

Charging for internet will destroy the creativity and innovation of the internet. The only innovation will be about how to get around the charges. Do not implement this as it takes away freedom.

Comments provided by :
Schuler, William

Use of the internet should remain free and unencumbered by more government intrusion. Anything less is restriction of free speech and a violation of the Constitution.

Comments provided by :
Scriven, Lee

I oppose any FEC regulation of the Internet. The internet allows unencumbered free speech which is guaranteed to us through the Constitution.

Comments provided by :
Scrivner, Paul

Gov regulation of the net!!! Wow! Two points: this would allow an already "over reaching" government, which has lost the free people's trust, to further damage the citizen\government relationship. This will also stifle the flow of ideas coming from small businesses, and entrepreneurs, while , at the same time, protecting larger corporations from competition. Can you say " equal presentation under the law"--- this is not only another attack on the constitution, and American citizen's rights; this is an attempt to further disgrace the Democratic Party in America " The land of the free!"

Comments provided by :
Seals, John

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.

Honor our First Amendment freedom, and defeat this proposal!

James Seikel

Comments provided by :

Seikel, 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 :

Seip, Charles

I am entering my concern over the FEC, whose job is to regulate monies spent on elections, not to regulate free speech, political or other, on the internet. This is a wrong direction for the obvious reason that we are in the U.S.A. where free speech is Constitutionally guaranteed. Regulation = undue burden on citizens and more cost to taxpayers in an administration that is already grossly in debt. Policing people for an opinion they have is not only un-American, it smacks of a dictatorship. This is not 1700 England. We fought that Revolution and won. Keep the internet, and the country, free!

Comments provided by :
selander, diane

What next, This attempt to control Americans freedom of speech must be stopped. We are a democratic free country. Entitled to the freedoms of our constitution. This another move by Obama to turn our country into a third world entity as has been his plan all along. Please stop this insane attempt to control our first amendment rights.
Sincerely, Maria Sellman

Comments provided by :
Sellman, Maria

I wish to make a donation

Comments provided by :
Senior, John

This president is trying to destroy the constitution and will do it if no one stops him. He cannot regulate the net without violating the free speech of all Americans. For crying out loud, Congress, stop this nonsense.

Comments provided by :
Senkoff, Jaimi

The FEC is tasked with regulating money spent on elections, not political speech and especially not political speech made over the internet. Restricting political speech infringes on the first amendment right to free speech. In addition the FEC would need to grow or create a policing agency to search for violations and attempt to bring to justice individuals violating these regulations. This requires expenditures funded by taxes and would most likely result in the eventual determination by the federal court system that the regulation infringes on the first amendment rights mentioned earlier.

Bottom Line: Infringes on First Amendment Rights, Costs more than the benefit received, will most likely be frowned upon by the courts.

Do the right thing and save the taxpayers the expense of continuing down the road with this folly.

Comments provided by :
Sensel, Paul

What FEC is proposing is simply a violation of the First Amendment. Even the current FEC Chairman, appointed by President Obama, has called it a "Chinese Censorship Board". The Nov.4th election result should be a wake up call to all Democrat FEC Commissioners that majority of people in this country are against the "all powerful" Federal government. Please confine your activities to what you are mandated under the law -

- a. Regulating & monitoring elections;
- b. Regulating money expenditures on elections,
- c. Not regulating political speech.

Sincerely,

S. Shaikh, P.E.

Comments provided by :
Shaikh, Sirajuddin

It has come to my attention that there is a movement trying to limit freedom of political speech on the internet. I am most decidedly opposed to limits being placed on these freedoms. This is a dangerous direction to take. Please preserve our freedom to express ourselves, as is our right.

Comments provided by :
Shanley, Mary

Comments regarding proposed FEC regulation of the internet, specifically the monitoring of political conversation. This is not acceptable. It is not the proper task of the FEC and would be an impingement on constitutionally guaranteed First Amendment rights of free speech.

Regulation would be extremely costly to taxpayers, requiring a host of "regulators" to police internet communication. Enforcement would be difficult and arbitrary, and would place an undue burden on both individuals and small groups. Proposal of this sort of regulation is a blatant "power grab" attempt to silence free speech and to further insulate politicians from accountability to voting citizens. It must not be permitted.

Comments provided by :
Sheaffer, Claudia

Please stop trying to take away any and all First Amendment Rights of the citizens of The USA.

Comments provided by :
Shepler, Helen

I don't think government has any role regulating the internet. Government has shown that it can't be trusted and shouldn't be in the business trying to regulate speech.

Comments provided by :
Shikashio, Randy

Free speech is free speech. It should remain so in online forums as well. Please do not impose censorship on our right to free speech guaranteed by our Constitution.

Comments provided by :
Shimonenko, Sergey

I think that it is atrocious that you would even consider regulating online posts! Do not do this evil thing. Or country is based on the exchange of ideas without government interference or authorization. Quit trying to make the county as you want it because your way is just wrong!

Comments provided by :
Shine, Michael

Please do not monitor what is on the internet. What we say on the internet should be free speech.

Comments provided by :

Shore, Judy

No Net Restrictions. What are you all scared of? Freedom of speech and having an opinion and being able to express it freely is an American right. The government should stay out of this and let the owners of the media device govern their site.

Comments provided by :
Shufelt, John

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 :

Shull, Winston

The government is dangerously overreaching into our Constitutional rights. We are not willing for someone else to decide what we can and can't say or where we can or cannot express our opinion. The way the government is operating now only certain people will have the right to express an opinion. One political party will get in office and refuse to ever leave office. No one will ever be able to expose the wrong things done by the political party in power without being persecuted for exposing the wrongs done. Our country is close to operating as a dictatorship now. Because only the wealthy can afford paid advertising for their opinions-the poor won't have any voice at all. This level of government control is dangerous. One political party will be able to prevent another party from ever taking office by controlling our freedom of speech. We the American public will not give over our Constitutional rights to appease dictators in power.

