

Dear FEC Management

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,
Mike Adams

Comments provided by :
Adams, Mike

Reversing the exemption for free postings online would have dangerous ramifications for constitutionally-guaranteed free speech. Elected officials do not have the authority to disregard any part of our constitution.

Comments provided by :
Adornetto, Toni

I undersyand you are trying to pass regulations to further monitor and police internet information. You have plenty of our information already but to target and regulate polical conversations would really piss me off. I hope you reconsider and revisit your job description because I will not sit and watch you further bully my freedom of speech. I have a right to my own thoughts and expressions wiyhout having to worry about someone looking down at what I say.

Best regards, karla

Comments provided by :
alaniz, karla

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 regulation is in direct violation of the US Bill of Rights that guarantee citizens right to free speech.

"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 :

Alley, Robert

Do absolutely nothing !!!!

Our government can no longer be trusted to be fair and impartial.
I trust no one to regulate the internet

We DO NOT want or need your oversight...thanks for listening

Comments provided by :
Allunario, Jim

FCC: What I do online in my personal communication is none of your damn business. Hank

Comments provided by :
Alvarez, Henry

I don't know what you people are afraid of but as far as I know I have a right to free speech no matter the means printed, internet, phone. So you'd better stay out of controlling the internet before you get taken down by the law which still prevails in this country regardless of what you think.

Comments provided by :
Amoling, Allan

We need less oversight, not more.

Comments provided by :
Anderson, Christopher

We need NO more regulation Re: internet use!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Comments provided by :
Anderson, Thomas

please, we need to keep freedom of speech alive; this is the MOST AMERICAN VALUE and the one that certainly most envy in the world.

Comments provided by :
andoro, luis

To put it simple: HANDS OFF! You have no business regulating the internet. The only reason you wish to do so is because of your Marxist-Stalinist philosophy of Big-Brother control of everything: business, the sheeple, thought, EVERYTHING. 1984 was only a BOOK, not your way of life. It was about Engsoc, not Amerisoc. The Constitution, you know, that thing that you have worked so hard to shred, and otherwise destroy, says, "We the people of the United States..." not, "We the sheeple of the United States..." Will you never get that in your heads?

Comments provided by :
Anthony, John

Stop this power grab now!

Comments provided by :
arnason, brian

I implore my government to do what is right and leave our second amendment rights alone, there is no reason other than an evil intent, to take any action at this time. it would seem that certain elements, of this governing body are attacking our personal freedoms using this route, please see to it that this form of injustice is avoided, thank you kindly, MAX ASCHER

Comments provided by :
ascher, nax

STOP!stop messing with the Constitution's First Amendment and the Internet you can not control us that's why our forefathers decided to put that in the Constitution.... it's the land the free home of the Bravesit's the land of the free land of the free home of the Braves....you can't control us...

Comments provided by :
Babb, Mary

This is very bad will lead to censorship as in China

Comments provided by :
Bachmann, Randy

Harry Reid and the rest of communist-socialist members of Congress are going to be found out. Americans are going to know each of them intimately. We cannot have any members of Congress voting against the Bill Of Rights or against freedom liberty and prosperity we protect in our Constitution. Americans know that certain members of Congress are chiseling away at our rights. Harry Reid, Dick Durbin, Charles Schumer, and a number of others, place little or no value on our Constitution or in America. Obama has already stated his distain for the Constitution and will continue to tell people America is not an exceptional nation, and exceptional people. The greatest education must be to instill in school children the basics of our Republican form of Government. This must be done by us. There is no one else and there are fewer and fewer in Congress (the present patriots and newly elected members excepted) that want to acknowledge our successful Republican form of government. We must go forward and expose all imposters, the progressives, the liberals, the Bernie Sanders, Carl Levin's and those who fill their own coffers at expense of working Americans. We cannot allow A FEW COMMUNISTS, Reid, Durbin, Schumer, to dictate what Americans hear (As they Control information). We must daily inform Americans of their intentions. Certainly as soon as Reid and others gain control of information by editing-out the 1st Amendment, they will begin attacking to destroy Christianity. We should counter by removing Islam from American soil, as its only reason for existence here is the destruction of our Judeo-Christian base. We will prevail and we will establish once again and forever our support and protection of Israel, face and defeat all opponents. We will prevail. Though Reid and others embrace and anti-religion agenda, we will protect all the 1st Amendment and all others.

Comments provided by :
Baer, Ken

Do not try to regulate our free 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.

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."

Do not try to regulate my internet!

Comments provided by :
Bagby, 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 :

Balek, Steven

Do not mess with the 1st amendment. Or the pastors in Houston. Or anyone's free speech. We are legion. We do not forgive. We do not forget. EXPECT US!!!!

Comments provided by :
Bales, Joshua

Political speech on the internet is protected and allowed according to the First Amendment of our Constitution. It is not to be regulated by any commission. Thank you.

Comments provided by :
BALLARD, W

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.

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

Andrew Barbieri
969 Center Hill Rd
Hillsdale NY 12529

Comments provided by :
Barbieri, Andrew

I object to you trying to regulate what I say on the internet. You are going against the second amendment taking away our free speech.

Comments provided by :
Bartel, Gilbert

I like the internet just the way it is, please leave it alone.

Comments provided by :
Baughn, David

We sure don't need any government control over the internet or any taxes on it.

Comments provided by :

Beck, Fred

I have a grave concern that the Democratic Leadership is trying desperately to control what is supposed to be our freedom under our Amendment. I feel this past November mid-term election would have given the Democratic Leaders the message that WE the US Citizens do not care for your ways of doing things. Now the FEC Commissioners want to regulate the internet. In my opinion you are trying to regulate OUR FREE SPEECH. Your doing this to control any or all political speech on the internet. You are doing this know and have been since 2008 through the news media. The only exception to this is FOX NEWS. They are still fair and balanced in their reporting. God Bless Them. For 275 year our Constitution and the Bill of Rights has allowed our government to operate and function with excellent success until 2008. I Strongly recommend that the commissioners DO NOT try to change the First Amendment. If any FEC Commissioner of either party votes for this change I will NOT vote for them in the next election!!

Sincerely;

Newton T. Beck

Comments provided by :
Beck, Newton

Let's leave the internet as it is, without government control.

Comments provided by :
Behrns, Richard

I do not want the FEC regulating 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 :

bennett, john

Internet access to information should be able to be obtained free to download

Comments provided by :
Bennett, Mel

I am opposed to ANY government regulation of the internet. My freedom is important to me and I will not stand aside while more of my freedoms are taken. Do not tread on my Free Speech please

Thank you

Steven M Bennett

Comments provided by :

Bennett, Steven

America is a free country. Freedom of speech is a constitutional guarantee. Any attempt to regulate speech on the Internet is tantamount to Communism and will not be tolerated by free Americans.

Comments provided by :
Bernier, Ronald

Stop trying to destroy our right. If you can do it, so can we. Leave our constitution alone. It is what makes us the amazing nation we are. If you don't like it, move to another country.

Comments provided by :
Biller, Quentin

I am opposed to the new Internet regulations that would both violate my 1st Amendment rights and would hunt my use of the internet. 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.

Comments provided by :
Birchfield, Gary

Please leave the Internet alone!!!!

Terry Bishop

Comments provided by :
Bishop, Terry

The Fec has no right to regulate free speech. The first amendment of the constitution allows free speech. Do not infringe on my right or anyone else's on the internet. The fec should stick to regulating money spent on elections.

Comments provided by :
Black, Curtis

Dear board members of the FEC - please don't regulate speech content on the internet. Whether for political comments or any other type of speech - other than pornographic or vulgar.

Thanks'

Matt

Comments provided by :

Black, Matt

Please don't regulate the Internet.

Comments provided by :
Black, Stephen

RE: FEC Commissioners want to regulate our online posts

Are we in China or the USSR? Where in the first amendment can you even try to justify the ability to censor our emails, vocal comments or expression. Judge Stewart R. Dalzell, one of the three federal judges who in June 1996 declared parts of the CDA unconstitutional, in his opinion stated the following:[1]

The Internet is a far more speech-enhancing medium than print, the village green, or the mails. Because it would necessarily affect the Internet itself, the CDA would necessarily reduce the speech available for adults on the medium. This is a constitutionally intolerable result. Some of the dialogue on the Internet surely tests the limits of conventional discourse. Speech on the Internet can be unfiltered, unpolished, and unconventional, even emotionally charged, sexually explicit, and vulgar ? in a word, "indecent" in many communities. But we should expect such speech to occur in a medium in which citizens from all walks of life have a voice. We should also protect the autonomy that such a medium confers to ordinary people as well as media magnates. [...] My analysis does not deprive the Government of all means of protecting children from the dangers of Internet communication. The Government can continue to protect children from pornography on the Internet through vigorous enforcement of existing laws criminalizing obscenity and child pornography. [...] As we learned at the hearing, there is also a compelling need for public educations about the benefits and dangers of this new medium, and the Government can fill that role as well. In my view, our action today should only mean that Government?s permissible supervision of Internet contents stops at the traditional line of unprotected speech. [...] The absence of governmental regulation of Internet content has unquestionably produced a kind of chaos, but as one of the plaintiff?s experts put it with such resonance at the hearing: "What achieved success was the very chaos that the Internet is. The strength of the Internet is chaos." Just as the strength of the Internet is chaos, so that strength of our liberty depends upon the chaos and cacophony of the unfettered speech the First Amendment protects.[1]

References"

1: a b Rowland, Diane (2005). Information Technology Law. Routledge-Cavendish. p. 463-465. ISBN 978-1859417560.

Comments provided by :
Blackard, Roderick

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 :

Blair, Thomas

The Commissioners serve full time and are responsible for administering and enforcing the Federal Election Campaign Act. I don't feel they should regulate our online posts and conversations. Please don't pass new regulations to control any political speech on the internet.

Comments provided by :
boentges, john

Big government is not the answer to solving all problems. In most cases Big government IS the problem! Remember the Constitution (law of the land), as well.

Comments provided by :
Bokland, Roy

The FEC should restrict its activities to what it was designed to do: regulating federal election funds. It has no business regulating the speech of private citizens on free forums throughout the internet whether it done by blogs, posts, you tubes, etc. What's more this is hugely impractical as it would require hiring an army of investigators to follow up on the myriad ways that people have to express themselves. It's time to stop the expansion and overreach. Free speech is our right, and it most explicitly applies to political speech. Stop trying to abrogate our rights.

Comments provided by :
Bond, Joseph

The FEC's proposal to regulate the internet seems little more than an effort to limit the free speech of those using an increasingly popular media, the internet.

We've seen a demonstration of another federal agency, the IRS, being used as a tool to limit the ability of advocates of a particular political philosophy to communicate their message. When senior members of the IRS take the fifth related to their selective administration of IRS regulatory practices, it becomes obvious that 'government' can and will be used as a political tool.

I firmly believe the better approach, vis-à-vis the FEC, would be to provide more restrictions on the FEC rather than on the constitutionally protected free speech of US Citizens, even to the extent of eliminating that federal agency altogether.

Comments provided by :
Boone, Emmette

With all due respect, please keep your hands and rules off the First Amendment and our rights to free speech. As a participating, contributing citizen of the United States, I urge you to drop this proposal and never pick it up again. All free speech, especially political, is part of what keeps this nation alive. Please do NOT become like either Communist China or Communist Russia (when they were the USSR) and try to regulate political speech online. It's absolutely ridiculous. It's big government trying to control (based of course on fear). The Democrats, who are behind this regulation, just want power and are afraid that free-thinking people won't let them have it. This is an abuse of power and an over-reach of our government. It will cost way too much, and there are much more important things to do with the money that the government DOESN'T have. Thank you for your attention to this comment.

Comments provided by :
Boswell, Mike

I am disturbed to hear that there is a proposal to regulate or even monitor political speech on the internet. Fascism is not good, no matter who is doing it.

Comments provided by :
Boxmeyer, Steven

I understand the FEC is looking to regulate the internet posts, comments etc. This is not what the FEC should be involved in. The FEC is tasked with regulating money spent on elections, not political speech. Regulating the internet would be costly, unreasonable and a violation of the First Amendment. Please cease and desist on this issue. Do NOT violate the First Amendment in any way, shape or form.

I would suggest you work to limit campaign spending so that all qualified candidates could run for office, not just the ones who have alot of money.

Thank you.

Comments provided by :

Boyd, Linda

To the Federal Election Commission board members:

Please, would you just leave the Internet ? and those who use it ? alone and stop this foolish and Orwellian attempt to regulate it and regulate free online speech?

I have to point out that:

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, in communist China-like fashion, would have to unleash an army of regulators ? at taxpayer expense ? 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. Internet regulations will place an undue burden on small groups and individuals.
5. These new regulations would be extremely costly for taxpayers and difficult to enforce.

Leave my Internet alone! Leave my liberties alone! Leave me alone!

Joe Braddy
Winter Haven, Fla.

Comments provided by :
Braddy, Joe

Absolutely no regulations placed on the internet. Please allow the marketplace to determine it's destiny. No government!!!!

Comments provided by :
Brady, 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. Not to mention a gross violation of our constitutional right to freedom of speech and expression. Thank you for hearing my comments

Comments provided by :

Brainard Jr, james

WE have enough government regulation to last several lifetimes. Don't regulate the free speech of the internet--the only place where truth is not perverted. NO NET NEUTRALITY.

Comments provided by :
Brand, Jan

I do not want the FEC regulating speech on the internet, under any guise. You might want to brush up on the Constitution of the United States to understand that free speech is guaranteed by that document. Your organization has NO place trying to undermine any of my GOD given freedoms. You didn't grant me these rights, GOD did, and you can't take away something you didn't give.

The current unconstitutional regime has been steadily eroding freedom in this country. We are on the slippery slope to totalitarianism and it must stop, right here and right now.

Your only job is to regulate money spent on elections. Each citizen's free speech rights are outside of your purview. Free postings online give a voice to each and every citizen. Your attempts would cut off that right for a large number of citizens under guise of government action. That is unconstitutional. I again suggest you read the Constitution until you understand it.

Do NOT trample free expression on the internet. Stick to your mandate and stop trying to grow your power. The influence of the federal government needs to be reduced drastically so our country can be restored to the land of the free and the home of the brave.

Comments provided by :
Breglio, Robert

PROTECT OUR CONSTITUTION AND ALL RIGHTS THEREIN; NO EXCEPTIONS.

Comments provided by :
Brent, Janice

leave things alone we don't need more government in our live there is way to much of that now

Comments provided by :
Bretton, Marie

I oppose internet regulation as a violation of our Constitutionally provided 1st Amendment right to free speech. Additionally, this amounts to an overburdening tax on the entire American population and stifles innovative creativity by individuals. Moreover, it would require a virtual army of people to enforce such a measure which, in turn, would overload our already exploding budget deficits putting America even further into debt leading to total bankruptcy of our economy. Therefore, I urge you to leave the internet open and free for everyone to use which will continue to benefit all Americans.

Comments provided by :
Britt, Carl

The federal, local, or state government has no constitutional authority to monitor and prohibit free speech on the Internet or any other forms of communication. This proposal would limit the exercise of free speech, and who decides what is right and wrong for the American people to say. Regulating the exercise of free speech on the Internet has the potential to even go after people that have religious disagreements such as those that do not agree with abortion, or homosexuality, or evolution.

Comments provided by :

Brown, James

My rights are being abused

Comments provided by :
Brown, Jim

The American people don't have any privacy anymore! It seems to be getting worse every day! Let the people have some privacy and do not regulate the internet! The Internet is a very sophisticated tool that we use every day and we don't need more control in our daily lives by our government! Our forefathers did not intend for us to be controlled like that of other communist countries and that's the reason they fought for our freedoms! Communism creeps in the more we are regulated! Are we going to become like communist China because our government wants to regulate all of our lives a little bit at a time, piece by piece?!

Comments provided by :
Brown, Peggy

One of the best and most important values of the Internet is the fact that it does not cost the user. Please leave the Internet as it is and do not move forward with charging for its use.

Comments provided by :
Bryant, Steve

The Federal Election Commission is only responsible for the regulation of campaign finance laws. You can't control free speech especially viewpoints express over the Internet. That will violate freedom of speech.

Comments provided by :
Bryson, Albert

I don't want the government to regulate what I say on the internet. It is the freedom of speech admendment #1. Safeguard our rights as citizens of the USA.

Comments provided by :
Buckles, Heidi

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

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."

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 want the FEC to keep their hands OFF the internet, they didn't create it, and have no need to control it in the manner suggested, it is NOT a "utility"!

Comments provided by :

Bunetta, Thomas

We do not need more of our Federal Government controlling of our freedom of speech. The IRS and Barack Obama have shown how much they like about American Citizens.

Comments provided by :
Burdette, Garland

DO NOT VIOLATE OUR 1st AMENDMENT RIGHTS BY REGULATING - FREE SPEECH.

THIS IS NOT YOUR JOB TO OVERSEE WHAT INDIVIDUALS OR GROUPS CAN ARTICULATE.

Comments provided by :

Burkard, Barbara

The Constitution is a sacred document and any attempt to alter is not only unconscionable it is a direct attack on the one thing that makes this country the absolute best this spinning rock has ever seen. Should the FEC pursue any regulation that directly hinders the first amendment of We The People, I believe it would time to organize and seek legislation to disable the ability of the FEC without prior congressional approval.

Comments provided by :

Butler, D. R. Tuffy

I am against the government dictating what I can or cannot say on the internet. That goes against my freedom of speech! People have the right to say what they want to online. Also, I find out a lot of information online about government issues that I did not know about. Is that the reason the government wants to control the internet? So that they can control what (WE THE PEOPLE) find out about the government? Just in case the government forgot, WE THE PEOPLE pay your salary.

Comments provided by :
Cain, Donna

What is being proposed here in absolutely nothing short of a Chinese Censorship Board".As an online blogger who provides commentary and analysis on current events I have big problem with Democrats deciding which speech is acceptable and which isn't. The idea that Democrats are far more special than Republicans is dumb, stupid and idiotic and I am very much opposed to this proposal.

Comments provided by :
Calame, Edward

Commissioners,

I respectfully request you take no further action in regards to regulating the internet. Government overreach has become rampant in all aspects of our lives and I certainly feel that the internet **SHOULD BE LEFT ALONE**.

Comments provided by :

Cannon, Kevin

we have enough regulations on the internet now Keep the government out of my internet & don't tax it

Comments provided by :
cantley, peggy

TO: Fed Democrat commissioners,

Keep your "dirty paws" off my internet with these nonsense regulations. I pay for my internet as other folks do and 'nobody, I mean nobody asked for my opinion. You certainly don't pay my internet monthly bill. I didn't elect you for these positions. Leave my 'freedom to the use of internet to me, a consumer. You are a 'bully' and do not represent the American people/consumer on the use of the internet.

Your position/s are nonsense and should be removed. Does your family or friends agree to this. NO! Therefore, mind your own business in these matters and go/stay home.

Nina Carelock

Comments provided by :
Carelock, Nina

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 :

Carlson, Richard

Please keep 1st Amendment untouched! No Government regulations on the Internet. We are a free society, not a communist one like China!

Comments provided by :
Carrillo, Dominique

Please leave the internet alone, it belongs free and unencumbered.

Comments provided by :
Carslay, Thomas

This appears to be another attempt to stifle free speech and limit our Constitutional freedoms, when will politicians learn that the American people are not that stupid and stop such blatant attempts?

Comments provided by :
carter, david

Good morning:

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 don't need the government controlling our speech on the Internet.

Thank you.

Larry Carter
Fort Worth, Texas

Comments provided by :
Carter, Larry

The US government has no right to be silencing political speech for the benefit of any incumbent party. Period. The FEC's only job is to regulate/tally money spent on ads made.

This new regulation is a serious attempt to deny all people their constitutionally protected free speech.

Will the FEC have the same problem as the IRS if this regulation is passed? Heck yes.

Comments provided by :
Chambers, Lisa

I am writing today to say that I do not agree with those Democrat FEC Commissioners who wish to regulate my free speech on the Internet. It is a violation of my 1ST Amendment Rights and I'm sick and tired this administrations constant attack's on the American tax payer because they think they know what's best for us. I believe the resent election results speak for themselves but apparently they still don't get it. We have had enough!

?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. We have much more important things in this country to spend tax payer dollars on, such as voter fraud which that they seem to conviently ignore.

Thank You,
Jason Chronister

Comments provided by :
Chronister, Jason

I am not in favor of the overreach by the FCC in their attempt to regulate speech on the internet. This action is in violation of the FIRST AMENDMENT and should not be allowed.

Comments provided by :
Chubon, David

The Internet should be left alone. It doesn't need an unelected government agency to interfere.

Comments provided by :

Clark, John

Last I checked we still live in the United States of America,(not Red China), where free speech is still allowed.

The FEC is tasked with regulating money spent on elections, not political speech. Stick to what your supposed to be doing.

Reversing the exemption for free postings online would have dangerous ramifications for constitutionally-guaranteed free speech. We are not a fascist nation as of yet.

Comments provided by :
Clement, Mark

I do not support the FEC regulating speech in any way particularly on the internet. I am against any such regulation. The first amendment to the U.S. Constitution guarantees the right of free speech to all.

If the FEC attempts to censor the internet, then the FEC is acting unconstitutionally.

Comments provided by :
Cloud, Eugene

Do not mess with my free speech.

Comments provided by :
Cocos, Fred

The US Bill of Rights clearly states, "Congress shall make no law ... abridging the freedom of speech ...". Hence any prohibition that you attempt to make on political speech before, during, or after elections is unconstitutional. So stop trying to prohibit free speech.

If you do not like the First Amendment, then submit an amendment to the Congress to pass and submit to the States for approval. The process is clearly stated in Article V. Otherwise, you are violating the Constitution.

Comments provided by :

Codespoti, Daniel

The FCC will make the internet like VA care within 5 years. Lots of competition now, no need for external help.

Comments provided by :
COFFEY, JOE

In the United States of America, we have the right to express our opinions freely. That right is set forth in the First Amendment to our Constitution. To deny this right to U.S. citizens in their communications on the internet is contrary to what has made our nation great. Monitoring and removing citizens' personal postings would be expected under a Communist dictator -- not under a government which respects and protects basic human rights. Monitor and spy on those who would destroy our liberties -- not on good people who only want to uphold our lawful freedoms.

Comments provided by :
Coffin, Carla

To all democratic so called leaders. I am all ready disgusted by owe-bama and his policies!! They (policies) are stripping away my personal freedoms that so many have died fighting for throughout the history of our country. Now you democrats (cronies of owe-bama), want to regulate what I say and do online!! Perposterious!!! Our constitution, which grants me the right to free speech, will not be silenced by you "politically correct liberals". You may force me to participate in that costly owe-bama care, lie-filled, health program. But I'll be damned if I sit idle and watch you (democrats) walk all over the Flag and Constitution it watches over!! To put it bluntly, keep your dirty, lie-ridden, hands off my (our) rights, and keep them out of the internet, before that too, turns into another democrat controlled fiasco!!

Comments provided by :
collins, steven

?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 :
Colunga, Theodore

I strongly oppose limiting my First Amendment Rights. This proposed regulation is something the communists in Russia or China would enact to control their population. America is a FREE country. This is wrong and as a legal United States citizen, I oppose it.

George Colvin

Comments provided by :
Colvin, George

leave the internet along it is just find the way it is. Every time Government gets involved it's for control not betterment of Society.

Comments provided by :
Conner, Tom

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 :
Conover, 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. In closing, I am against any governmental agency infringing on my 1st Amendment rights and free speech. That includes comments against political policies or ideologies from a local, state, or federal governing body.

Comments provided by :
Conrath, Dan

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 :
Conrath, Sharon

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

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

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

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

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

If you think the 2014 elections went badly, wait until the 2016 election!

.....James Cooney

Comments provided by :

Cooney, James

I feel this legislation will infringe on my first Amendment rights and severely restrict my freedom of speech.

Comments provided by :
Cope, Linda

Free speech is the greatest of our liberties. The internet is the epitome of that right and liberty. FEC vice-chairman, Ann Ravel is out of line. Restricting and control free political speech on the internet is anti-American -- it's something that the Chinese government does, not the US.

Comments provided by :
Cormell, Laird

I want to keep the internet free. Do not silence the diversity of opinion and speech.

Comments provided by :
Couch, Michael

Dear Representative:

I am writing to comment regarding the fact that Democrats in the FEC are attacking our First Amendment rights by trying to regulate the internet, thereby, trying to regulate our 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.

It is my sincere hope that these things be considered seriously and thoughtfully in light of our First Amendment Constitutional rights.

Thank you.

Respectfully,

Maria M. Coullard

Comments provided by :
Coullard, Maria

Dear FEC commissioners, the Constitution clearly states the God given right to freedom of expression. Hillsdale College has a Free (A Liberal's Dream) course on that and other rights 'endowed by our Creator'. Please take the course so you can learn the errors of your ways. Then you can participate in the Change that is sweeping across America. You can become Conservative Americans instead of Marxists and promote Freedom and Liberty for All. As a Legal American Citizen, not a pretend citizen like your base, the great grandson of Legal Immigrants, not Criminal Invaders, like your base, I object to your attempt to violate the Constitution by regulating 'Free Speech'. Yours in Liberty, Ron Covington.

Comments provided by :
Covington, Ron

I ask you as an American citizen that you respect our First Amendment and allow the continuance of free speech by NOT regulating the Internet. We are already smothered with senseless regulation for a government that is five times as big as it should be.

Comments provided by :
Cox, Stephanie

I do not believe more regulations are the answer. Less is best. This will stifle our freedom of speech. Please do not go down this slippery slope.

Thank you.

Comments provided by :
Crabill, Theresa

I disagree with this infringement of my 1st Amendment rights. 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 :

Craggan, Michael

F.e.c.

Government regulations on free speech will never be tolerated.

Attempting to mask the fascist intent to control free speech as equal time and monopoly busting is a lie the American people will not buy.

Comments provided by :

cramer, James

The internet does not need to be regulated by the FEC. Any attempt to limit or control free speech regarding politics or any other communication is purely political and not in the best interest of anyone except those who would try to limit the truth. In the last 24 hours, it has become know that Obamacare passage was counting on the stupid taxpayers for passage. There should be transparency at all levels of Government at all times. We need less Government not more regulation to promote dishonesty. Reg 2014-01 is a needless partisan issue.

Comments provided by :
Creasy, Lawrence

I am against the proposed actions. 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.

This is wasteful and irresponsible expenditure of tax revenues.

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.

The web is an integral tool in daily communication for many citizens. 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 strongly oppose such action by the FEC.

Comments provided by :
CRONENWETT, Brian

Censorship of free speech is unacceptable, and is no longer free when slanted to only government's opinion. To stifle the exchange of ideas is flatly unconstitutional propaganda generation.

Comments provided by :
cronin, john

To FEC Commissioners

The FEC is tasked with regulating money spent on elections, not political speech. Your job is to do nothing more or nothing less. Remember this is America and not Stalin's Communist Russia nor Nazi Germany of the 30's .

J W Cross

PS

"Americans are so enamored of equality that they would rather be equal in slavery than unequal in freedom."

"Democracy and socialism have nothing in common but one word, equality. But notice the difference: while democracy seeks equality in liberty, socialism seeks equality in restraint and servitude."

~ Alexis de Tocqueville

Alexis de Tocqueville's concerns have been proven to be well-founded. He was definitely correct. Americans just didn't listen until it was too late. Well..... we're sure in the he11 are listening now.

Comments provided by :
Cross, Joseph

To the Federal Election Commission: I disagree with your trying to take away our freedom of speech and freedom of religion. Also, I object to your trying to denigrate to Republicans, who have fought hard and long to get America back to Christianity. That is the only way America and the world will have peace again. God rules the world and sees every move you make and every move everyone takes. I am sure that God is not pleased with your actions and before long God will return to earth to receive those of us who have served Him, believed in Him, prayed to Him, Loved Him, and listened to his voice, which only He will give the world the truth. Take time in your everyday life to talk to God in prayer and ask God for your guidance; otherwise you will wind up in purgatory where your eternity will be spent in Hell. I am praying for you that you make the right decision. Don't forget! God is watching and America is watching through the eyes of God. God bless America. Praise God, from whom all blessings flow! John 3:16 I am ready to meet God and go with Him to Heaven when it is my time to go. I look forward to it. I hope you will be ready for it, as well, otherwise, you will have a disastrous eternity!

Comments provided by :
Cross, Maybelle

Just leave the Internet and our freedom of speech alone. We are allowed to voice our options as we wish and you can't be permitted to take that away at any time for any reason. Back off!

Comments provided by :
Dalie, Jason

You have a responsibility to keep the Internet open, free and unregulated. You have NO authority to regulate or control an entity that is global in scope and impacts the lives of millions of people. It is NOTHING even remotely resembling a utility...it does not impact lighting or heating homes, clean water or fuels and as an entity, does nothing of its own merits to constitute a public monopoly.

Tom Davie
Sarasota, Fl

Comments provided by :
Davie, Tom

No need for the FEC to expand your powers, you are unmandated, unfunded, and unwanted. The tasks that are assigned to FEC are done poorly and over budget.

Comments provided by :
Davis, Jeffrey

The FEC is tasked with regulating money spent on elections, not political speech!
These new regulations would be extremely costly for the taxpayers and difficult to enforce!
Not to mention that it's unconstitutional and against my first amendment rights!

Comments provided by :
Deeds, James

These actions must be stopped and are absolutely ludicrous. You need to stop creating rules to suit you, and think about the greater good of society, and this once great country. I implore you to take a good, hard look, at who this benefits, and make the right decision for the CITIZENS of the United States of America, rather than your own personal interests.

Comments provided by :
DeFrances, Michael

Our country was founded upon certain rights based on individual liberty. The very first such liberty listed in our constitution, is the freedom of speech, expression and religion. Most people still enjoy that fundamental right when using the internet. Please do NOT do anything that would jeopardize that right. Keep the internet completely open and free, lest we take a step closer to a fascist dictatorship. Thank you,

Mike

Comments provided by :

Degroot, Michael

The last six years have been nothing less than disastrous for our country. With two years left having lost control of the Senate you people are still trying to take our 1st. amendment rights away with regulation of the Internet. Elections have consequences. The people have spoken, Stop your illegal activities or hopefully you will be prosecuted. Praying God deals with all traitors.

Comments provided by :
Del Rio, Roger

As a frequent user of the Internet I do not think any regulatory laws are needed now. There are too many regulations in various areas now. We do not need any more. In fact, we should do away with many now. Furthermore, we do not need any more encroachment on our liberties especially those that are connected to our Bill of Rights.

Comments provided by :
Dello-Stritto, Fred

Please honor our US Constitution and practice what the Government preach. I can understand the safety of the Americans because I hear the same comment all the time. But, that does not mean that we can regulate and police the Internet to the majority of the innocent citizens. We ought to allow the agencies to monitor the Federal and State governments because they are threat to us to begin with with the plain politics. Thanks! Ronnie

Comments provided by :
Delvisco, Ronald

I will not let any body take my rights to speech away from me or the United States of America.

Comments provided by :
denbo, cody

I oppose any regulation/rulemaking which controls content distributed on the internet in any fashion particularly any attempt to regulate political expression.

Comments provided by :
dennis sr, donald

As a voter and citizen of the United States of America, I believe the use of the internet should NOT be controlled by my government. Please leave the internet as it is.

Comments provided by :
Derryberry, Milton

Please keep the state out of the internet

Comments provided by :
Devore, John

Please leave our First Amendment alone! We don't need to spend any more tax dollars on controlling political speech, or ANY speech, on the internet. We don't need to hire anyone to monitor the internet. Free speech on the internet is none of your business! We live in America, not China. Reversing the exemption for free postings online would have dangerous ramifications for constitutionally-guaranteed free speech for all.

Comments provided by :
Dietz, Carrie

The FEC should have absolutely no role in regulating speech on the Internet. Stay away from our constitutionally guaranteed right to 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.

Comments provided by :
DiMeo, Richard

If you control the peoples voice on politics, there will no longer be free and fair elections.
to limit free speech on the internet, leaves only the word of a very biased and one sided press core
that is not believed or trusted. Leave free speech alone.