Comments provided by :
Simmons, Barbara

The FCC should stay OUT of the internet!

Comments provided by :
Simmons, Tim

Don't touch the internet. Keep it FREE and stay out of the internet. You have no business even thinking about taking over the internet.

Comments provided by :
Simms, Pam

This looks real bad this might mean I wont be able to go to porn sites anymore or anyplace else I want to go this should be free from any body checking it.

Comments provided by :
Simonet, Vernon

Please stop trying to regulate everything we do! Free speech is not free, so many have paid dearly for this privilege. Please, use some common sense and do what is right, true, and just.

Comments provided by :
simonik, patrick

The FEC is tasked with regulating money spent on elections, not political speech.
We need to continue to have constitutionally-guaranteed free speech.

Comments provided by :
sinclair, dave

Please keep you hands and minds off of the internet, it called Free Speech and is protected by the first amendment. So stop trying to trample on the Constitution, and just sit there and enjoy the pay & benefits the liberals have got for you, if you try to limit free speech, we may just eliminate your job. Hope you get the message!

Comments provided by :
Sines, Robert

They have no right to regulate the internet in regards to our personal postings, this would endanger our first amendment right to free speech!

Thank you..represent us correctly please.

Comments provided by :

SINTIC, DONALD

This proposal is just another attempt at control and censorship of the American citizen. Our constitution provides for our free speech on the internet as elsewhere! Thank you

Comments provided by :
SINTIC, Jane

Do not regulate on line posts and conversation. I don't want to prevent anyone from expressing what they think.

Comments provided by :

Sjolin, Robert

To the FEC,

I wanted to voice my opinion that the FEC has no authority to censor free speech on the internet. To do so would be unconstitutional and violating our beloved 1st Amendment freedom of speech. The Federal Election Commission was created to regulate the campaign finance legislation in the United States. Your agency describes your duties as "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 FEC has no right to even attempt to censor the free speech of the people on the internet. Whether people use their voice to speak of things political or non-political, it does not matter. The 1st Amendment grants us the absolute right to speak freely about anything, and the founders of our country added this right in the constitution because they knew that one day our government might try to deprive us of speaking our mind. In closing, censoring any speech, especially speech on the internet is completely and absolutely unconstitutional and would deprive us of our 1st Amendment God given right to free speech which no man or government can ever take away from us.

Thank you for reading my concerns,
Jeff Skerenchak

Comments provided by :
Skerenchak, Jeffrey

I oppose government regulation of the internet. This would be an unlawful intrusion of the government into private affairs. Power given to regulate becomes power to control and limit; that is unacceptable in a free society.

Comments provided by :
Slack, Lynn

I understand that there is proposed language which would attempt to regulate and restrict free political postings on the internet. Such wording is, in my view, quite blatantly in opposition to freedom-of-speech rights which I hold dear. Such language is incompatible with First-Amendment rights.

Furthermore, were you to introduce such language, and somehow get away with it, for a time, until someone sued the crap out of you, the language would put a huge and unjustified burden on the backs American tax-payers simply to hire the people and produce the structures necessary to enforce it. And finally, public speech on the internet is, to put it bluntly, outside your jurisdiction to regulate. Stick to monetary donations and campaign spending ledgers, please.

Sincerely,

A concerned and caring citizen of the United States

Comments provided by :
Smedley, Atkin

I do NOT support NET NEUTRALITY or anything that resembles it, PERIOD!! Pres. Obama and his support groups have deceived many thousands of petition signers with their petitions supporting it but not specifically identifying it as "NET Neutrality"--LYING to Americans just as they have on ObamaCare. Once again playing on "STUPIDITY" of ill-informed citizens to think NET NEUTRALITY is a positive influence on internet users when in reality it is about greater federal government control. I ABSOLUTELY OPPOSE NET NEUTRALITY, I DEMAND MY SIGNATURE ON "PRO-NET NEUTRALITY" PETITIONS BE DISREGARDED AND REMOVED. I DO NOT SUPPORT NET NEUTRALITY AND HAVE INFORMED MY CONGRESSIONAL REPRESENTATIVES OF MY POSITION.

Comments provided by :
Smiley, JamesR

i as an American and a citizen of the United States do not want my internet regulated to prevent freedom of speech. this is government "over reach" regulating the Internet is simply another step for the government to keep people under their boot. government has already grown too large as it is why must government stick their nose into every aspect of our lives?!

Comments provided by :
Smith , Kathy

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 :
Smith, Scott

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.

The FEC and all other Federal Regulatory Agencies MUST get their nose and activities out of individual, business, state, city, county, and local issues if not authorized by the Constitution of the United States and at the present time most are not.

PRS

Comments provided by :
SONDRUP, PAUL

FREEDOM IS NOT FREEDOM WHEN YOU IMPOSE ANY RESTRICTIONS ON ANY SOURCE OF COMMUNICATION ON THE FREE WILL OF THE PEOPLE. AT ANYTIME FOR ANY REASON.

Comments provided by :
sonnier, thomas

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 :

Sorrow, Spence

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 :
Soto-Osborn, Susie

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.

Keep hands off political speech on the internet and elsewhere!

Protect our First Amendment right to free speech and thought!

This is America--not supposed to be a police state!

Comments provided by :
Spellerberg, Shirley

I whole heartily object to the idea of regulation of the internet by the federal government. History has shown the they have way too much power already which is too often abused.

The people we elect to represent us in Washington should know by now that the American people have had enough of big government.

Comments provided by :
St. Amour, William

The government wants to control everything.THEY CAN'T!!!!

Comments provided by :
St. Myer, James

I am not in favor of any censoring of any kind on any internet site. That is not your role as FEC.

Comments provided by :
Starl, Debra

What this country needs is less regulation not more. That said...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 don't spend my hard earned money on new regulation of something that does not need regulating.