Comments provided by :
Dimmock, Robert

It is clearly a violation of the rights granted to all citizens of the United States of American to insert any censorship of private comments or personal opinions by a government entity. We are a people governed by laws that reflect the rights granted to us by God. The laws in this country must conform to the Bill Of Rights which are the first ten Amendments to the Constitution crafted the Founders of our nation. This would be a clear violation of the right of Free Speech guaranteed by the Bill of Rights.

Comments provided by :

Dixn, James

Don't start regulating the internet to take my freedom of speech rights away!

Comments provided by :
Donaldson, 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 :

Dontigney, Gail

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 :
Dotson, Shane

I do NOT wish the government to monitor my e-mail traffic; nor should the government regulate the internet. I do believe that the government should protect the internet from hackers.

Comments provided by :
Douglas, William

In 1776, my great great great Grandfather took up arms and attacked the British rule to fight for the newly created Bill of Rights. We created the 1st Amendment so we don't end up in jail like our English King would have done should we have spoken out against his rule. It's called Monarchy Rule!

The beauty of this country is that we can all have different opinions on politics. If we curb one side it leads to tyranny and a monarchy. NO FREE society can live where their speech or point of views are oppressed to suit a political agenda. That is communism and anyone that votes and pushes that should be immediately removed from office.

EVERY SENATOR, CONGRESSMAN AND PRESIDENT take an oath to uphold the Constitution, even if you don't think every right is "RIGHT". By trying to take those freedoms and undermining the Constitution you go against your oath and undermine the people you govern. That is a CRIME!

DO NOT regulate the Internet or limit the 1st Amendment

Comments provided by :
Dowd, Jason

Any rule made by the FEC must pass a constitutional review and I don't believe that such a rule to regulate the free speech of individual americans will pass that review. Please do not waste your time and our money.

Comments provided by :
Drake, David

Censoring free speech from an American perspective by Americans living under our constitution and Declaration of Independence is not only contradictory to our entire country foundation but in my solemn opinion an act of treason in representing a free people. The fact that we now have to fight against our own appointed governing body is a very saddening reality. For those in power reading this, please consider resigning your position to someone with integrity and humility if you no longer wish to protect your countrys freedom and citizens.

Comments provided by :
Driebs, David

Dont do this it will only make people hate the government more than they already do!

Comments provided by :
Dudas, Bryce

The internet has been a fantastically successful enterprise - I maintain largely because of the lack of government interference. I say, 'If it's not broke, don't fix it!' I see grave danger for individual citizens in FCC regulations which would only impinge on our First Amendment rights - never mind the additional 'thought police' that would have to be hired (yet more unnecessary taxpayer \$\$) to enforce these unnecessary regulations. This is a horrible idea! No, no and NO again to any government regulation on the internet!

Comments provided by :

Dudley, Jean

Please read the first amendment. We are supposed to have freedom of speech. If you don't like those freedoms you are welcome to go to Iran or North Korea. I served my country for many years to preserve our freedoms.

Dave Dull
USNR RET

Comments provided by :
Dull, 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.

I AM OPPOSED TO ANY ACTION WHICH WOULD ATTEMPT TO INFRINGE ON MY RIGHTS, ESPECIALLY WHEN SUCH ACTION WOULD BE ACCOMPANIED BY ENORMOUS ENFORCEMENT COSTS.

Comments provided by :

Dunning, Greye

Ladies/Gentlemen:

I am strongly opposed to government interference and/or regulation of the Internet. You are aware of the saying, "If it ain't broke, then don't fix it." From my point of view, the Internet has worked well for me and millions of users. Why regulate it? Why move to tax it?

Yes, I fear government intrusion and regulation of what should be 'free speech.' There are too many bureaucrats and liberals who will take advantage of any opportunity to suppress free speech or conservative talk. Am I paranoid? No. Just consider what nefarious activity has been going on within the IRS. It is abominable. Our Internet has worked just fine as it is - ever since Al Gore invented it.

Thank you, from a concerned citizen.

Lawrence R. Eaton
Palmdale, CA

Comments provided by :
Eaton, Lawrence

Please do not tax the internet. The internet should be kept free as it was intended.

Comments provided by :
Ebert, Derek

Hello. I am writing in opposition to this proposed regulation. 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 new regulations would be extremely costly for taxpayers and difficult to enforce.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Comments provided by :
Edelmann, Anne

What business is it of the Federal Election Commission what political speech is involved in internet communications? You are charged with regulating the money spent on elections, not with regulating political speech. Please! You have already regulated too much speech by the very fact that you exist.

The first amendment to the U.S. Constitution guarantees the right of free speech, and they were talking specifically about political speech. Regulating speech--including the internet--is something done in Communist countries, such as Red China and Soviet Russia. People have died to defend our right to say what we want to, even about politics!

Personally, I think that your commission and all it stands for should be abolished. But that's another issue. Right now, I just want you to stay out of the regulation of political speech; it's not your job!

Comments provided by :

Edwards, Donna

The government must not regulate the Internet. Free speech is a constitutional right.

Joe Egan

Comments provided by :
Egan, Joseph

FEC Members,

Over the span of two decades, the Internet has become a valuable tool for members of this supposed "free society" to collaborate, debate, and obtain information. Any attempts to limit or even strictly regulate online political speech is antithetical to the core values and foundational philosophies of the United States. I will actively campaign against any attempt to place undue burdens upon the free speech of individuals, small groups, and policy advocacy organizations. Please do not seek to undermine the freedoms we now enjoy.

Thank you for listening,
Mrs. Carrie A. Eiler

Comments provided by :
Eiler, Carrie

I am extremely concerned with the state of internet regulation. In the early times when the printing press was new, it was instantly recognized as a form of distributing materials and opinions that should be protected by constitutional law. In those days the concept of an electronic medium by which information can be even more accessible did not exist. As the internet has grown, it has now become the primary source for sharing information and opinion. Even the book industry and classically supplied television stations have been and are in the process of being moved to or replaced by open and free internet. The internet is the means of supplying and distributing electronically stored text, which is exactly what is protected by the constitution.

The FEC is tasked with regulating money spent on elections. Free speech has nothing to do with money. Friends communicating with friends and public communicating with the public happens in person, over the phone, in text, in schools, in government buildings for personal reasons that have nothing ever to do with money, and the FEC is going to regulate regardless.

This is going to waist your time and our time. The taxpayers are the ones that will pay for this, and they are paying for regulating themselves. This is ludicrous. We do not need to be protected from ourselves. That responsibility belongs to us and none else. It is your responsibility to uphold the constitution and oppose such regulation with vigor. We the people of the United States of America are not going to have any of this. We will oppose it through and through. What some think will eliminate chaos in reality will only cause more until you all figure out your responsibility.

- An Active Citizen

Comments provided by :
Eliason, Daniel

I respectfully ask you NOT to regulate the internet. Our constitutional-guaranteed free speech would be irreversibly impaired by reversing the exemptions of free postings online. Any of these new regulations would be very costly and difficult to enforce. The FEC is NOT tasked with regulating free political speech but rather with money spent on elections. The FEC would need a huge group of people to monitor all the internet sites daily to find potential violations based on opinion postings. Those opinions & individuals may then face inquiries by FEC staff, none elected people whose political agenda could be served, similar to the recent IRS cases. I again respectfully ask you to leave the internet as free speech for all and none regulated.

Sincerely,

Larry D. Ellingson, O.D.

Comments provided by :
Ellingson, Larry

By you controlling what comments people post online, you would be violating the constitution's freedom of speech. It would be a violation period. So I as well as many others ask you to forget this whole silly idea. Thank you for your time.

Comments provided by :
Elliott, Earl

I absolutely, without provocation, am against this regulation. The FEC's position should be committed to its purpose, which is regulating money spent on elections, not political speech. Political speech is freedom of speech, and is in no way, a "monetary election" issue. Trying to reverse the exemption for free postings online would seem to have dangerous ramifications for our GUARANTEED FREE SPEECH provided by our CONSTITUTION.

Thank you for your time,
Michelle Elloway

Comments provided by :
Elloway, Michelle

Since the FEC is tasked with regulating money spent on elections, it has no constitutional right to try to regulate political speech.

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

The FEC would need thousands of regulators at no small cost to taxpayers to constantly monitor internet sites looking for potential violations.

These new regulations would unnecessarily generate enormous amounts of litigation against common persons just exercising their 1st amendment rights. They should never be put into effect.

Comments provided by :
Elser, Norman

GO AWAY AND LEAVE ME ALONE

Comments provided by :
Engle, 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 :

Erwine, Glenn

I, James W Estes, am vehemently opposed to allowing the FEC (or any government agency) to regulate my online posts and conversations, therefore, I oppose any regulations that would allow such internet control by the federal government.

Comments provided by :
Estes, James

Communist style tyranny must end here and has no place in the land of the free.

Comments provided by :
Estridge, Chuck

I consider recently proposed electoral commission regulations to regulate internet content and expression as a direct violation of the American citizenry's Constitutional rights. It is very critical that these regulations not be approved and published and that the very commission mechanism, both in structure and personnel, that allows such action to be contemplated be disbanded. Your regulatory mission must never be construed as power over the inalienable rights of American citizens.

Comments provided by :
Evans, Irvin

Get rid of Obamacare and all the stupid regulations. Keep our Military strong

Comments provided by :
Evans, Tom

The intent of the internet was to encourage the exchange of information and ideas and encourage free speech. This being said I see no reason that the FCC should attempt to change how the internet works it should be left to the users and the companies that host sites to set rules which include speed and to a small extent content.

Comments provided by :
Eyre, Curtis

The proposed regulations are an attack on our First Amendment Right to Free Speech. They are too broad in scope and without limit to be viewed otherwise. The FEC is charged with regulating election spending, not political speech, reversing exemptions for free postings is totally an attack on free speech. These proposed regulations would require an army of enforcers that would be an invasion of privacy. An undue burden would be placed on small groups and individuals and be prohibitively expensive for taxpayers.

Comments provided by :
Fain, Steven

If you don't like freedom of speech, move to another country. This is the USA, see the first amendment of our Constitution.

Comments provided by :
Farrell, David

my internet is my business, not the government's

Comments provided by :
Fasterling, Pat

The discussion to regulate the internet as a utility has only one purpose and that is the control of speech. Regardless of what politicians say, regulation will ultimately lead to censorship. It is the way of government. I strongly oppose any attempt to change current law or to impose this through executive order.

Comments provided by :
Fellers, Raymond

No.

No way, no how.

Government has no business regulating political speech.

Ever heard of the First Amendment?

Do the comments made on the internet make the government uncomfortable?

Good.

Why not address the problems that people are unhappy about?

The very idea that some government commission is going to read my posts and evaluate them for appropriateness makes me ill.

It's bad enough that my private e-mails are read and stored by the government already - now you're going to censor them outright.

Please point out the Constitutional justification for this. I'd like to point you to the Bill of Rights, specifically the Tenth Amendment:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people"

Nowhere in our Constitution can I find anything that says that some commission can decide whether what I decide to post is appropriate or not. It isn't your job. You don't have that power.

There's a reason for that.

Comments provided by :

Fielder, Gregory

do not let the internet be under gov.regulation keep I t free

Comments provided by :
fields, philip

The Government has no business monitoring free speech on the internet. Free speech is our right as part of the constitution and the Bill of Rights.

Comments provided by :
Fisher, Thomas

This is The United States of America. We don't need the internet regulated!

Thanks.

Comments provided by :
Fixmer, Cheryl

Quit trying to erase the first amendment of my constitution.

Comments provided by :
flaming, clayton

This is the one truly free communication tool that actually works and allows people from all over America to communicate with family, business and friends. It is NOT contaminated by the FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.

A perfect example of how well the Federal Government works is OBAMACARE. First you have to actually commit FRAUD by LYING TO WE, THE PEOPLE, IN ORDER TO PASS THIS EXTREMELY ILLEGAL POWER GRAB. Second, Obamacare Website does not even work properly nor is it secure. Third, you are empowering the IRS to manage payments and collections of money. They are presently under the investigative eyes of the House and soon by the Senate.

NO, NO, and NO more!!!

Comments provided by :
Ford, Denise

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 not try to add more regulation to our lives. This country is supposed to be about individual freedom, not limiting our right to free speech(in all areana).

Thank you.

Comments provided by :

Foster, Randy

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.

We do not need more government, more regulations, or more costs.

Comments provided by :

Fox, Michele

I am absolutely against any suggestion that political speech, or any type of free speech, be restricted on the Internet. I feel that any attempt to do so would be an infringement of our constitutional right to "free speech", and whoever wants to restrict it will be "called out" as a traitor to the United States.

Comments provided by :
Frame, Douglas

To Whom it may concern,
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'm not happy with the government intruding on my First Amendment rights! This would be costly to the tax payers and difficult to enforce.

Sincerely,
Gilbert F. Franchina

Comments provided by :
Franchina, Gilbert

Here goes our government again trying to run everything there way and not let the American public have a say.

Leave the internet alone because it is just fine the way that it is and quite trying to run our lives.

A concerned citizen of the United States of America,

Randy J. Franklin

Comments provided by :

Franklin, Randy

As you consider new FEC rules, please refrain from anything that prohibits or even inhibits free speech among American citizens. It is a frightening development that the FEC would even consider instituting a panel of people or technology that monitors internet communication between peace-loving individuals.

Free speech is one of the bedrock principles that made the USA great and must be preserved and rigorously protected by all government branches and agencies.

Thank you.

Comments provided by :
Freeman, Linda

Save our First Ammendment from this terrible idea.

Comments provided by :
French, Bruce

I believe trying to regulate content on the internet is a blatant over-reach by the FEC and will be an unconstitutional restriction of the first amendment protections of free speech (political or otherwise).

Here are my main objections:

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 :
Fritsinger, Keith

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 :

Fry, Patrick

Do NOT pass regulations for the internet. There needs to be freedom of expression and not regulations governing what people can and cannot say.

Comments provided by :
Fulsaas, Joanne

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 :
Gabel, Ann

The internet is not a utility and should not be classified as one. Nothing is needed from the Federal Government to make the internet any more neutral or accessible. The only thing your involvement will do is further erode The People's ability to speak out! Leave the internet alone. Voters did not give you the right to regulate internet speech or anything else concerning the internet.

Comments provided by :
Gauge, 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.

Comments provided by :

Gallagher, Noreen

Do not attempt to regulate the internet and change my free speech. Please refer to the Constitution and the oath u took to uphold it.

Comments provided by :
Gay, David

To whom it may concern,

- 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. This will place an undue burden on small groups and individuals.
- 4 - These new regulations would be extremely costly for taxpayers and difficult to enforce.

In other words DO NOT change the regulations of the internet in any way. We want you out of our lives, not in it more.

We believe in freedom. It is a long hard fought for right. DO NOT begin to take it away!!!!

Comments provided by :
Geddie, June

Freedom is freedom. Limiting free speech via any media is not right. I may not agree with the definition of 'speech' when it comes to 'art' or burning the flag. But there is one clear area mandated by the writers of our Constitution was free speech concerning the government: Especially as it concerns elections.

The internet is the ideal place for these discussions because of its' leveling of the playing field. Access to the internet is practically universal in this country. Libraries & some public building provide free access. This is the most critical place where the ability to comment, exchange & discuss the qualities of candidates is most important.

It is unethical to consider ANY reduction in ability to comment. Censorship is one of the key things we fight against in this country. This is nothing short of censorship.

And note, in extreme cases, we already have laws against slander & such. These are the protections our judicial system provides.

Comments provided by :
Gelik, Roger

I DO NOT support this measure. This is not appropriate for our country. This is a terrible idea and does not align with our values in the United states. Please vote this down.

Thank you
Ryan Gerry

Comments provided by :
Gerry, Ryan

I do not want my rights infringed on. Do not read my emails. The government has taken away to many of my rights, I protest.....

Regards,
Robin

Comments provided by :
gilbertson, robin

To Whom It May Concern:

Please do not over reach and regulate 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.