Regards,
Concerned Tax Payer
Robert Steffensen

Comments provided by :
Steffensen, Robert

To Whom it may concern:

It is my understanding that the FEC is tasked with regulating money spent on elections, not regulating political speech. I understand that the Constitution of the United States grants freedom of speech to all individuals without unjust limitation.

I understand that reversing the exemption for free postings online would have dangerous ramifications for constitutionally-guaranteed free speech.

This would require the FEC 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.

Last time I checked, this was still the United States of America and not China. The regulations that you are considering are ridiculous and it is not the job of any person to regulate THOUGHT or free speech.

Comments provided by :
Steiger, James

I am opposed to any action by our government to limit freedom of speech on the internet!

Comments provided by :
Steinkamp, Jeffrey

The internet should be available equally to all. It is already self regulating and we do not need the government involved. Anytime the government gets involved, it cost more money and more of our freedom is taken away. We do not want them to pick winners and losers. No more regulations. More regulations are job killers.

Comments provided by :
Steitle, Karen

Ever since the appalling American Civil War, the U.S. Government has been strengthening itself at an frightening rate!!! Due to a military / Natl. Guard / Reserve build-up, there is not a ONE of us who can make a "physical stand" against them!! They have passed laws to make & keep us powerless. They TAX the livin' crap out of us, so we have a difficult time AFFORDING the means to make a futile-stand against an ever-growing, powerful "police state." And, NOW they want to pass laws that will make it "hate speech" if we dare have a personal-opinion that we'd like to voice. With little to no way to defend ourselves against the militarized, government hordes, AND being unable to speak-our-minds, against a constantly encroaching, over-reaching, godless government, can ANYONE please explain to me, E*X*A*C*T*L*Y how these uncircumcised Philistines differ ANY from the depraved bunch that are running the countries of China, Russia, Iran, or North Korea?!?!?! Forbidding the right to arm oneself, and forbidding the freedom of protesting a oppressive government has NOT worked in the past, nor will it work now.....

Confiding in the RINOs who have been able to hold onto their cushy-jobs ~ makes one a very STUPID, "useful idiot!!" They have NOT "performed" in the passed six years, so, don't expect them to perform any differently, now that they are "in charge!"

Comments provided by :
Stevens, David

I do not want my First Amendment Right to be violated by the FEC or by anyone!! The FEC isn't even tasked with censoring political speeches. How much of my tax dollars will be wasted by policing personal opinions about our political views?? How will this be enforced? Geesh...if I wanted to be censored by Big Brother I would move to China. STOP VIOLATING OUR AMMENDMENTS! -Melissa Stevens, proud US citizen

Comments provided by :
Stevens, Melissa

I believe as a American our free speech shouldn't be altered in anyway. The amendments were written by our founding fathers, and they gave us the freedom to say as we pleased as long as it wasn't false or was simply just our opinion. For our free speech to be taken away at talking about politics that's taking away our word and debate. We may as well have voting taken away because without being able to talk and choose a side how will we have our right to vote? You can't take something like that away because that is taking our freedom even if its the Internet, the government shouldn't have the right to regulate what we say if its not hurting anyone. Politics, celebrities, and anyone famous who has made their mark in history should expect to be spoken of in some way. That's expressing yourself and your opinion. Nothing you say about them has to be true if you believe it yourself other people will think otherwise and that is fine by me. If I were a politic I would expect that some citizens will love me and some will not. I wouldn't take it to heart I would try my best to give the people what they want.

Comments provided by :
Stone, Cheyenne

There is no reason to place controls on the internet! Any Company or person wanting that to happen are only interested in removing freedom from people.

The FEC is tasked with regulating money spent on elections, not political speech. Are conservatives going to be the ones who are targeted as with the IRS? Who decides what is "incorrect" speech?

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

There are too many government controls now, and too many governmental employees. If these regulations are put in place then 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. Who decides what the violations are? Then those found would have to be subjected to inquiries simply because they posted opinions online. These regulations will place an undue and unnecessary burden on small groups and individuals. Not only will these new regulations be extremely costly for taxpayers they will be difficult if not impossible to enforce.

Therefore I want to state that any regulations of this nature would be in violation of the constitution and totally unacceptable.

Comments provided by :
Studinski, Barbie

Do not regulate the internet for political content. This would be against our right of free speech. It would also be very costly and very cumbersome.

I don't want 'Big Brother' watching law abiding citizens constantly.

Comments provided by :

Suddarth, Mary

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 :
Sutton, Scott

Any Consideration about giving away partial or complete control of our Internet to anyone foreign is wholly unwise, abridging our constitutional rights to free-speech and in my opinion, the very thought of doing such, to be considered an act of treason and since now a major part of our national structure for communication and therefore, National Security as well.

Comments provided by :
Swenson, Stewart

I am an 87 y/o widow who depends on the Internet for family contact, News, shopping, entertainment, etc. Be fair to us.

Comments provided by :
Switzer, Pauline

It is disconcerting to see the government continue to inject itself into every phase of our lives. I prefer to live in a country with ultimate freedom. I believe making any changes to an internet that is presently free from government regulation is an affront to our freedoms. Stay away from the internet and let it remain an entity free of government control or oversight.

Comments provided by :
Swota, Robert

I am submitting my comments in opposition to the FEC's regulation of online political speech. I oppose the proposed FEC regulations that would reverse the exemption for free postings online, first of all because of the frightening impact it would have against free-speech rights which are constitutionally-guaranteed. Furthermore, the FEC's purpose is to regulate money spent on elections, not political speech. The effort behind the proposed regulations to control political free speech at the federal level should be enough to shut them down in our constitutionally- governed republic, but also consider . . .

In order to enforce the proposed new rules, untold numbers of regulators would be needed to sift through internet sites on a daily basis to look for potential violations, not only creating a significant new cost burden for taxpayers, but also placing an undue burden on small groups and individuals who might be subject to inquiries simply because they posted an opinion online.