Sincerely,

Ronald Ginochio

Comments provided by :

Ginochio, Ronald

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 :

Gisler, Pat

I DO NOT want the FEC interfering with all Americans' Rights of Freedom of Speech and Freedom from Government Tyranny. The FEC should not care about OUR opinions or what we feel is important to each individual. What new bureaucracy will be implemented, and at what cost to us? Stay away from OUR internet postings and private e-mails. The government doesn't want citizens having Freedom of Expression when it comes to elections, but the Senate Majority Leader raised millions of dollars that he doesn't have to reveal the source(s) of the monies he has raised. I don't trust ANY politician or their cronies to keep my privacy if they feel it will help their side win an election. The FEC has NO right to any private thoughts and postings by ANY American Citizen.

Comments provided by :
Glennon, John

It seems to me the internet is functioning just fine in its current capacity. If it should receive any attention at all it should to enforce the existing laws regarding criminal use of the net. Regulation so that the government can tax its use is counter productive and only hurts the less financially viable people.

Comments provided by :
Goeckerman, Neil

As an AMERICAN CITIZEN, protected by THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, I am APPALLED at the overreach of UNELECTED government officials in agencies supported by MY tax dollars!

Please remember:

- 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.

Please be assured that I am also sending my comments to my elected representatives. I VOTE.

Comments provided by :
GOLDSMITH, REBECCA

there is no way in hell I will keep my shut when it comes to politics we still have a constitution and it permits to discuss what I want so you can take your rule and shove it up your obamma ass kissing hole

Comments provided by :
goldstein, mark

I have a Constitutional Right to Free Speech and I expect YOU to protect those rights, NOT take them away. The FEC Commissioners must not be allowed to take my rights away, waste taxpayer dollars, or invade my privacy. The United States of America is not Hitler's Germany.

Comments provided by :
Goodstone, Rose

Please stay away from more regulations concerning the internet.

Comments provided by :
Gough, Ken

To Whom it May Concern,

Please understand that the American people have grown weary of over-regulation. We have shown our displeasure with "big" government with the last round of elections (November 2014.) This extends to Federal Agencies who operate under the governing body of the US Congress and other branches.

Also, please remember... "Four boxes keep us free: the soap box, the ballot box, the jury box, and the cartridge box."-- Frederick Douglass in a speech delivered on November 15, 1867

This additional regulation would seek to control our "soap box" option. Neither is this ACCEPTABLE, nor is it YOUR JOB as outlined in your scope of work. As you are appointed and not elected, we CAN and WILL ensure that the ELECTED officials of this country reign you in regard to this sort of overreach.

The "jury box" has been used and found American Federal Government severely wanting, which brought about the use of the "ballot box" just recently. While there may politicians who believe the American people are disengaged or distracted, rest assured, we DO multi-task! To underestimate us is to your own professional demise.

The "ballot box" has recently spoken and can go across the aisle or to a third party (becoming increasingly popular) to ensure you "govern" in the manner for which you were appointed, not in the manner which special interests would like to sway you or your particular political party might sway you.

You will also find that when people are "allowed" to exercise their "soap box" options, the other "boxes" have less reason to be used.

Consider this prior to your vote on this monstrous piece of regulation.

A couple of the reasons I am AGAINST this regulation are:

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. (WE, THE AMERICAN TAX PAYERS, DO NOT WISH TO DOLE OUT MORE MONEY FOR FEDERAL GOVERNMENT OVERREACH.)

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 ensure you consider this when you vote on this regulation and anything in the future. Using your agency to accomplish things forbidden of Congress, you are STILL accountable to the American People.

Thank you for your time. Now, please, do what the American People are telling you to do and leave our First Amendment rights alone!

Comments provided by :
Graham, Geni

To Whom it May Concern,

Please understand that the American people have grown weary of over-regulation. We have shown our displeasure with "big" government with the last round of elections (November 2014.) This extends to Federal Agencies who operate under the governing body of the US Congress and other branches.

Also, please remember... "Four boxes keep us free: the soap box, the ballot box, the jury box, and the cartridge box."--Frederick Douglass in a speech delivered on November 15, 1867

This additional regulation would seek to control our "soap box" option. Neither is this ACCEPTABLE, nor is it YOUR JOB as outlined in your scope of work. As you are appointed and not elected, we CAN and WILL ensure that the ELECTED officials of this country reign you in regard to this sort of overreach.

The "jury box" has been used and found American Federal Government severely wanting, which brought about the use of the "ballot box" just recently. While there may politicians who believe the American people are disengaged or distracted, rest assured, we DO multi-task! To underestimate us is to your own professional demise.

The "ballot box" has recently spoken and can go across the aisle or to a third party (becoming increasingly popular) to ensure you "govern" in the manner for which you were elected, not in the manner which special interests would like to sway you or your particular political party might sway you.

You will also find that when people are "allowed" to exercise their "soap box" options, the other "boxes" have less reason to be used.

Consider this prior to your vote on this monstrous piece of regulation.

A couple of the reasons I am AGAINST this regulation are:

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. (WE, THE AMERICAN TAX PAYERS DO NOT WISH TO DOLE OUT MORE MONEY FOR FEDERAL GOVERNMENT OVERREACH.)

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 ensure you consider this when you vote on this regulation and anything in the future. Using your agency to accomplish things forbidden of Congress, you are STILL accountable to the American People.

Thank you for your time. Now, please, do what the American People are telling you to do and leave our First Amendment rights alone!

The U.S. Bill of Rights

The Preamble to The Bill of Rights

Congress of the United States

begun and held at the City of New-York, on
Wednesday the fourth of March, one thousand seven hundred and eighty nine.

THE Conventions of a number of the States, having at the time of their adopting the Constitution, expressed a desire, in order to prevent misconstruction or abuse of its powers, that further declaratory and restrictive clauses should be added: And as extending the ground of public confidence in the Government, will best ensure the beneficent ends of its institution.

RESOLVED by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled, two thirds of both Houses concurring, that the following Articles be proposed to the Legislatures of the several States, as amendments to the Constitution of the United States, all, or any of which Articles, when ratified by three fourths of the said Legislatures, to be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of the said Constitution; viz.

ARTICLES in addition to, and Amendment of the Constitution of the United States of America, proposed by Congress, and ratified by the Legislatures of the several States, pursuant to the fifth Article of the original Constitution.

Note: The following text is a transcription of the first ten amendments to the Constitution in their original form. These amendments were ratified December 15, 1791, and form what is known as the "Bill of Rights."

Amendment I

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.

Amendment II

A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed.

Amendment III

No Soldier shall, in time of peace be quartered in any house, without the consent of the Owner, nor in time of war, but in a manner to be prescribed by law.

Amendment IV

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

Amendment V

No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the Militia, when in actual service in time of War or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offence to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.

Amendment VI

In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the Assistance of Counsel for his defence.

Amendment VII

In Suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by a jury, shall be otherwise re-examined in any Court of the United States, than according to the rules of the common law.

Amendment VIII

Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.

Amendment IX

The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

Amendment X

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

It is the job of the FEC to assure fair and free elections, not to regulate free speech or any of the vehicles that assure free speech. Please focus on your job. And by the way, requiring positive ID to confirm voter eligibility does in no way restrict voting rights or limit access to the polls in any way. Those that would have you believe such likely have motives that are suspect. Thugs with clubs, on the other hand, do limit access to polls and have a negative impact on voter participation.

Comments provided by :
Green, Gordon

I do not want to be shut down on the internet for expressing my view on political, religion, or any other subjects. Stop trying to take all our rights away. This is America read the constitution. We have certain rights. This is a waste of OUR money spend it on things we really need.

1. Helping our veterans! 2. Getting healthcare under control stop with the nonsense and use common sense.

Comments provided by :

Green, Kathy

ANY ATTEMPT TO REGULATE SPEECH OR INTERNET ACCESS BY WAY OF REGULATIONS, TAXES, PASSWORDS OR OTHER IMPAIRMENT WILL BE MET WITH STIFF RESISTANCE, PUSH BACK AND WILL OFFER PRIMA FACIA EVIDENCE OF THE PEOPLE'S NEED TO DEMAND THE WHOLESALE REPLACEMENT OF PEOPLE EMPLOYED IN POSITIONS OF DECISION MAKING IMMEDIATELY. THERE WILL BE A GROUNDSWELL OF PROTESTS, ANGER AND RESISTANCE FROM UNIVERSITIES AS WELL AS BUSINESS PEOPLE ACROSS THE NATION THE LIKES OF WHICH WE HAVE NOT YET SEEN. DO NOT EVEN T H I N K ABOUT SUCH A RIDICULOUS PROPOSAL. THIS IS AMERICA, NOT COMMUNIST CHINA OR NORTH KOREA.

Comments provided by :
grey, charles

Let it be known that your Gestapo-esque attempts to put us down will NOT be tolerated. Humans are not meant to be controlled by one, as evidenced by the many failings of the Crown.

Many unjust "rulers" ended up dead. I HIGHLY suggest you re-consider this course of action lest you stir a hornet's nest. This is America, and you obey WE THE PEOPLE. WE DO NOT OBEY YOU.

Comments provided by :
Grimes, Jeffrey

To equate money with free speech is a perversion of the Founding Father's intent and is toxic to the health of our democracy and our Republic. The voices speaking against this bill are the voices of plutocracy who seek to undermine the very fabric of our political system. Please restore the power of the people to vote and their faith in a system that once guarded vigilantly against all forms of corruption and coercion.

Comments provided by :
Grimm, Matthew

Please do not try to regulate freedom of speech or any other freedom in your feeble attempts to "help" America.

Comments provided by :
Groom, Josh

I am writing to say we should NOT pass this legislation. In a time when we have many more important things to do with our resources, adding more bureaucracy is not one of them.

This will attack our First Amendment rights. I do not believe the FEC should be in the business of trying to regulate free speech.

This should NOT be passed.

Comments provided by :
Grove, Tom

Please stay with your appointed task of regulating money spent on elections and stop trying to regulate the internet. The internet is free, except for what we pay to access it. Leave it alone.

I am afraid you will end up squashing my free speech. And you would also add more cost to my tax bill, which is already enough, by hiring more bureaucrats. Enough!

Thank you.

Louise Gudas

Comments provided by :

Gudas, Louise

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

Comments provided by :
Gulledge, Donnie

This comment is to protest attempts by the FEC to censor or regulate posts on the internet by American Citizens.

? 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 :

Gwyn, Mary

I am always amazed at the over reach of Federal bureaucracies. We all know this is politically motivated, and it's not much of a stretch to know what political party is behind this move. Don't you all have families that this will affect at one time or another? Please hear the American public we are SICK of your over-reach.

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

Comments provided by :
Haehnel, Gaye

DO NOT REGULATE THE INTERNET!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Comments provided by :
Hagler, Denise

don't be regulating my inter net activity. This is a invasion of my privacy.

Comments provided by :
Hales, Dan

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 :

Hamby, Sharon

Government needs to stay out of the internet and healthcare. They are over reaching their authority.

Comments provided by :
Hamilton, Mary

I strongly oppose net neutrality on the basis that the Internet is already free and open. There is no need for government regulation of this industry.

Comments provided by :
Haney, 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.

Comments provided by :
Hanna, Heather

I am a Precinct Committeeman and I speak on this in part based on my conversations with other voters. The FEC has no business regulating political speech. The very essence of the First Amendment is that political speech, in particular, ought to be vigorous and free for the purpose of airing opinions that will help people come to a consensus. If some speech is limited or restricted, the tension created by that limitation will tend to keep the people from reaching a consensus. Keep it free and open, and the people will reach consensus on the important issues of the day.

Comments provided by :
Harbaugh, Gary

Democrats want take everything away from us, only a lot People don't release that.

Comments provided by :
Harland, Josie

We don't need a board to regulate and/or limit free speech on the internet. This is against our basic Constitutional rights.

Respectfully,

Tim Harper

Comments provided by :
Harper, Tim

I am writing this message in regard to restricting and regulating my first amendment rights on the internet. I am adamantly opposed to any regulations or restrictions and I do not want my First Amendment Rights to free speech violated on the internet or any other setting on what is supposed to be free soil....

Comments provided by :
Harrington, Jeffrey

American citizens are regulated enough with out now another government agency trying to stifle our freedom of speech. It's time for federal government to back down and stay out of americans' lives.

Comments provided by :
Harris, David

The FEC has a job to monitor and regulate funds used for elections. The FEC is not set up to regulate free speech of any kind. This includes the internet use in political comments and campaigns. Sometimes there may be offensive remarks or criticism that some person does not like or does not want others to hear or read. Many politicians will lie to degrade a challenger. Even though I find these words and actions ridiculous, free speech means just that, you are free to say your thoughts. If some words are censored, then we can expect a person or group to be in charge of speech sensor. This will be wrong. Please keep the internet and free speech alive.

Comments provided by :
Harris, Kenneth

It amazes me to see how Democrat politicians waste their time attempting to take away a right given to the American people by GOD. If you put this much energy into illegal immigration, crime and poverty, America would be a better place. But I know you are doing the work of Satan and you will not be successful in the end. If anyone's freedom of speech needs to be taken away it would be politicians on both sides of the table. The issue with America and other countries are the leaders, dictators and presidents. So let me say, I don't care what kind of blocks are put in place relating to speech, I will continue to say and speak what I want. Focus on something else and leave the 2nd amendment alone.

Saunya

Comments provided by :
HARRIS, SAUNYA

Sir, Ma'am, I believe that any internet regulation of any kind is a direct violation of the First Amendment and an assault on free speech. Face the fact that the internet is free flowing speech and to regulate it for speech, content, taxes and revenue is an assault on freedom. Bureaucrats have no place on the internet, only freedom is represented there. May not like some of the stuff that's on it, but the alternative is Government regulation and that always becomes a nightmare of foolish rules and regulations to support some one's belief that we are too stupid to take care of ourselves. Sincerely Everett Harrison

Comments provided by :
Harrison, Everett

INSTEAD OF INFLICTING CENSORSHIP ON LAW ABIDING CITIZENS, START ENFORCING CENSORSHIP OF CHILD PORNOGRAPHERS, HUMAN TRAFFICKERS, TERRORISTS, ETC. STOP HARRASSING CITIZENS WHO ARE EXERCISING THEIR CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS. BREAKING THE LAW ON THE INTERNET IS NOT A CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT. DISCUSSING POLITICAL VIEWS AND RELIGIOUS OPINIONS IN NOT BREAKING THE LAW. IN ADDITION TO THAT, THE FOLLOWING REASONS TO PUT A STOP TO TAKING AWAY OUR FREEDOM OF SPEECH ARE AS FOLLOWS:

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 :
HAVENS, LAURA

From the FEC website: The duties of the FEC, which is an independent regulatory agency, are to disclose campaign finance information, to enforce the provisions of the law such as the limits and prohibitions on contributions, and to oversee the public funding of Presidential elections.

The FEC is tasked with regulating money spent on elections, not political speech. Anything beyond regulating money spent on elections would be outside the intention of the FEC.

Comments provided by :
Hayes, Jim

Hello,.

The internet is great when used properly. It is a great source of information at your finger tips.

We are choking on regulation.

Comments provided by :

Hearn, Michael

Once again, our first amendment rights are being threatened by the very people who are responsible for protecting that right. As a tax-paying citizen of this great country I implore you to abandon this attempt at squashing the free speech of myself and all other citizens of this country.

Comments provided by :
Henderson, John

Keep the government out of the internet regulation business.

Comments provided by :
Hensley, Avery

We already live in a controlled society and with the proposed FEC guidelines to monitor the Internet thus amounts to nothing more than complete censorship of my freedom to discuss and share my political views with others. Something along the lines of 'brown shirts' or what the Chinese do.

This is a bad idea from the beginning.....all I can expect is a black helicopter over my house now that I've expressed my opposition.

Comments provided by :
Henton, Steve

Do not regulate the internet! This is an attack on the freedom of speech! What about the 1st amendment do you not understand? This is a tyrannical power grab by and for dirty politicians against the rights of citizens!

Comments provided by :
Hentz , John

Keep the internet free and clear of government ! You ruin everything you touch !

Comments provided by :
Hernandez, Jose

The government needs to leave the internet alone, and leave it to the private sector. Any time the government gets involved with public life, they mess things up, and services end up costing more, and the services are not efficient. You don't have to stick your nose in everything we do. The entire government needs to downsize and quit costing us so much money.