FEC regulation of online political speech is anti-constitutional and an overall bad idea for taxpayers.

Comments provided by :
Symons, Michelle

Please do not let the FEC regulate the internet. Thank you!

Respectfully yours,

Dr. Khadija Taaka-Patch

Comments provided by :
Taaka_Patch, Khadija

The job of the FEC is to regulate the amount of money that is spent on election. First Amendment political speech is not part of the FEC's scope of power. Do not reverse the exemption for free postings online. To reverse this would be a dangerous step toward thwarting our constitutional guarantee of free speech. An expansion of the FEC powers would also be very costly and difficult to enforce.

Comments provided by :
Tabeling, Mary

As I understand it, three Democrat FEC Commissioners in the FEC are attacking the First Amendment by trying to regulate the internet. This infringes on the free speech of every American. These three Democrat FEC Commissioners want to regulate online posts and conversations. Washington already controls the news we receive through the major media outlets; now they want to control any political speech on the internet.

The implications of these proposed regulations is limitless, and to enforce these new rules the government will have to appoint censors who monitor online political communication every day. Has the US become communist China?

This is not your job! 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 employ untold numbers 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. Again I ask, has the US become a dictatorship where we no longer have the Constitutional right to free speech?

This would place an undue burden on small groups and individuals who lack the resources to buy air time to get their message out and is extremely unfair to the under-represented in this nation. As well, these new regulations would be extremely costly for taxpayers and difficult to enforce or prevent abuses such as seen by the IRS.

I am against this proposal and will monitor your future behavior. I have a Constitutional right to freedom of speech and the FEC has no business making Unconstitutional laws!

Comments provided by :
Tabor, Bruce

I do not want anyone telling me what I can say and/or read ! I don't want censorship here in America! This is not Germany 1932 this is America 2014 and we don't want a dictatorship , furthermore won't allow it. We have free speech and if you try to censor our internet postings then you are taking away our civil rights. We have lost many of our civil liberties since 09-11-2011 so leave we web searchers alone! We have had just about all the "help" we can stand! Let us continue staying in touch with what is happening in this world ! It is my right, it is our right!

Comments provided by :
tarrance, marilyn

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 :

Taylor, Laura

Regulating political speech on the internet is a violation of the First Amendment. don't regulate political speech.

Comments provided by :
taylor, melinda

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 :

Tellez-Martinez, Esteban

I am writing to discourage the proposed regulation of the Internet.

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 :

Theune, Julie

Please do not regulate our internet. Thank you.

Comments provided by :
Thies, Kimberlee

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. The federal government has NO right to censor free speech.

Comments provided by :
Thom, Joseph

Please stop being communist and leave a lone out freedom of speech.

Comments provided by :
Thomas, Donald

WE SHOULD ALLOWED TO SPEAK OUR MINDS! GOD GIVE US A BRAIN TO THINK AND LIPS SO WE CAN TALK! LAW MAKERS SHOULD NOT BE ABLE TOO TELL US WHAT TO SAY OR SPEAK! NOR SHOULD LAW MAKERS SHOULD NOT TELL HOW WE SHOULD LIVE! GOD BLESS EVERYONE!! GOD BLESS AMERICA AND THE WORLD!! I LOVE YOU ALL!! DO THE RIGHT THING STOP TAKING OUR FREEDOMS AWAY FROM US! YOU TAKE OUR FREEDOMS AWAY LET US STOP PAYING TAXES AS WELL!

Comments provided by :
Thomas, Marvin

The Federal Election Commission (FEC) is the US independent regulatory agency created to administer and enforce the statute that governs the financing of federal elections. The commission was not created to regulate the internet and our free speech.

Comments provided by :
Thomas, Mike

The FEC is on a dangerous path of oppression against all people who use the internet for political commentary. It is unacceptable to have any government regulations on the internet. The internet has survived just fine without government involvement. I would view these Title II regulations a violation of my 1st admendment rights. Keep your dirty fingers off of the internet. No one wants you except for our shit for brains President Obama who is a sociopath.

Comments provided by :
Thomas, Patrick

Keep your hand off my internet

Comments provided by :
Thomas, Ruth

Please STOP this proposed bill on regulating the internet.

Comments provided by :
Thomason, Arthur

The FEC is tasked with regulating money spent on elections not political speech, reversing the exemptions for free postings online would have dangerous ramifications for constitutions guaranteed free speech.

Comments provided by :
Thomason, Lori

by creating a monitor to block or listen to our e-mails will be a violation of our 1st amendment & cause much wasted money that could be used to put to better use to help people instead government. Government is suppose to be for the people not for it's own control of people.-John.

Comments provided by :
thompson, john

Since when has the United States ever treated their people with contempt and suspicion? We are not the people you should be worried about. It is our blood, sweat, and tears that built this country along with our forefathers, and the people you should be worried about are the crooks in the senate, and the bankers that are too big to prosecute. Since when does the average American Joe who puts in his forty-hour a week, if he can even find a job, who comes home to spend time with his family and friends, need to be monitored like a common criminal? What have we done to deserve such disregard. I was born, and raised here, along with many of my ancestors. We are the ones who deserve respect and privacy. Our ancestors have fought hard for this country. I come from a long line of Marines who have defended this great nation of ours. My father has since been the last to protect it. With all the lying and deceiving on capitol hill...it is no wonder the American people have lost faith in our judicial system. You no longer have our best interest at heart, but treat us as the terrorists. I am ashamed of what our great nation has become. I used to be proud to be an American, and I would salute the flag every time I passed one. Now, I fear that within my life time, she will be destroyed. Our borders are wide open, the bribes and deception behind closed doors. People who see the American people as an infectious disease that needs ridding. Only the elite and celebrities are glorified. You are allowing history to be taken out of our schools, teaching our children the only way to be anything in this world is through beauty and how much money is in your pocket. I dare say, I am not looking forward to the next twenty or even forty years. I am an American, and you have no right to spy on me or any other that has done nothing but try to survive in these hard times...and you do not even allow that. You are taking all of our jobs, putting poison in our food, you do not listen when we cry out in pain. What would your ancestors say about the selling out of this country? Stop and think of that. You are destroying everything they sacrificed for the freedom you now hold in the palm of your hands. Please, please, if not for me, do it for your children, or your children's children. There is still time to reverse the evil that has been done. Please, allow us to become a great nation once more so that we may hold our head up in pride.

Sherry A. Thompson

Comments provided by :
Thompson, Sherry

Fellow Citizens who wish the right of UNRESTRICTED SPEECH to INCLUDE POLITICAL COMMUNICATION REGARDLESS OF THE MODE OF THE COMMUNICATION.

The intentions of this message is to assure that the least restriction possible to the First Amendment Right of Free Speech/Communication is imposed by the government for ANY PURPOSE. No censorship of ANY TYPE SHALL BE IMPOSED BY THE GOVERNMENT WITHOUT THE VOTE OF THE ENTIRE VOTING PUBLIC.

No mode of communication shall be censored in any regard except where public safety is DIRECTLY threatened. No mode of communication, to include the internet and other means of mass address, shall be inhibited in any regard except for the direct threat to public safety.

Free and uninhibited speech via any mode of communication shall not be inhibited by the government for ANY purpose except where public safety is DIRECTLY threatened. Political communication shall not be infringed upon by any government agency, at any time, for ANY purpose save a direct and clear and present danger to public safety. ANY attempt to restrict this totally uninhibited right must be approved via Constitutional Amendment and approved during nationwide election. The people of this FREE NATION expect and DEMAND free, uninhibited, and uncensored communication regardless of the mode of said communication.

ONLY DIRECT THREAT TO THE PUBLIC SAFETY SHALL OPERATE TO RESTRICT, BY THE SMALLEST POSSIBLE DEGREE, ANY FORM OF COMMUNICATION REGARDLESS OF MODE OF SAID COMMUNICATION. No political communication shall be inhibited by the government at ANY time, for ANY purpose except for clear and present danger to the public safety. Free communication by any mode, at any time, and for any purpose shall NOT BE INFRINGED.

if I have failed to be redundantly and boringly, patently, and unmistakably clear in every detail; the right of the people, their organizations or communications action committees, POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE, and any other form of aggregation shall not have their communications INHIBITED BY THE GOVERNMENT IN ANY WAY.

This concludes my comments.

Comments provided by :
Thornton, Michael

I DO NOT WANT "THE GOVERNMENT" MESSING WITH THE INTERNET!!!

GOVERNMENT IS "ALREADY TOO BIG"!!!!, OR DID YOU NOT GET "THE MESSAGE"
ON ELECTION DAY WHEN THE REPUBLICANS TOOK CONTROL OF THE SENATE???

"LEAVE THE INTERNET ALONE"!!!

Comments provided by :
THURMAN, CAROLE

Leave the internet alone. Let commerce take it's course and innovation lead where it will.

Comments provided by :

Tiefel, Lynda

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 Demand No Changes to the internet it should be free and open to everyone

no spying on users of it either people have a right to do what they want and are entitled to be secure and private

Comments provided by :

Tilbury, Shawn

Stop trying to control everything and that includes my first amendment. Leave the Internet alone.

Comments provided by :

Tiller, Wallace

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 :

Tippit, Will

FEC Commissioners are proposing regulations on online posts and conversations in their plans to regulate the internet. This proposal attacks our the First Amendment rights by regulating our free speech. The broad scope of these proposed regulations is limitless, and to enforce these new rules the government will have to appoint censors who monitor online political communication every day. The following comments are offered on these proposed regulations. 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. It is my recommendation to remove all consideration of these new regulations!

Comments provided by :
Titus, Richard

Do not take away our First Amendment rights. We, the people, overthrew a corrupt government as the Foundation of this country to enjoy the freedoms of person, property and speech. We, the people, will not stand for government tyranny under any guise. Your proposed actions to limit freedom of speech will not be tolerated. We will stand against this blatant attempt at thought control and we, the people, will be triumphant.

Comments provided by :
Tourjman, Elle

The answer is NO to any FCC or any other government interference/regulation of the Internet. Leave it alone and just the way it is.

Regards,
Joe Toy

Comments provided by :
Toy, Joe

Please stop adding more and more regulations, I want to see less government interference in my life. We are a republic governed by the people.

These proposed regulations will place an undue burden on small groups and individuals, as well as be extremely costly for taxpayers and difficult to enforce.

Sincerely,

Leslie Tozzini
concerned citizen

Comments provided by :
tozzini, leslie

The FEC should have no place in regulating free speech on the internet.
New regulations will be costly for the taxpayers placing undue burden on individuals.

Comments provided by :
Trantina, Linda

I am writing to express my opposition to the Federal Government taking control of the internet by creating regulation. This is supposed to be a free country with free speech, and government control of the internet is definitely unconstitutional. There are way too many rules and regulations that are supposed to protect the public; and what many of them have created is the encouragement of the abandonment of personal responsibility. PLEASE KEEP YOUR HANDS OFF THE INTERNET!!!!

Comments provided by :
Tripp, Mary

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

Comments provided by :
Turner, Bonnie

The Internet is a global force for good (with apologies to the U.S. Air Force). To have any government body determine they can regulate this medium flies in the face of many national constitutions and the very ethos that spurred the development of the technology and the current practice. The Internet is where ideas exchange on a daily basis, sometimes reflecting the very worst in our human condition, but mostly reflecting the very best discourse mankind can deliver.