Comments provided by :

Hesse, Joe

I do not believe the government has any right to censor anything I say. We are and always have been entitled to free speech. Taking that away becomes a dictatorship. We are a free country here and it needs to stay that way. The government works for the citizens of this country and they need to remember that. They can and will be replaced. I do not imagine they would like it much if it was them that was being censored.

Comments provided by :
Hewlett, Rhonda

I do not want the FEC making rules about my internet posts and conversations by email. I do not want my freedom of speech infringed upon!

Comments provided by :
Hicks, Sylvia

To the FEC: You are really going to attack the First Amendment? I think you'd better pay attention to the American People who DO NOT WANT our Constitution altered!! You're trying to regulate the internet, you're trying to regulate our free speech? We demand that you stick to your intended purpose, and not wander into these uncharted waters!

Comments provided by :
Hinkle, Deborah

please let the internet alone like it is.

Comments provided by :
hobgood, ollie

I am sick and tired of this government infringing on our freedoms. You ram laws down our throats that we do not want. You catering to those who are unwilling to work for a living and attack the working class to pay for them. You raise our taxes to line your pockets and make us pay for illegals who have no rights as non-citizens to social security, welfare or health care since they never contributed. You should have let the banks and auto industries fail. You should have opened the state borders to the health insurance companies. You attack our freedom of speech. My Christianity is being attacked on all fronts. It has got so bad that we practically cannot say Amen in public. Let alone speak the name of Jesus Christ. Our gun rights are being taken away from us little by little with each new administration. Now you want to tell us what we can or cannot say on the internet. Do not allow the freedom we have on the internet to be infringed. We are looking more and more like a dictatorship than a republic. What ever happened to democracy were the majority vote wins. Why are you allowing the two percentile in this country to make the rules for the rest of us. This is NOT the America I served in the military for. Our freedoms are slowly being taken away from us.

Comments provided by :
Hoffner, Abraham

Please do not regulate Americans to death.
The Internet is fine the way it is. And we do
have a right to free speech.
Thank you for your time and consideration.

Comments provided by :
Hoots, James

The less regulation of speech and expression on the internet the better. Concerned citizens do not want news and information spoon fed to them as they would rather find the information and news by choosing established and new sites. Freedom of speech should not end at a computer keyboard!

Ken Hopkins

Comments provided by :
Hopkins, Ken

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.

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

Please to do not limit our right to free speech by seeking to regulate the internet.

Thank you,
Gary H. Horton

Comments provided by :
Horton, Gary

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,

Mr. Howard

Comments provided by :

Howard, Brent

I would find it very respectful if you would not violate my freedom of speech by regulating the internet. Stop!

Comments provided by :
Hoyt, Thomas

The internet is NOT a utility and there is no reason to treat it as such, which seems to be the excuse for considering a tax on it.

The internet is a communication network, which means that a tax which results in infringement on the First Amendment is UNCONSTITUTIONAL!

Government intervention with the internet will go the way of ALL government intrusion and will completely stifle the fantastic evolution of this service. Obamie-commie-I-don't-care is a perfect example of government incompetency and corruption - the audacity of Grubber to lie about this invasion of our health care and then the audacity of demorats and RINOs lamely lying and backing it - and Pelosi's inexcusable "we have to pass it to see what is in it!" Well we've seen it and we DON'T LIKE IT ANY BETTER NOW THAN WE DID WHEN YOU WERE LYING TO US!

Just crawl back under your rock and leave the fantastic and viable internet alone!

Comments provided by :

Huff, Earl

Dear Sirs

Please take the time to read the 1st amendment of our Constitution. You do not have the right nor the power to regulate speech in this country let alone political speech. I have the right to voice my opinion and ideas as you all do. It is a good thing to have ideas and opinions discussed in public as well as internet forums. This aids in the prevention of an intrusive government. Free speech also aids in keeping people informed. You would do well by adhering to the framework the founders of this country have provided instead of attempting to usurp the system. You have real problems to deal with such as illegal immigration, securing our borders, balancing budgets, providing safety from Islamic terrorists, etc. Note that these problems are self-induced by most of you to begin with because you already ignore your obligations to Americans and to the Constitution. Fact is the government at present is over intrusive and becoming more socialist or communist as we move forward. Our founding fathers intended us to uphold our Constitution to resist socialism, communism, and dictators. Restricting free speech is a deliberate attempt to make our Constitution meaningless and unintelligible. Stop the political self serving foolishness, stop your attempts to erode Americans' Constitutional rights and get busy with the aforementioned real problems at hand.

Comments provided by :
Hughson, Robert

Please do NOT regulate the internet!! Keep it as is!

Comments provided by :
Huston, Lynnette

The FEC needs to stick with elections funding and stay out of the Free Speech sector. Besides, there is no way you would get enough people to monitor the entire Internet for alleged violations of your petty laws. If what is said online bothers you, unplug and move to another country. We enjoy our freedoms here.

Comments provided by :
Hutchinson, Jim

Please don't regulate our internet!

Comments provided by :
Ianne, David

I will make this very short: GET OUT OF OUR LIVES AND STAY OUT!!!!

Comments provided by :
Iannotti, Ray

The Internet was created as a FREE Environment for people to use and should REMAIN FREE and NEVER be TAXED as we Pay way to much now. There are WAY MORE IMPORTANT Items that the FEC needs to concentrate on than the Internet.

Comments provided by :
Isaacs, James

This so called "NET Neutrality" nonsense has got to go. Seems like to me every time the Powers to be aka the GOVT gets involved with private sector business it gets worse then it was if you just leave it alone.

Comments provided by :
Jacob, Leo

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 government can not and should not try to regulate free speech of any kind. That opposes every principle this nation was founded upon.

The First Amendment (Amendment I) to the United States Constitution 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 governmental redress of grievances. It was adopted on December 15, 1791.

Comments provided by :
Jacobs, Wayne

Dear Sirs.

Reversing the exemption for free postings online would have dangerous ramifications for constitutionally-guaranteed free speech. I do not wish to see this happen.

This will place an undue burden on small groups and individuals. Totally ridiculous. Do something better with your time.

DO NOT regulate FREE SPEECH!

Thank you for your consideration.

Comments provided by :
Jaeger, John

When the FEC was established, it was supposed to regulate money spent on elections, not political speech.

To "fairly" and "comprehensively" regulate political speech, the FEC would have to unleash an army of regulators to police YouTube and other internet sites on a daily basis to look for potential violations, and subject them to inquiries simply because they posted opinions online.

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

These new regulations would be extremely costly for taxpayers and difficult to enforce. My observations during this just past election suggest that incorrect, false or misleading information is about balanced among the various parties and candidates. Thus, this would be a massive waste of government, organization, and individual resources, and should not be implemented.

Comments provided by :
Janda, Daniel

Your job is to regulate the MONEY spent on elections, not what the words. What sort of country do you want this to be? Whatever happened to sticks and stones may break my bones, but words will never harm me? There is soooo much that needs to be done to improve the election process. What first comes to mind is the enormous amount of money that is allowed to be spent. Are you planning on making candidates pay for this cencorship program or is this another plan to confiscate money from the average citizen? This is a foolish idea. Our Constitution guarantees that we are allowed free speech. This proposal would be a direct violation of the First Amendment.

Comments provided by :
Johns, Janell

God gave us the ability and right to think and speak.

The first amendment to the US Constitution gives us the right to speak freely.

You have no right to remove the right given by almighty God and by the highest authority of our government. If you think you out-rank those two authorities, you are in deep trouble with both God and the American public.

You are not God! You are an employee of "we the people" and should be fired for even thinking you can limit how we can communicate.

Comments provided by :
Johnson, David

Get to work on the many broken aspects of gov't and leave off breaking the Internet. We will resolve for ourselves whatever dire excuse you are using to drive this latest intrusion.

Comments provided by :
Johnson, Jim(FEC)

The internet has been around for years and does just fine except for NSA spying into our personal materials violating our 14th Amendment rights under the Constitution that Obama took oath to uphold. The internet should be left alone, spying stopped and remain as it's always been before Obama came into office!!

Comments provided by :
Johnson, Jimmy

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 :

Jones, Joseph

What you are attempting to do is pure evil!!!! Stop this treachery now. Stop attacking the First Amendment.

Comments provided by :
Jones, Kerman

Leave the internet alone! We don't need any government interference! Stop trampling on our free speech rights!

Comments provided by :
Jordan, Susan

I am sick and tired of the government trying to monitor every thing I say or do. Whatever happened to free speech and free of choice??

Comments provided by :
KARONES, TOM

One of the chief things in our Federal System in the USA is that we have freedom of expression on all sorts of matters, including political "speech". This is guaranteed in our constitution and, above all, in the Amendments to the Constitution. I cannot understand in the least how that free "speech" on the Internet must somehow be regulated. There are many ways and means of communication in our society. Just because I do not agree with what someone says does not mean that it should be expunged. I lived behind the Iron Curtain for sometime under a tyrannical dictator, where they forced households to give up their typewriters and duplicating systems so that the regime should not be forced to be expelled. The despots did not want the people knowing what they were doing, and they abused the people and the system and lived as though they were kings, and the rest just suffered in every way. +God save America+

Comments provided by :
Keefer, John

Constitutional rights should NEVER be messed with for anyone for any reason.....

Comments provided by :
Keister, David

To whom it may concern

I don't know what you people in office have up your sleeves, but to have the audacity to think you have the right and power to step all over CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS is beyond me. If you think otherwise then you need to take a strong look at your previous actions and take the GOD GIVEN KNOWLEDGE OF RIGHT AND WRONG and take the appropriate course of action. If you fear accountability then you should have thought otherwise before hand. As a citizen of these United States I am accountable for my actions and no less should be required of you.

Thank you for your attention

I do not favor any censorship of the internet. Freedom of speach is a fundamental of the constitution.

Comments provided by :
Ketzler, Keith

The internet works great just as it is. Do not be fooled, this is just another grab by the government for CONTROL. Think about the FDA. It was created to "protect" us. The FDA paved the way for BIG PHARMA to control medicine which outlaws low-cost alternatives or takes them and turns them into an expensive prescription drugs. KEEP THE GOV OUT! The internet is the only FREE (uncontrolled) voice we have left!

Comments provided by :
Kidder, Rebecca

Our individual liberties are already severely compromised by our federal government. I oppose any further intrusions into what I believe to be my personal natural rights.

Comments provided by :
King, Mike

The only constitutional way to regulate political speech on the Internet is the way that works in the real world. Editors regulate what they want to display at their sites. People complain if they observe outright lies. Most people expect candidates and office holders to present their side of the story, and consult other people if they want to hear or read the other side(s). Beyond that, it would be impossibly expensive--and unnecessary--to try to regulate what citizens say about elections and elected officials per our constitutional right to free speech.

Comments provided by :
King, Priscilla

Regarding the proposition to regulate posts on the internet: This is not part of the FEC's mission and purpose. The FEC is tasked with regulation of election finances. Regulation of online commentary does not fall within the FEC's responsibilities. Further, it is a violation of the First Amendment of the Constitution of the United States of America, which guarantees the right to free speech of U.S. citizens. The FEC regulates the financial processes to attempt to ensure that we, the people of the United States, can have a fair process for electing officials. Regulation of online commentary goes against this very idea. Limiting political commentary will limit our ability to have fair discussions regarding candidates and issues, thereby compromising our ability to have fair elections.

Comments provided by :
King, Rachel

Leave our free speech alone

Comments provided by :
Kizziah , Janet

The Internet has always been a Free media for citizens to communicate with their families, friends, their doctors, their banks, to shop, & contact their elected representative or state their position on political issues. It's called Freedom of Speech, whether you're standing on a corner with a sign stating your position on an issue, talking to a far away friend about the coming election, writing an email to your elected representatives, the Constitution gives citizens like myself the Right to Free Speech, the Internet being a modern media to facilitate the exercise of Freedom of Speech. To place restrictions on citizens access to the Internet would amount to denying individual citizens their Right to Free Speech, & therefore denying their Constitutional Rights.

Comments provided by :
Klay, Johnnie

?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 :

knoff, james

Our country was founded with certain rights guaranteed to its citizenry by the Bill of Rights. I urge you to protect that right by not regulating what may or may not be posted on the internet. It is not in the realm of the FEC's powers to infringe upon the right of free speech. To enforce such regulations would not only be nearly impossible, they would also be very expensive. Please leave politics behind and uphold the rights of the American people.

Comments provided by :

Knop, Paula

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 :

Koehler, Eric

Please take action. This is ridiculous.

Comments provided by :
Kohnke, Brian

Dear Sirs,

I am commenting on a proposed regulation that would limit our free speech right on the internet.

As the FEC, you are tasked with regulating money spent on elections, not political speech.

To implement this you would have to unleash an army of regulators to police YouTube and other internet sites daily to search for violators, and subject the websites to inquiries simply because of the opinions posted on line.

We as citizens do not have much trust in government agencies acting fairly and impartially and not being used as a weapon such as the IRS being used to target conservative organizations.

The inquiries would place undue burdens on small groups and individuals who are then being targeted by an army of regulators justifying their existences.

These new regulations would be extremely costly, difficult to enforce, and a poor use of limited resources and citizen's tax dollars.

please stop this rule.

thank you,

Comments provided by :

Kucinski, Edward

The FEC is tasked with regulating money spent on elections, not political speech.
Please abandon the idea of regulating speech the certain appointed czars do not agree with.

Comments provided by :
Kuntz, Susie

Dear FEC Commissioners,

Please refrain from regulating the internet. The broad scope of regulating the internet from free speech is against the intentions from the founding founders of this country.

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 :

Kunz, Michael

It has come to my attention that democrats in the FEC are attacking the First Amendment. That you're trying to regulate the internet. You'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.

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."

Be advised that the American public will not stand still for this trampling of our God given rights. November 4th. has shown that democrat political activists are an endangered species. I strongly suggest that you rethink you're actions.

Comments provided by :
Kuykendall, Dutch

The FEC is tasked with regulating money spent on elections, not political speech. Freedom is about choice. And limiting choices is what the FEC proposed regulatory ideas are all about. Powerful national and international forces are at work to control internet content, internet ideas, and internet speech. We must remain vigilant, so that these forces do not overwhelm our collective efforts to safeguard liberty.

Comments provided by :
LaCombe, Christine

The purposed regulation is absurd and actions similar to this can only be found in communist or countries held by a dictator.

We do have the first Amendment to the Constitution which gives us the right to free speech. If this was to pass what would be next text messages on phones? Listening to our personal conversations?

Censorship of Television and Radio? You must see the for what it is which is oppression of all of those who have opposing views which is pure socialism!

We demand this be struck down to protect our right of free speech afforded to us by the constitution!

Comments provided by :

Lafforthun, Neil

The Constitution of the United States protects FREE SPEECH, no matter the form it takes. What makes you think you have either the right or the power and authority to limit or restrict FREE SPEECH?

Comments provided by :
Lambe, William

Stop taking away our CONSTITUTIONAL rights - how do you interpret the laws - you are going beyond your powers.
STOP NOW.

Comments provided by :
LaMountain, Doreen

KEEP YOUR HANDS OFF THE INTERNET!

Comments provided by :
LANCE, STEVEE

I do not want the government involved in regulating or taxing the internet!

We do not need that ruined or used for the purpose of the government to spend more money than it has to perpetuate itself!

Wayne Landry

Comments provided by :
Landry, Wayne

Why do you want to make the internet a utility? Why is the Democrat party so determined to control citizens and turn the United States into a communist country? If I wanted to live in a communist country I would move to one and I suggest you do the same.

Comments provided by :
Lankford, Sandra

Regulating the "World Wide Web", is NOT part of your departments responsibility. Plus the fact of trying to "regulate our freedom of speech", is unconstitutional in nature.

I have already written my elected officials about my concerns in this regard. It WOULD have to come from the Senate to begin with, and NOT from your department. Laws are made by congress, NOT by government workers.

Thank you in advance for discarding any future attempts at regulating the Internet.