Political speech is protected speech and has been since the Founding. For the FEC to decide what is, or is not, correct political speech is absurd. There are many public comments aired on the evening news by our elected or appointed officials that are hateful and contrary to good order and discipline, but we do not seek to stifle that speech. Candidates from all political parties have stated in many ways how dissent and discourse is healthy to the governance of this great experiment in democracy.

As a citizen with a vote, I dissent and will stand with my friends, community, and other patriots and oppose the FEC if they desire to further regulate the free exchange of ideas in the public square.

If they attempt to silence the conservative voice, the liberals and progressives will be next.

Comments provided by :
Turner, Robert

Please let the internet stay free from government intervention. When the government gets involved, it messes everything up each and every time. Look at the railroads,Obamacare,schools and many more.

Comments provided by :
van Westrum, Mark

Leave the internet free. We have the right to voice our opinion without being regulated.

Comments provided by :
VanDevender, Faye

Stop this madness, this action place undue burden on groups and individuals.

Comments provided by :
Vaqlle, David

Another tax ??????????

We as Americans have had with the current administration of wanting to tax everything that moves or does not move leave the internet alone enough is enough. Why do you THINK!!! we voted most of the left nut jobs out of Washington

Comments provided by :

Varvis, Michael

Leave the Internet Just as it is. NO Government Reg's or interference. I am Happy with the Internet Just Like it is NOW!!!

Comments provided by :
Vaughn, William

I hear talk of the FEC to perhaps help regulate political speech or citizen input over the internet. I say No! We do Not want censorship of any kind. Besides, we need Less government intrusion into our lives on smoking to what we eat, etc. and a smaller government, not a larger one. We have a national debt to pay off and we need No more expenditures, none, for any new politically motivated bearueaucratic rules by any one party. You guys and the IRS are supposed to not be affiliated with any one party, but who would make the rules and say what should be censored? Americans want and deserve free speech as our veterans paid so dearly for.

Thank you.

Comments provided by :
Vernay, Mark

I am totally against regulating the Internet.

Comments provided by :
Vicars, Damon

The over-reach of the FEC to regulate political speech is an infringement on the citizen's right to free speech. I am opposed to any regulation that infringes on my rights in any way. We need less regulations not more and I absolutely oppose the intent to regulate the internet. This is not communist China and as a citizen of the United States I wish to register my complaint that the FEC would reach beyond their boundaries to attempt to regulate political speech on the internet. I also do not wish to fund the costly effort to restrict my freedom.

Comments provided by :

Vines, Tom

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE PAY TO MUCH TAX NOW. if OBAMO WANTS MORE TAXES LET HIM AND HIS SUPPORTERS PAY.

Comments provided by :
vinton, jo

We the people will not stand for this

Comments provided by :
Walden, Mike

Any reversing in the exemption of free posting online would create perilous ramifications for constitutionally-guaranteed free speech under the first Amendment.

Comments provided by :
Walmer, Richard

Dear Members of the FEC,

How dare you consider attempting to regulate the internet which is totally unconstitutional! We the people are NOT STUPID! Anytime the government attempts to regulate anything its for the benefit of the communist party. The only reason our communist and thief wants you to regulate the internet is to silence people in America who are against his communist regime which is the majority of Americans! Do this at you own peril because if you do attempt to do this I will fight with all my might to force the New Congress to TOTALLY DEFUND your whoe department!

Sincerely,
Craig Walser

Comments provided by :
Walser, Craig

The FEC should not be trying to regulate free speech on the internet which is protected by the 1st amendment of the constitution. This would be hard to enforce in the first place, and it would be at taxpayer expense. There will always be different world views that we agree or disagree with. To attempt to enforce political speech on the internet regardless of the world view, be it liberal or conservative is nothing more than censorship that would be practiced in any third world backwater not in the United States of America. We are a nation that embraces freedom on all fronts which is the envy of the world. To make any moves to change or to take any ounce of freedom away would come to the level of treason. So it would be better to leave free speech on the internet or any other communication forum alone,so America can continue to represent freedom on all things to all people. Let's continue to keep America free as founded by that wonderful document we call our Constitution.

Comments provided by :
Walton, Mark

I believe our rights have been violated. According to "free" America, we have the right to express ourselves and our beliefs both political and religious. The internet is still part of "free" America, as I recall. As a citizen of the greatest country in the world, if my voice is still heard, please don't filter anything I say that may be political or religious.

Comments provided by :

Waltz, Jeanne

The U.S. government does not need to be involved in the internet!!!!!! Keep your hands, and your regulations out of enterprises that you have no need to be regulating !!!!

Comments provided by :
Wanberg, Daniel

Please do not regulate our online posts and conversations.

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.

Again, please do not regulate our online posts and conversations.

Thank you.

Comments provided by :

Washer, Wendell

Comments provided by :
wasilewski, edward

simple and to the point, LEAVE THE INTERNET ALONE AS IS !!!

Comments provided by :
wassen, earl

CENSORSHIP, UNDER ANY NAME OR GUISE, IS THE TOOL OF TYRANTS. IT RUNS CONTRARY TO ALL THAT AMERICA, OUR TRADITIONS, AND OUR CONSTITUTION STANDS FOR. THOSE WHO PROPOSE CONTROLLING CONTENT OF SUBJECT MATTER ON THE INTERNET SHOULD BE ASHAMED OF THEMSELVES.

IT IS OUR SACRED DUTY TO UPHOLD THE FIRST AMENDMENT
ROBERT WASSMAN

Comments provided by :
Wassman, Robbert

As my Mom, L J Brouillard Bishop stated: The Inter-Net Works FAR Better than Any Government Regulated agency. Those Who Want to Increase their Inter-Net Speed Can, And, Do So By BUYING Faster Inter-Net Speed. I Survive on Under \$25,000.00 A Year. I Have Never Had A Problem Getting What I Want, Need and CAN AFFORD. Federal Government INTERFERENCE ("Regulation") Is NOT WANTED Or NEEDED!!!!

Comments provided by :
Waters, R L

The job of the FEC is to regulate money spent on elections, not political speech. Reversing the exemption for free postings online would have dangerous ramifications for constitutionally-guaranteed free speech. An enormous number of regulators would be required 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 very costly for taxpayers and difficult to enforce.

Comments provided by :
Watson, Luanne

DO NOT RESTRICT THE INTERNET WITH REGULATIONS. KEEP YOURS AND THE PRESIDENTS
FINGERS OFF OF THE INTERNET PERIOD!

Comments provided by :
Watters, Bruce

We are guaranteed freedom of speech by the First Amendment. The internet has been one of the greatest boones to political participation in the USA since it's inception! I do not believe the FEC should be regulating political speech and activity on the internet. I am opposed to any legislation that would limit political speech.

Comments provided by :
Webster, Linda

What part of the First Amendment to our constitution do you NOT understand???

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.

Say NO to this ridiculous proposal

Comments provided by :

Weiler, Detlef

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 :
Wells, Kurt

The FEC's purpose is to regulate money spent on elections, not to regulate political speech. our free speech is protected by the Constitution, and regulating online free speech would be completely wrong for the FEC to do. Besides being illegal actions by the FEC, it would be nearly unenforceable. On top of that, decisions would be made by unelected bureaucrats who should not be making these kinds of decisions. Then, to make matters worse, these new regulations would be very costly for taxpayers who are already unfairly burdened, especially in this economy with so much regulating that jobs are being lost!

Comments provided by :
Wellsman, Jennifer

Leave the Internet alone. There is nothing wrong with it. This is not your job. STOP the over reach!!!

Comments provided by :
Wendorf, Linda

the internet is where i am most of the time because i am on disability.It needs no regulations because it works quite well as it is.It should not be treated like a phone service & have regulations that will make it too expensive for people like me to use.It is a very easy to use & the costs the way they are are at least affordable.The only thing the internet could use is a bit more competition to make the costs more reasonable for the speed you pay for.I have used the internet for 20 years & became disabled for the last 14 years of use.i would not know what to do without it because it lets me talk to people all over the world.It is something that needs nothing more then what it has right now.I would appreciate it if you would not try to regulate it for these reasons.

thank you,

William A. Werner

Comments provided by :

Werner Sr, William

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 :
West, Jonna

I am against government regulation of the internet. That will most certainly lead to the same politicization of the internet as we see in the IRS, EPA, FDA, and on and on. It also is one more opportunity for the Government to violate our 1st amendment freedom of speech inalienable right. It also opens another door to government employees to enrich themselves using graft and corruption to further their own futures at the expense of the public good. Stay out of the internet!!!!

Comments provided by :
west, Richard

I am completely opposed to the FEC trying to regulate free speech; that includes all forms of speech, including online speech!

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 :

Whatley, Brady

Do not let the government regulate the enter net.

Comments provided by :
wiedmeier, Linda

The Internet is the epitome of free speech and thought permutations. I urge you not to decide what is right or what is wrong. Allow us this free speech zone! It is the easier way to create a much better society than imposing your rules on us.

If you do impose your will on us, you will find much error in your decision.

Thank you,

David A. Wiesner

Comments provided by :
Wiesner, David

A proposal to regulate internet posts directly contradicts the first amendment. Anyone who has taken an oath to uphold the constitution and supports this would thus be in violation of his/her oath and subject to removal from office.

Comments provided by :
Wiggins, John

Stop the internet control of political speech. 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 on line

+this will place an undue burden on small groups and individuals

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

Comments provided by :

willard, jan

I do not feel that the government has the right or need to regulate the web. As all true free markets it will work things out for itself. With regulation it will only breed more regulation. Speech will be threatened, commerce will be threatened, higher prices. Just take a look at other regulated industry, cost go up and people loose jobs. Also people with new ideas will be left out in the cold because of over regulation. There is no reason for this so please leave it alone.

Comments provided by :
Willey, Charles

It has come to my attention that FEC commissioners ,whose task is to monitor election spending, are attempting to establish regulations to the internet that would control and ultimately control or disallow free political speech on the internet.

Such restrictions would constitute a restriction of free speech by individuals as well as groups that is unconstitutional.

I OPPOSE any such rules or construction of free speech on the internet.

Sincerely, David Williams.

Comments provided by :
Williams, David

The FEC does not need to be expanding their powers in a way that would inhibit free speech. The government like an octopus is trying to always expand its powers and find new ways to stifle our most cherished First Amendment protection of free speech. The First Amendment was first because it is the most important right we have. All others derive from it. NO INTERFERENCE IN IT!!!

Any expansion of FEC authority would create an army of bureaucrats that would expand government, waste money and increase the size of an already bloated juggernaut. Reduce the size of government!!!

Comments provided by :
Williams, Matthew

? 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, the you should not censor online conversations
and speech concerning politics.

Thank you for your time.
Robert Wilson

Comments provided by :
Wilson, Robert

The Internet is one of the last unrestricted two-way forums for free speech in this country. Broadcast and cable are one-way communication media, in that there is no way for the individual viewer/listener to participate in open discussion. Meetings and public assemblies are often impracticable when local authorities require permits or issue other restrictions. Only on the Internet or by telephone or mail can individuals and small organizations, particularly those representing minority viewpoints, freely engage in discussion and/or organize support or opposition to political candidates or issues. Any rule restricting political speech, fundraising, or organizing activity over the Internet could be in violation of the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, and is definitely in violation of its spirit.

Comments provided by :
Winkler, Valerie

We are writing about our concerns about the proposed political speech censorship regulations proposed. As we see it:

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.

We urge you to not allow this to pass. Please feel free to contact us if you have any questions or concerns.