Daryl Lawrence

Comments provided by :
Lawrence, Daryl

Censorship destroys freedom. I didn't almost die in Afghanistan, and now disabled for life to have an over zealous government take away those freedoms I fought for. The government has no right to keep individuals from sharing their thoughts on government regardless of political affiliation. Shame on the government for even considering this proposal. I will not stand for it, and I will not comply! The first amendment of the Constitution was established not to protect popular speech, but to protect the unpopular speech. Can you really look at yourself in the mirror knowing that you are contributing to the destruction of the values and principles this country was founded on? Will you be able to sleep at night knowing that this is one step towards prohibition of freedom? I have a suggestion. Sit down and watch Family Guy episode "PTV." Have a wonderful day!

Comments provided by :
Leavitt, David

Please do not attempt to censor the Internet for political comments.

Comments provided by :
LeBreton, Albert

Put a stop to these communists.

Comments provided by :
Ledford, Dewey

Stay out of the Internet. This is a free speech issue and you are trying to infringe on my right to free speech. I have contacted my House Representative and both of my Senators to tell them to VOTE AGAINST any legislation that will regulate the internet. This is just another way the Federal Government is overstepping their authority. You are paid with tax payer money and you WORK FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE so STAY OUT OF REGULATING THE INTERNET and OUR RIGHT TO FREE SPEECH!!!

Comments provided by :

Lee, Lisa

The Government is in our lives too much already. This has the finger prints of Obama in it already!! No more Socialism!!! We are a free country & we will not have it overrun & our power as US Citizens taken away to become a Communist Country!!! We Americans are so angry with Obama trying to take our rights away as it is!!! We, the People, have spoken loud & clear!!! You, Obama, are going to get burned by the American people if you keep on playing with matches!!! I am so enraged right now & Obama's antics makes my blood boil. Stop him in his tracks!!! NO ONLINE TAXES!!! NO REGULATION!!! Stop them in their actions once & for all.

Comments provided by :
Lemal, Michelle

Neither the Federal Election Commission nor any other government agency should regulate the internet. Our first ammendment rights to free speech make this very clear. Bill Lembright

Comments provided by :
Lembright, Bill

Dear FEC,

This is not an area you need to be involved with. The Internet is a place of free speech. The public does not need any restrictions or rules from the government. The government will only gum up and wreck the internet and, hence, free speech. The free market is quite capable of regulating the world of the internet. Please stay out of it!

Val Lemen

Comments provided by :
Lemen, Val

Freedom of Speech carried out on internet social media among other written platforms or spoken venues is an inherent freedom guaranteed Americans in the United States Constitution.

Freedom of Speech includes the right to disagree, and the right to state in writing or make verbal statements of opposing opinions and views of anyone, including elected officials included in and pertaining to the three branches of government, administrative agencies, and other government bodies or entities.

Freedom of Speech includes the right of Americans to state opinions of free thought and discuss those thoughts in *public forums whether they be in buildings, newspapers, news broadcasts, home meetings, public squares, or internet and network social media.

Freedom of Speech includes the right to ask probing questions of substantive nature in order to arrive at the truth of matters.

Freedom of Speech includes to right to insist on answers to questions in order to arrive at the truth of matters.

Freedom of Speech includes the right to ask media personnel questions regarding the happenings and events in the nation, the world, and Washington DC regarding the workings of government. Inherent in Freedom of Speech includes usual and ordinary mechanisms of society to be heard in public forums, *supra, and Constitutional guaranteed societal mechanisms such as freedom to peaceably assemble, freedom of association, freedom of religion, right of counsel, right of freedom from quartering, due process, and other rights included in the Bill of Rights.

Restrictions upon Freedom of Speech should be limited, strictly scrutinized, and only pertaining to the safety of others. Misinterpretations or lack of understanding one's expressions of free speech remains the responsibility of listeners to research, question, and determine the truth of matters.

Censorship of Americans' political opinions and conversations on the internet "Stifles Free Speech" and causes a "Chilling Effect" on the Constitutional Guarantee of "Practicing and Engaging in Free Speech."

Censorship of Free Speech on the internet is no different from censorship of conversations in our daily lives.

Censorship of Free Speech on the internet regarding political matters is unacceptable.

Censorship of Free Speech on the internet coupled with one-sided broadcasting of news and withholding of news by media, ushers in tyrannical forms of regulations and governing that remains unacceptable and hinders the American Way of Life according to the principles and intent of the Constitution.

The US Government and extended entities such as the FEC act as "Guarantor of the Rights and Freedoms of the People as Guaranteed in the Constitution," and therefore must not participate in "Chilling of Free Speech."

In Conclusion: FEC regulation of Free Speech on the Internet, et al, regarding political matters and discussions act in contradiction to the "Guarantor Role" of the FEC by denying Congress and Americans their rights as Guaranteed by the Constitution, Bill of Rights, and other governing documents.

Although this submission is not inclusive of position statements, this submission represents the "heart of the matter" by insisting the FEC or any other government agency, entity, or governing body refrain from regulating restrictions of Free Speech of Americans on the Internet and other such public forums.

Respectfully Submitted,

Diane A. Lenning, Ed.M. /J.D.

Comments provided by :
Lenning, Diane

if you are truly trying to regulate our free speech then you should go back to your own country !!

Comments provided by :
Leubner, Milos

I believe in freedom of speech which is my right, as a citizen of the U.S.A

I do not want the government to interfere with political speech on the internet.

Comments provided by :
Lightfoot, Charles

Please read the First Amendment. You position should be Guardian not Playground Bully.

Comments provided by :
Link, Keith

My comment is about internet spying and control of internet comments posts and remarks. It is a blatant violation of our rights as american citizens to speak or comment on any politicians that we see doing a bad job or stealing from americans way at life. We the people have the say on whats best for america and our freedom . Its becoming very unsettling to know our democrats want to see america fail and all of a sudden want to regulate or silence us its never gonna happen get use to it its called life and we love it. This is the united states of america people whats going on when we silence our people or regulate what we say its called control thats not freedom get a life and leave us and our speech alone.

Comments provided by :
linton, Brandy

The internet needs to be kept free of regulations. We don't need a big brother type group watching what is said. It is free speech leave it alone. This administration is already attacking conservative view points via the IRS, how on earth would you stop it from corrupting the internet with Democrats political bias? Keep it from being added to the long list of this administrations failures. The people voted they don't like Obama policies, I can tell this is a crash and burn attempt that is a failure with people worldwide. Stop trying to trick people into thinking there is any good in more government control.

Comments provided by :
Long, Clayton

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

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

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.

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 :

Lose, Jay

I live in the United States of America. I live in the greatest Country in the world and enjoy the freedoms that come with that honor. However, these freedoms are coming under attack more and more. Efforts to monitor and regulate speech on the internet is unacceptable. Free speech is the root of our freedom. We need more speech, not less. Please stop the effort to control internet speech by ANY organization or government administration. Thank you.

Comments provided by :

Love, Linda

The US has been working using the Constitution as our guidelines. This is what our country was founded on and has been working for over 200 years. Why do you insist on going against it. Leave us the citizens of the US alone and let the 1st Amendment work the way it was intended. Government does not need to poke their noses into everything.

Comments provided by :
Lundberg, Mary

For the following reasons stop trying to regulate our 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.

Comments provided by :
Lyons, Gary

Reversing the exemption for free postings online would have dangerous ramifications for constitutionally-guaranteed free speech. By the way, this is a common practice in those socialist countries, China, Russia, North Korea, and etc, why will we even consider to apply it in this country?

Comments provided by :
Ma, John

The government regulates this and that and then some. The internet is paid for by us and unless it involves pornography or sales of weapons, children, sexting, drugs, threats to the security of America or anything else illegal and immoral, the internet is ours for our freedom of speech, communication and laughter. What is the government afraid of that they need to regulate our every move? There should be no taxation or regulation imposed on speech.

The government was designed to give us our freedom and represent us not strangulate us and impose their misjudgments upon the people. The government should set about doing something they were designed to do and just maybe they would be earning their wages for once instead of gouging the very people they were elected to represent.

Comments provided by :
Mahan, Linda

Don't try to limit my free speech on the Internet.

Comments provided by :
Mahoney, Richard

We do not want or need FEC regulations on conversations on the intranet. The intranet has become a valuable tool for private citizens to exchange ideas. Established news outlets to often are controlled by an agenda, left or right. The FEC is tasked with regulating money spent on elections not political speech. As we have seen the weapon-ization of the IRS we do not need the FEC interfering with our constitutionally guaranteed free speech. The American people cannot afford a bloated bureaucracy that would be required to monitor potential violations. The internet is an amazing place to discover and exchange ideas. Please do not ruin it with FEC regulations. Thank You

Comments provided by :
Mandley, Jeff

We do not want or need FEC regulations on conversations on the intranet. The intranet has become a valuable tool for private citizens to exchange ideas. Established news outlets to often are controlled by an agenda, left or right. The FEC is tasked with regulating money spent on elections not political speech. As we have seen the weapon-ization of the IRS we do not need the FEC interfering with our constitutionally guaranteed free speech. The American people cannot afford a bloated bureaucracy that would be required to monitor potential violations. The internet is an amazing place to discover and exchange ideas. Please do not ruin it with FEC regulations.
Thank You

I can take care of my own internet. Do not know why you feel the need to control every thing we do.

Comments provided by :
Marsh, Geraldine

Americans have a Constitutional right to free speech, even if it is political in nature. Trying to police the internet for political speech is not something that the FEC has been tasked with and should not be attempted. It would be overly burdensome, if not impossible, to do, and would be an extreme waste of taxpayer dollars!

Comments provided by :
Martin, Joellyn

Leave the 1st Amendment alone. We should continue to have free speech. Internet or public, it's our rights.

Comments provided by :
Martinez, JOe

Sirs,

I would like to urge your group and any others to desist from infringement of our protected right to free speech, whether oral, written or electronic in nature. Do not censor or limit our internet communications!

Thank you,
Edgar Massey

Comments provided by :
massey, edgar

I understand one of the functions of the FEC is to insure voter fraud is detected and prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law. I also understand it is not a function of the FEC to disparage or deny Article I civil rights of the American people. It is also my understanding the American people will not tolerate any Communistic efforts by the FEC or any other government agency. I will inform my Representative of the intent of your Democrat membership and ask that he reconvene the House Committee on un-American Activities.

Sincerely,

George D. McAdoo

Comments provided by :
McADOO, GEORGE

I am against these regulations. They are unlawfull.

Comments provided by :
McCall, Robert

Our first amendment rights are the foundation of our basic Constitution and the internet is part of our free speech. It should not be infringed upon. Keep our free speech free or pay the consequences..

Comments provided by :
McCaslin, 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. 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 :
mcclenaghan, dave

We need freedom of speech most of all. This would be giving who ever can lie the best, control of the content of any ones speech. I think that every thing should slow down and quit pushing change so fast. To many important things are being skipped over and not thought through. I understand this fast approach is how one would get things done and some would not be paying attention. I am against any of this being done.

Comments provided by :
McCollum, Robert

This news is disturbing and I am very disappointed that any of our elected officials could think that censoring free speech on the internet does not violate our Constitutional rights. The internet brought us the ability to better communicate, express ideas, and advanced humanity as a whole. Why the sudden the desire to tax, regulate and control? In 20 years there have been zero issues...so I ask, what is the agenda? Is it that white collar criminals need to find another cash cow to slaughter and exploit (just like the bailouts, housing market scams, or the Obamacare screw-job)? Or is this more aimed towards shutting down independent media outlets and controlling the people that don't want to believe the spiderweb of lies and half truths that pass as mainstream news? In 20 years theres been no issues, so why now? Doesn't the NSA already spy on everything we do, as well as the smart meters, smart phones, and new appliances?

Banning free speech on the internet not only compromises our freedom of speech, it abolishes independent media and the freedom of press, and ultimately ushers in thought control. Will we then be getting microchips implanted in our brains to control our thoughts? Where does this madness end? The need to sensor and control our privacy and freedoms by our governmental agencies is completely out of control. I'm all for advancing humanity and human (Constitutional) rights, but this takes us backwards, back to pre-Nazi Germany.

It's no secret that China uses internet censorship to oppress and control their people, why are you bringing those communist tactics here? You cannot control political speech on the Internet without undermining and terminating free speech. This does not make us any "safer", it just makes us less free. I 100% do not support any government induced regulation of free speech or taxation of the internet.

Comments provided by :
McComb, Brian

Dear Madams/Sirs,

I strongly oppose the Rulemaking being considered at this time. I am against the proposed direction to control 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.

Tank you for your considerations

Sincerely,

James E. Mccool

Comments provided by :

McCool, James

I am opposed to the FEC regulating or monitoring individual posts on the internet because this would be an intrusion on the individual American's freedom of expression. I can see no basis for the government taking such an action or using its limited funds in even studying it.

Comments provided by :
McCormick, Jack

The government has no business regulating the internet. Keep the taxes from the internet.

Comments provided by :
McCreary, Dwayne

Do not attempt to regulate our free speech.

Comments provided by :
McDaniel, Scot

Because I object to "BIG" government being involved in every aspect of my life, I am writing to you to voice my strong objection to the FEC Commissioners regulating any online posts and conversations as it would have dangerous ramifications for constitutionally-guaranteed free speech. The FEC is tasked with regulating money spent on elections, not political speech.

To enforce these new rules the government would have to appoint censors to monitor online political communications every day. This will place an undue burden on small groups and individuals and would be extremely costly for taxpayers and difficult to enforce. The middle class cannot afford to pay for another "BIG" government ridiculous idea or take-over.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Cecilia

Comments provided by :
McGregor, Cecilia

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 :

McGuinness, Kevin

DO NOT restrict or monitor my usage of the internet in any way. This is something the FEC has no business doing.
Stay out of our business!!!

Walter McKinney
Concerned United States Citizen

Comments provided by :
McKinney, Walter

FEC,

Do not try to dictate free speech anywhere, as our Constitution allows us to have a voice in this country. Your meddling in the affairs of private citizens shows irresponsibility towards not only the citizens of this country but dereliction of duty towards the laws of the land. Do not make laws that violate the Constitution or the Bill of Rights.

Dennis McLain

Comments provided by :
McLain, Dennis

November 12, 2014

Gentlemen:

Please refrain from passing any legislation on the internet. I adamantly oppose any effort to curtail my right to free speech.

William McPherson

Comments provided by :
McPherson, William

The First Amendment of the the US Constitution states that Congress shall make no law to regulate free speech, religion and assembly. What applies to Congress also applies to the Executive Branch of Government since Congress is in charge of writing the laws which the Executive Branch is supposed to enforce.

The use of the internet is the exercise of Free Speech. Any attempt to regulate speech on the internet because it may not be politically correct or because it might be embarrassing to a political party which might be temporarily in charge would nullify the 1st Amendment. If this were to be done, we might as well move to Russia because that is exactly where America will be heading. Then we will need to change our name to THE UNITED SOCIALIST STATES OF AMERICA.

To anyone who reads this - I hope and pray that you will do everything in your power to reject this internet and free speach power grab.

John J. McRee

Comments provided by :
McRee, John

There is no valid reason to regulate or attempt to regulate the internet and/or postings on the internet. The FEC is tasked with regulating money spent on elections, not political speech. These proposed regulations undermine and/or nullify our constitutionally guaranteed free speech.

Comments provided by :
Meiers, 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 is America, not China. My free speech is guaranteed in the Constitution of the United States and this is nothing short of censorship to keep the public in the dark on serious political matters.

Comments provided by :
Mello, Jeanne

Leave the internet alone and stick to your true purpose - regulating the money spent on elections. Any actions to regulate free speech on the internet oversteps those bounds. This type of regulation would be akin to the censoring which takes place in communist nations. People like myself should be able to use free postings to express my opinions, which are constitutionally guaranteed free speech. It would place an undue burden on small groups and individuals aside from any cost that you would impose on an already over-taxed public.

Comments provided by :
Menig-Muntz, Susan

We the people demand our Constitution be upheld, this includes free speech, and we do not want or need government regulations interfering with it!

Comments provided by :
Merrill, James

It blow my mind that the people keep trying to take our freedom away from us, telling us they know better. if you had seen the last election we want less out of washington, dc. Most everything you people do does take this country backwards. as some say most of you should be fired and sent packing for the hills. please get out of our life and take care of your own household. also please get a real job!

leon

Comments provided by :
metz, leon

I resent being told what I can or cannot say regarding political comments. Our forefathers drafted the constitution for our benefit to be able to have free speech. I don't believe that discounts free speech on the internet.

Thank you

Arline Middaugh

Comments provided by :
Middaugh, Arline

Please do not regulate free speech on the internet. Doug Miller

Comments provided by :
miller, doug

The FEC has no right to monitor or censor my internet communications. Doing so violates my First Amendment rights, is illegal, and unacceptable. It increases the power of the Federal Government and violates the principles of the free society to which our country is supposed to adhere.

Comments provided by :
Miller, Louis

I think most Americans are fed up with all the lies and slander that get put out with every election cycle. Campaigns go on for many months and become almost unbearable.

I am, however, opposed to the FEC trying to regulate speech. It puts too much power into the hands of a very limited number of people. This could lead to a "dictatorial" influence when it comes to campaigning. If the "censor" likes the cause of the one doing the posting they can and likely will let almost anything pass. If they oppose the cause they can limit or eliminate the posting.

We DO NOT need anything like this in our country. If this is the kind of electioneering that you favor, may I suggest that you move to a country where that is common practice. Otherwise leave things alone.

Comments provided by :
Miller, Marvin

? These new regulations would be extremely costly for taxpayers and difficult to enforce.? The FEC is tasked with regulating money spent on elections, NOT political speech. Stay out this issue. As the Elections Committee, it is obvious that the government wants to control what people see or say. Such control over the internet, infringes on the Americans' Freedom of Speech!

Comments provided by :
Minzes, Judy

I see nothing wrong with the Internet as it is. I do not want to see the Government involved in further regulating Internet Access beyond what they already do. "Don't fix it if it is not broken" applies here as far as I'm concerned. Thank you for your consideration.

Comments provided by :
Mitchell, Lawrence

To Whom it May Concern:

No FEC regulations on the internet!!!! We do not need governmental interference on censoring of the internet. Hands Off!!!

We went to the polls on November 4, 2014 and rejected the policies of more governmental oversight that this administration has been shoving down our throats. Stop this power grab now.

Thank you,
Tammy Mixdorf

Comments provided by :
Mixdorf, Tammy

Stop, just stop.... all this is about is control and a new revenue source. I already pay for my access and associated taxes. No more!!

Comments provided by :
Mize, Rick

The FEC is tasked with regulating money spent on elections, not political speech. The First amendment was directed at free 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.

Are you planning to monitor all email for political content? Are you expecting self reporting like the IRS?

This is nothing but an attempt to silence opposition voices by those in power.

You will pick and choose who to prosecute.

Comments provided by :

Moench, Carroll

Folks,

Please leave the internet as it is intended. FREE of government influence. We do not need to be regulated, taxed or controlled

Please do not help with your great ideas for regulation.

We have been able to see government management and control first hand with the ACA and our health care, a big mess.

Leave me alone.

thank you

P. J. Moody

Comments provided by :

moody, pj

To whom it may concern,

Upon learning of the new proposed regulation by the FEC, I must say that I believe this to be unconstitutional and threatens my first amendment rights. Free speech is just that--free speech no matter what the speech is about. Leave the internet alone, and stop trying to manipulate free thinking Americans into silence and fear. What country is this anyway? China?

Comments provided by :
Moore, Kevin

Please do not limit or control the right of freedom of speech on the Internet. There is open discussion that is necessary to preserve debate on the issues that our nation faces. Only then will the truth be discerned and the correct actions be taken concerning these issues. Thank for considering my comments.

Comments provided by :
Morgan, Earl

Why doesn't the FEC stop playing games already. The First Amendment to the U.S. constitution protects Free Speech, EVERYONE'S Free Speech, not just Liberal Democrats who only want to hear what they want to hear.

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 wish the FEC would stop the one-sided political nonsense. Start to follow the founding document of our country, the CONSTITUTION!

Comments provided by :
Morin, William

The Internet, with all its faults, is still the last bastion of individual freedom we have left. Amazingly, in its development by the people rather than governments, it even has extended that freedom to much of the world, except in totalitarian countries (such as Communist China) that will not countenance such freedom for their citizens.

But the United States, of all places, was founded on the Constitution with its guarantee of freedom of expression (speech, the press, religion, assembly, petition for redress, etc.) In fact, those rights were created specifically to protect expression that would be controversial, perhaps offending other citizens and even the government.

The technology has changed dramatically, but the principle remains. The various means of using the Internet--email, blogs, websites, social media, etc.--are simply new forms of speech, the press, petition, and in some cases assembly and religion. Thus they still fall under the protection of the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

Thus any move by Congress, or any government agency, to regulate, tax, give favorable or unfavorable treatment to specific types of speech or speakers, or to abridge those rights anywhere--including on the Internet--amounts to a violation of the rights guaranteed by the Constitution.

Rather than regulate the Internet, it would be far better to work on restoring those same freedoms in other areas of society where government already has encroached on those rights.

Comments provided by :
Morris, Gordon

No government control over the internet! This violates our first amendment rights.

Comments provided by :
Moser, Byron

keep the government out of the internet they do nit belong there. They have there nose in all of our busniess

Comments provided by :

Moses, Kathryn

leave the internet alone

Comments provided by :
Mouton, Bradley

The first amendment must be protected for everyone including you at the FEC! This is not a Communist Country where no one has any rights!
But some on the left would like to change this country, don't follow this doctrine..
I spent 15 months fighting in Vietnam 40+ years ago and have a vested interest in our Freedoms! Do the right thing and defie the overreach, your children will thank you!

Thanks, Rick Mudge

Comments provided by :
Mudge, Richard

I DO NOT WANT THE FEC TO MONITOR THE INTERNET NOW OR EVER !!!

Comments provided by :
Murray, Bennett

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.

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

I am amazed that you are even considering this. This is the land of Freedom with the right to Free Speech, one of our most important freedoms.

Inherent in that liberty is the right to have and voice your opinion and we are entitled and given liberty to do that in the United States of America.

I am disturbed by all the opinion censorship and the speech censorship.

If you allow this to proceed the US will be like China and Russia. Is that your goal?

Thank you,

Sheila Nannigna

Comments provided by :

Nanninga, Sheila

I am opposed to any censorship of the internet especially when it comes to voicing opinions about politics. Our right to free speech is part of what has made this country great. Any attempt to take that away is paramount to going back to the monarchies of old when the kings squelched any dissident speakings. History tells us how that worked out for the people. It was not good.

Comments provided by :

Need, Merle

Keep the internet open and free, an extension to the 1st amendment.

Comments provided by :
Nelson, Maurice

Stop trying to regulate EVERYTHING! Leave the Internet to the people and stop trying to restrict our freedom of speech! If you want to control the political speeches/comments we are allowed to read, get a job in China! We the People treasure our first Amendment - we will not allow you to distroy it, along with everything else you are trying to destroy. Hands off the Internet!!!!!!!!!!

Comments provided by :
Neumann, Diane

FEC Regulation of Internet

I believe the NET Neutrality and any other regulation on the Internet by the FCC should be dropped.

Internet users have been pleased with the NET since the 1990s and the only complainers are Corporations. So who do you want to please, the Corporations or Users.

Regards,

Michael E Nixon

PS For an Administration that seems to complain about big Corporations a lot, I have no idea why this would ever be considered.

Comments provided by :
Nixon, Michael

Why is it that Democrats want to follow in the footsteps of China, North Korea and Russia. These are the countries we're always talking about them taking their citizens rights away. The Constitution are the only laws of our country that belong to the people. They aren't there for you to change and make them say what you want. The reason you lost the election is just for reasons like this. Don't abuse the people and remember the oath you swore to and the faces of the people who voted for you.

Comments provided by :
Norcott, William

Free speech is the American citizens right under our Constitution. We as citizens have already had too many of our rights taken away. FEC regulation of online posts and conversations is anti-American. Please re-read the First Amendment and do what is right!

Comments provided by :
Nowak, Glynis

I do NOT want the proposed regulations.

Upon reviewing the "Draft Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in Response to McCutcheon v. FEC " of 10/8/2014, I am struck by how proposed rules will still admit more "loopholes" to squeeze through. If I understand your intentions correctly, you intend to regulate everything partially, so that you are insuring your own "JOB SECURITY" by making sure that loopholes will remain that will require FURTHER regulations that will only partially complicate an otherwise straightforward process.

I would suggest you instead turn your intentions to regulating morality, honesty and honor. Or perhaps you could use, as a model, a perennial best-seller: The Bible (not as a religion, of course, there are already regulations against that), just as a recipe for life.

Comments provided by :
Nowark, Greg

The extremists action of treating internet service as an utility is just wrong. The current government and leader represent a minority of the people but at this time have the power to make changes that the majority do not desire. I don't agree with limiting bandwidth capability at peak times to some customers. That is definitely an issue. That would be no different than cutting off the electricity to eliminate rolling blackouts. There may be some rule changes needing to be made but to a minimum to alleviate the issue with plain and simple language. That is the problem with the current government thinking, lets change it all with a complete overhaul while we have the opportunity so that our personal names are on it and make it so complicated that it takes legal assistance to understand.

Represent the majority of the people's interest and not the special interest groups with money nor personal agendas for perceived fame. The industry I work in has a saying for people like that " THEY ARE A LEGEND IN THEIR OWN MIND". Humbleness and a little humility considerations would help decision making that represents the people and not big money and minority interests.

Comments provided by :

OBlanc Jr, Milton A

Please refrain from imposing any regulations on the Internet. It should remain free for all, not subject to modification by interested parties. Regulation leads to taxation which in this case will not benefit the vast majority of the world's people. The Internet is a wonderful thing. Please leave it as it is.

Comments provided by :
Ocheltree, Thomas

Please leave our freedom of speech alone. It is our first Amendment right to talk about what ever we want, as American Citizens, on the internet and any where else for that matter. 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 :
O'Connor, Jennifer

Please keep the Government's hands off of the internet. Freedom of speech is guaranteed by the Constitution and the Government has no right to regulate such speech on the internet whether it is political or otherwise. Keep the internet free - no Government censorship!!!

Comments provided by :
Olson, Douglas

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 considered to be against the First Amendment Rights of the Constitution of the United States.

Respectfully,

Comments provided by :
Olson, Michael

Quit messing with the greatest advance of our age! Nothing good will come of it. You will stifle innovation.

Comments provided by :
ONeil Jr, George

Please do not regulate the internet. Let it stay as free & open as possible. Let the Free Market forces work their magic there like it has in the past. That's why it has grown so big, so fast & so widely used. Yes, it will have its problems, but the Free Market will work them out!

Thank you for your attention to this issue.

Comments provided by :
Onofrio, Frank

I firmly believe government governs best that governs least. The FEC trying to control free speech/political speech on the internet is a horrid overreach and must NOT be allowed to proceed.

I agree with FreedomWorks:

- 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) I DON'T WANT TO FUND, via the FEC, the vast 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.
- These new regulations would be extremely costly for taxpayers and difficult to enforce.

NO, do not EXPAND where you do not belong

Comments provided by :
Oppenheim, Deena

The Federal Election Commission is UNConstitutional.

There is NO provision in the Constitution of the United States for an election commission.

HOWEVER, since this agency does exist, FOLLOW THE CONSTITUTION!

The 1st amendment PROTECTS FREE SPEECH.

REG 2014-01 Earmarking, Affiliation, Joint Fundraising, Disclosure, and Other Issues is UNConstitutional, and attempts to silence Free Speech.

NO! No to REG 2014-01! NO to this UNConstitutional Power Grab!

Comments provided by :
Ortiz, Jim

I do not believe it is constitutional for the internet to be regulated by any government or private agency. I believe the internet comes under the right of free speech guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States. I also believe that by regulating the internet you will drastically hinder those with limited incomes (like me) that use the internet for research and for the purpose of occasionally purchasing goods not to mention putting a huge damper on free enterprise.

Comments provided by :

Owens, Jane

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. Basically it would be a violation of our first amendment rights.

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 :
Packett, Gregory

I don't want you screwing up the internet....just like the federal gov't screwed up healthcare.

Leave my internet service alone!

Comments provided by :
Page, Dave

Our founding fathers gave us the first 10 amendments so that we could live our lives without being submitted to the government's every wish. I hope that I will not see the day our country falls because of the government's control. The 10 amendments are there for our freedom. Not for the government's control.

Comments provided by :
Palmer, Mickey

What is happening to this country. Why are you Dem. trying to destroy our freedom of speech. You all grew up with the laws of our Constitution. Yet you all have no respect for it or abide by it. You Democrats going to turn our country into a Dictatorship? Think of our children (your children) what lies ahead for them. SHAME ON YOU

Comments provided by :
Palmiero, Rose

I do not see any value to regulating political speech on the Internet. Regulating any type of speech should only be done with care so as to not stifle innovation and override constitutional rights. The election process should not favor one side of the political spectrum and this kind of censorship may trample on one side which may favor Internet speech. Also, there are issues of enforcement and external forces. We would only with great difficulty and expense be able to limit speech in the Internet, but other countries would not have the same rules. This would open a wave of speech rebellion. I do not see it as feasible or desirable to make such an attempt. The American public would not tolerate it.

Comments provided by :
Parker, John

Stop taking our 1st amendments rights away from the US citizens!

Comments provided by :
patterson, rikki

Do not regulate the free speech of the internet... some times the truth hurts.

Comments provided by :
Patton, Bill

concerning REG 2014-01 earmarking, affiliation, joint fundraising, disclosure, and other issues (mcCutcheon) Please do not take away my freedom of free speech on the internet. we should all continue the freedom we have to disagree with others, and i hope you will come to that conclusion also. thank you.

Comments provided by :
patton, lynne

The job of the FEC is regulating money spent on elections, NOT policing political speech. Leave the internet unfettered and free from government interference. Recent proposed regulation of the internet would be an unforgivable infringement on the God given right of free speech. Government regulation of postings online would have dangerous ramifications for constitutionally-guaranteed free speech. The cost would be unbearable. 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, I respectfully demand the government keep its hands off the internet. This is The United States of America, NOT Russia, China or Iran.

Comments provided by :

Paul, Kelly

I view this regulation as an inappropriate use of intervention in the personal life of every user of the internet--rather like going though each piece of mail at the post office to determine if it should be considered for delivery or every book at the library to make the decision to ALLOW me the RIGHT to read same. The FIRST AMENDMENT guards my RIGHT to FREE SPEECH AND FREEDOM TO VOICE MY OPINION. My Grandfather in the Spanish American War, my Uncle in the 1st World War, my Uncle in the 2nd World War in France and my Husband fought in the 2nd World War and Korea. All fought for the rights of every American and I stand against and will speak out against ANYONE OR ANY LEGISLATION THAT ATTEMPTS TO TAKE AWAY THAT FREEDOM.

Comments provided by :
paul, florence

While it is reasonable to worry about obscenities and terroristic threats and vicious emails unless the e-mail provider incites the sending of those the government should keep their control to a very minimum. That is just to prevent a monopoly on services or being able to prosecute irresponsible behavior on the Internet between customers. Not dictate or control what customers by their First Amendment rights can say about their government, when it is not malicious, libelous or slanderous nor what citizens can say about their representatives with the same restrictions.

Comments provided by :
Pavlick, Kieran

This is an infringement of our 1st amendment rights, we are not communist China so do not take us there.

Comments provided by :
Peadar Sr., Jeffrey

Do not infringe on my or any one's freedom of speech

Comments provided by :
Penner, Cody

Any government intervention concerning the internet poses a great threat to our freedom of speech. It seems anytime the government gets involved in our personal liberties it is to stifle them. As we look at the IRS as just one example of blatant thieves, liars and corruption I can only imagine what would happen if we let politicians monitor our computers! Absolutely NOT!

Comments provided by :
Pennington, Warren

I do not want the government monitoring the internet in any way other than the act of monitoring for criminal activity.