Comments provided by :

Winschel, Matthew

You mean to tell me that The Federal Election Commision wants to take on the unconstitutional task of censoring the entire internet? Does it dawn on any of you mega-intelligent FEC bureaucrats how much it will cost to employ people to efficiently censor the entire internet? You are telling me that I will pay, out of my paycheck, for you to censor the internet? I would love to know who or what gives you the right to decide that for me. You are tasked with monitoring ELECTIONS. NOT POLITICAL SPEECH ON THE INTERNET! I am absolutely secure in my 1st Amendment right given to US by OUR Constitution. You have absolutely NO PLACE to regulate what I feel like typing and/or posting on the Internet. Obviously, whomever or whatever group of you FEC geniuses has had the revelation that you have the ability to regulate & censor Internet speech, came from somewhere that has a very different Constitution than The United States of America & have seriously different beliefs in what our rights guarantee us. You & your liberty as an American citizen(if that is, in fact, what you are) are protected & uplifted by the exact same Constitution that protects & uplifts me & my liberty. You stay out of Internet censorship. It is not for you to decide what people are allowed to express. Whether you agree with it or not. Step out of your job mindset & step into your American citizen mindset. Use your brain & not your desire for control & power.

Comments provided by :
Winstead , Adam

I stand for the constitution and the first amendment.
and will not stand for terrany.

Comments provided by :
wittekind , ehren

The FEC is tasked with regulating money spent on elections, not political speech by everyday citizens. If FEC reverses 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. As a taxpayer, I don't want my monies spent on policing on-line free speech and the country would have to wonder why the FEC Commission has a war on free speech. Don't waste my tax money on curbing free speech which is guaranteed in the Constitution.

Comments provided by :
Wolfe, Marie

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 about the same as the TSA issues that continue to surface. The Federal Government hosting so many para-military organizations?quite armed from what has been disclosed?read about the firearms being and assigned and assigned by to Federal agencies that have nothing to do with law enforcement?any idiot(s) can see through this haze?give it a try, just a little research will be horrifying.

This proposed exception will place an undue and unconstitutional burden on small groups and individuals who wish to express and debate their opinions.

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

Additionally, I highly oppose the infringement on my 1st Amendment rights by those wishing to make the America I love identical to our Communist adversaries in other countries. This whole issue is incredibly anti-American, but you are on that particular team, it appears.

Well, you are about to meet your worst dream?millions of Americans who appreciate their heritage and are willing to confront those going the opposite direction?.as we have in so many wars before us?and this is a war, albeit internal.

Think carefully?you have a lot of risks and unnecessary lawfully confrontations at stake.

Comments provided by :
Wood, Henry

leave the internet alone, you people have killed america enough!!!

Comments provided by :
wood, steve

As a veteran, and a descendant of many veterans who served the United States of America to keep our freedoms in place, I am disappointed that certain commissioners of the FEC want to take away a freedom that our forefathers gave to us in the Constitution. We have the right to express ourselves, even if you disagree with our point of view. So, please do not mess with our fundamental right to freedom of speech, or face serious consequences.

Comments provided by :
Woodard Jr, Lewis

To whom it may concern

You should not be trying to subvert the internet by any means. It is unprincipled, illegal, and unconstitutional.

Comments provided by :

Woodard, Marta

The internet is best left alone without any restriction from government or otherwise. Knowledge and ideas must be uninhibited in order for people to evolve intellectually. Anything else and we might as well attend ceremonious book burnings and enslave each other.

Comments provided by :
workman, brian

What's next, government agents in every office or meeting place in the country to monitor speech? We the people have had enough of this. Our government is too big and is turning on us, just look at what is happening (has happened?) at the IRS.

Have the recent elections told you anything?

The FEC apparently needs to be reminded that they have been tasked with regulating money spent on the election process. Free speech is not a part of this task. Please get back to your task. While you are at it, please occasionally refer to The Constitution for guidance.

Comments provided by :
Woulf, Richard

For the sake of the ones that put their trust in you please act accordingly .thank you „Shelden L. Wright

Comments provided by :
Wright, Shelden

FEC you make me think of the abusive husband that tries to isolate his wife from friends and family because he is afraid of losing control and his evilness is exposed.

FEC---what are you afraid of?

Comments provided by :
Wylie, Sheila

I oppose the proposed regulations on the internet for the following reasons:

- 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 :
Wysocki, Korey

As owner of a 20 year old computer service company, I vehemently oppose any changes to the use of the internet. The internet must NOT BE CONTROLLED IN ANYWAY BY ANY GOVERNMENT! Free speech is just that free of government interference and control. There is no constitutional right to control free speech. Get out of the way and allow a free market place set the use of the internet.

Comments provided by :
Yealy, Don

would you guys PLEASE leave the tax payers alone!!!!

Comments provided by :
YELEY, CINDY

I do not wish for the internet to be regulated or restricted in any manner by the FCC or any government department. It is the last uncensored place where we can speak our minds without government restrictions.

Comments provided by :
Zablotny, Michael

Hello,

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 inviting abusive IRS like targeting which could be used by the party in power (Dem's won't remain in power forever, check 2010 & 2014 elections)

Comments provided by :

Zeller, Troy

Gentlemen,

It is my understanding that you as part of the government are endeavoring to become a monarch.

May I ask if any of you have read the Constitution? If not, it may be wise to do so. In the Constitution the government is supposed to be the servant of the people, not the people the servant of the government.

And part of this legal right is that the citizens of each state have the full God given right to express their opinions about anyone, including the government, without any interference, rules or regulations. Charging fees or taxes is an infringement of this legal God given right.

Should you feel that you have the right and power to continue down the road of excess government regulation, taxation and invasion of privacy you should plan to be rewarded accordingly.

Comments provided by :
Zimmerman, George

I stand on the 1st amendment that I have the right to speak my mind without the gov. looking over my shoulder to monitor what I post.

I am firm in my stance against government regulation of the internet.

Comments provided by :
zimmerman, william

Please do NOT add controls to the Internet!!

My reasons for this request include the following:

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 :
Zitko, Dolores