Comments provided by :
Peraino, Marc

Need to stop messing our country up. If you don't like it get the hell out

Comments provided by :
petit, carl

Dear FEC,

Our country was founded on the principle that all men are created equal. Our constitution in shores us the right to free speech. Free speech only remains as such if the medium in which it is presented remains accessible to all and not to those who fall within a particular acceptable realm or sphere. The FEC is not tasked with regulating political speech.

The existing laws governing regulation of campaigns is already overstepping its bounds, but "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 :

Phelan, 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.

I don't want the Government regulating the Internet.

Comments provided by :
Pickard, Steven

gubment is pure EVIL

Comments provided by :
pierce, joe

Do not regulate my internet!!!!

Comments provided by :
Pinder, Nathan

Keep your filthy stinking hands off the INTERNET.

Sure, for our own safety! Right! More government intrusion and infringements of our rights. THIS IS NOT COMMUNIST CHINA.

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH! GET THE HELL OUT OF OUR BUSINESS! WE ARE FED UP!

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH! GET THE HELL OUT OF OUR BUSINESS! WE ARE FED UP! ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!
GET THE HELL OUT OF OUR BUSINESS! WE ARE FED UP!

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH! GET THE HELL OUT OF OUR BUSINESS! WE ARE FED UP!

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH! GET THE HELL OUT OF OUR BUSINESS! WE ARE FED UP!

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH! GET THE HELL OUT OF OUR BUSINESS! WE ARE FED UP!

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH! GET THE HELL OUT OF OUR BUSINESS! WE ARE FED UP!

need I repeat?

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH! GET THE HELL OUT OF OUR BUSINESS! WE ARE FED UP!

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH! GET THE HELL OUT OF OUR BUSINESS! WE ARE FED UP!

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH! GET THE HELL OUT OF OUR BUSINESS! WE ARE FED UP!

Comments provided by :

Pinson, Michael

To the Commissioners of the Federal Election Commission,

There are currently FEC commissioners that want to regulate online posts and conversations. I strongly oppose this as an attack on the First Amendment rights of the American people to 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. Enforcement of these regulation would also be extremely costly to the taxpayer would only lead to more abuse of power from the federal government.

Respectfully,

David Plesher

Comments provided by :
Plesher, David

The Internet is A-Political. Stop your interfering and meddling in something that you have no right to manipulate! Let Congress pass a law and then enforce the law if a change is needed! Wouldn't that be a novel idea for a political commission?

Comments provided by :
Posik, Robert

In short this legislation would curtail political free speech that is protected by the second amendment. It is therefore unconstitutional. This appears to be outside the remit of the F.E.C. and will cost tax payers more money in regulators. This legislation should not be passed.

Comments provided by :
POULTON, NIGEL

This regulation is a direct assault on First Amendment rights and should be summarily dismissed. Political speech has not and will not be censored in the United States of America.

Comments provided by :
Price, 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

Please do not proceed with more regulation on the internet.

Comments provided by :

Prickel, Jeff

I am strongly against this proposed rule. The FEC regulates money spent on campaigns, not political speech.

Since the freedom of speech is one of our most basic rights, agencies of the government should work to protect that right, not abridge it.

How would the FEC regulate as proposed in this rule? It would require many more people to effectively do it, and to what constitutional purpose?

Please do not institute this rule.

Comments provided by :
Pritchett, Roger

FEC Chair,

You have no right to try to control 1st Amendment free speech, on any media. If you want to control speech, move to a Communist country, they can use you there.

Debbie Ragsdale

Comments provided by :
Ragsdale, Debbie

Stop the intended regulation of free speech. It is unconstitutional to limit the free speech of Americans regardless of the content. Democrats must grow up and stop using the FEC as a political tool to bludgeon its opposition. Americans have the constitutional right to express themselves even when it is in opposition to the thoughts and purposes of the democratic party, this is America not Russia or Communist China. This current push to regulate away the free speech rights of every American is blatantly political and is an attempt to suppress the free will of Americans who oppose the current destruction of our economy, our healthcare and our national defense by a Marxist, progressive destroyer who currently resides in the White House. He is not king of America and the FEC should not be working to give him the power of one to kill our free speech rights.

I agree with the following points from Freedomworks:

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.

America is not a communist country, regardless of how much the democratic party and the White House wish it to be, and the president is not king. Oppose all attempts to regulate free speech no matter the medium being used and stick to your stated task of "regulating money spent on elections, not political speech."

Comments provided by :
Rainey, Steve

These proposed regulations expand the power of the FEC beyond the intended scope of its commission.

While the FEC is now tasked with regulating money spent on elections, these new regulations will provide the FEC with the authority to police free online postings, which are currently exempt from the FEC's regulatory authority.

The internet has enabled an unprecedented opportunity for free and open discussion of political issues. With the internet, American voters have an inexhaustible resource for educating themselves.

These proposed regulations provide the mechanism for the FEC to influence exactly which information is allowed to be presented. This mechanism will inevitably be abused.

These regulations will place an undue burden on small political organizations as well individual citizens.

These regulations will be selectively enforced. The American taxpayer will pay too much for this selective enforcement - both in dollars and stifled free speech. Selective enforcement will be a violation of the natural right to free speech - a right recognized in the first amendment to the Constitution.

Comments provided by :
Rambin, Jon

Absolutely NO NO regulations or interference with the internet. I'm disturbed by the continued efforts by the FCC to control our freedom of speech both in media and any type of communications. How dare this administration continue in this direction. Did you not understand the election results? The citizens gave spoken. You work for us.

Comments provided by :
Ramirez, Ana

I do not think you or any other committee from the US government should be allowed to censor or otherwise control what any US citizen puts on the internet for someone else to read. That would be taking away my FIRST AMMENDEMENT RIGHTS. That is guaranteed to me and anyother citizen of our country.

Comments provided by :
Rawley, Guy

Why do you think that you need to tax the internet? We already pay more in taxes than necessary. There should be no regulation of the internet. It is already bad enough with all the adds now you want to regulate it so you can acquire more power in your own areas. If this keeps up a civil war is coming. So please quit this endeavor NOW!!!!

Comments provided by :
Ray, Homer

I am against ANY regulation on my speech on the internet. It is not the FEC business to regulate ANY speech.

Comments provided by :
Raymer, Mark

I am opposed to the FEC regulating the internet 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.

Comments provided by :

Reardon, John

Use Common Sense for the betterment of the public!

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.

Larry

Comments provided by :

Reddick, Larry

ALL speech in America is protected by the Constitution...
Americans will not be told EVER what they can and cannot say.

Comments provided by :
Register, Heath

As if the FEC did not have enough already to do; now you want to engage in something else that is an unconstitutional imposition on free speech and an invasion of privacy. To date, the FEC has done very little to "regulate" election efforts; why would the American people want to allow you more unrestricted power. The federal government is already too large, too complex, too intrusive, and too incompetent. Additionally, I have cited other criteria for your not expanding the reach of 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, placing an undue burden on small groups and individuals.

*These new regulations would be extremely costly for taxpayers and difficult to enforce. The federal government already over-spends and under-produces.

I urge you to just seek to enforce the regulations currently in place, and to seek to do so more effectively than you have in the past.

Comments provided by :
Reviere, Paul C.

I do not think "Not for profits" should be allowed to donate to politicians. If they opt out of the process the rest of us have to use, ie pay taxes, they shouldn't have the right to influence politics. Since they are allowed to donate, there should be full disclosure of those contributions.

There should be full disclosure of all political funding from whatever source.

There should be restrictions on donations and on how much politicians can spend on elections.

Comments provided by :
Rhea, Carla

I hope you will not permit the FEC to regulate speech on the internet. It would be too costly to have people constantly monitoring everyone's postings, besides being in violation of first amendment rights of free speech. It seems the government has no problem protecting the rights of others to post pornography and immoral or obscene comments, but wants to limit speech they consider "politically incorrect." Our country was founded by patriots who had the freedom to print pamphlets expressing their political views. Today's technology should permit political expression on the internet.

Comments provided by :
Richards, Ellen

Keep the government's hands off the Internet.
We have done well this far without gov't intervention.
Less regulation is better.
Do not proceed with Net Neutrality

Comments provided by :
Richardson, Neil

Please leave the internet as it is ...you suffocating us with all your government rules and laws and we have had enough. This a free country and we want to keep it that way...

Comments provided by :
rider, gloria

I do not want you to regulate the internet. It is none of your business how I use it unless I am breaking the law.
Have a Blessed day,

Carolyn

Comments provided by :
Roach, Carolyn

I am writing to express my displeasure with the proposal to regulate online posts and conversations. The FEC is tasked with regulating money spent on elections, not political speech. I believe that reversing the exemption for free postings online would have dangerous ramifications for constitutionally-guaranteed free speech.

As Americans, we are already subjected to plenty of monitoring and oversight by the Federal Government agencies. This action would require even more regulators to search for potential "violations". Our budget is already out of balance, so another Czar or agency is unnecessary.

I would ask you reconsider this proposal.

Comments provided by :

Roberson, Steve

If you want to act out your communist/fascist fantasies and censor opinions/free speech (one of the limited freedoms you haven't already taken from us yet) why don't you move to communist China. I'm sure you will be much happier there.

Comments provided by :
roberts, art

What I say and how I say it is MY RIGHT and nobody's business but mine. I also pay for the use of the internet. Therefore I also look at what I say as personal property. Bought and paid for. Government is already too involved in my life as well as every person living in the USA. Back OFF!

Comments provided by :
Roberts, 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.

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

WE NEED SMALLER GOVERNMENT, NOT LARGER GOVERNMENT!!! The FEC and Congress needs to read the Constitution and Bill Of Rights and adhere to those 2 documents.

Comments provided by :

Roberts, Thomas

Keep the internet free of any government regulation. My team and I would make sure to vote and fire any person that even tries.

Comments provided by :
Rodriguez, Hector

Attacking our "Free Speech" is unconstitutional and must stop at once!!!

The good people of this country have only to "go" to Washington to find who does, and does, and does not, protect our Constitution. Lying and spying, against its own citizens is not your job. Breaking down and destroying our rights, according to your selfish wants, instead of defending our rights IS NOT what you are there to do. PROTECTING our rights are why your there.

Self-serving political types to aid and abet those who trample on the rights of its citizens are no better than those who wish to denigrate this great country.

Go away, get a job!! Leave the Constitution and our Free Speech" alone.

Henry David Rogers, Jr.

Comments provided by :
Rogers, Henry

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 government has become too big. Keep the internet free by keeping the government out of it.

Comments provided by :

Roman, Elaine

I believe in the United States Constitution. The US Constitution is the basis for all of our laws. One of the basic precepts enshrined in the US Constitution is the right of all citizens to address their representatives, regardless of the means by which this is done. No individual has the right to limit my intercourse with my elected officials. Doing so is a clear violation of the responsibility placed upon the elected representative. The elected representative does not have an option but to listen to those whom he/she represents. A refusal to listen is grounds for legal removal through the electoral fora. Having said that, the individual or group of individuals communicating with their representatives must do so in a respectful and mannerly way. Disrespect, in either direction, must be discouraged, but would not void the representative's responsibility to listen to his/her constituents. Any means, process, or method that voids or limits, or restricts my ability to communicate and have discourse with my representative is a clear violation of Constitutional rights. The rights of Free Discourse and Free Speech were affirmed by the Constitution and law and not granted to us.

Comments provided by :
Rosito, Marco

Internet should not be regulated for content, nor should there be any gatekeepers (internet providers, governments, regulatory agency, etc) that throttle, block or impede any legal posts, content, or business.

It is our best chance at true freedom!

All are truly equal online, and should remain that way.

Comments provided by :
Rospierski, Aaron

Government regulation and stifling of the internet is Unconstitutional and violates our First Ammendment rights. I urge you to please defend our freedom, instead of bowing to the influence of lobbyists.

Comments provided by :
Rourke, Marty

I don't understand why/how the FEC is dealing with internet activity.

Free Speech is guaranteed under the Constitution.

Please LIMIT your activity to dealing with elections & money raised for those elections.

Comments provided by :

Rousselle, James

The FEC is tasked with regulating money spent on elections, not political speech. We will tolerate the FEC going against the Constitution by limiting freedom of expression on the Internet in any way. 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 :
Rowell, David

Please leave my internet alone. It does not need to be controlled or regulated by the government !!!!!

Comments provided by :
Ruble, Jim

Dear Sirs,

Under the First Amendment to the US Constitution I strongly oppose the any scrutiny or restriction of free speech on the internet. Unconstitutional restrictions would include requiring any licensing, registration, fees, taxes, or any other limitation on free speech. Any restrictions on speech on the internet are subject to selective enforcement for political purposes, as we have seen with the recent IRS scandal. The FEC should stay out of any restrictions on First Amendment speech on the internet, or anywhere.

Comments provided by :

Ruckstuhl, Ken

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

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."

I don't want the internet regulated. I don't want my free speech infringed upon.

This is a blatant move by the Obama administration to control every aspect of our lives and I won't put up with it!

Comments provided by :
Ruggles, Sandra

It is clearly a violation of our God given right to free speech to be subject to censorship on the internet. (He gave us the internet, too, mind you). Do not do this, please.

Comments provided by :
Russell, Pamela

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

Comments provided by :
Ryan, Morris

Do not regulate the internet.
it's not a good law for the people.
Thanks Ed

Comments provided by :
Sanchez, Edward

I don't have a lot of free time to sit and watch the news so the one way I stay up to date on political issues and world events is via the internet. Please do not censor the political content allowed on the web and take away our freedom of speech. This is a right this country started with and it would be shameful to say so many lives were lost fighting for something that today's government says we can no longer enjoy.

Comments provided by :
Sanders, Regina

The FEC has NO business regulating political opinions on the internet! What I choose to write is like a letter in my emails, my opinions shared anywhere are my constitutional right!

I cannot begin to imagine what it would remotely take to enforce this.

The cost to the tax payers would be enormous.

AND we live in the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA not THE REPUBLIC OF AMERICA! Or as if we live in communist China!!

IF this would become reality GOD FORBID... it such a slippery slope to losing even more of Constitutional Freedoms.

I adamantly oppose any such regulation! Talk about over-reaching!

ENOUGH! NO, NO AND AGAIN I SAY NO!! This IS a government BY the people for the people. We are not some dumb sheepeople!

Respectfully,

Comments provided by :

Sanor, Diane

You cannot have my first amendment rights. If you want them so badly, I dare you to come to my house and try to take them. I am sick of the weaponization of MY Constitution by YOUR administration in order to suit YOUR personal american hating agenda against a freedom loving GOD fearing nation. Remember this you communist loving scum, the cessation of my rights means the cessation of yours as well. What don't you idiots understand about this?

Comments provided by :
Saunders, John

The less government interference the better.

Comments provided by :
Scales, 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 :

Schaus, Rob

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 :

Scheffler, 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.

~ We must continue to follow the constitution as it was set up. to change or alter would be detrimental to national security, even if the Government is the culprit.

~ The greatest Hate speech comes out of Washington by imposing laws against what it has stood for for two hundred plus years.

Michael Scheftic

Comments provided by :
Scheftic, Michael

I'm positive with everything going on, in our country and abroad, there are plenty of other things to be worrying about than to "tax" the Internet. That is exactly what this will be.

Republicans. This is why I, and many like myself, voted you into office. Don't allow the democrats to do this...

Comments provided by :
Schifone, John

Our government is charged with protecting free speech not taxing it. Any action by this administration to interfere with, control or manage the internet is deeply disruptive and disturbing.

Comments provided by :
Schoenberger, Henry

FEC,

I beseech you to please read our Constitution and The Bill of Rights and what they say about Free Speech. Any maneuver to curtail free speech is a beginning to curtailing a free people. Our forefathers were very forward thinking in these matters and this move to control peoples' speech is Orwellian in nature.

The Constitution and Bill of Rights are important documents and those working for the people should never cross the boundaries set by these documents. They are what made this country great and will help it to greatness again if left alone. Please do not take away our rights of free speech.

Sincerely,

Diana Schommer

Comments provided by :

Schommer, Diana

The following points are not my original thoughts, but they accurately reflect my opinion. Please consider:

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 :
Schroder, Kristofer

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

Comments provided by :
Schwenck, Vaunda

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 :
Schwenker, Daniel

no comment

Comments provided by :
Scott, Dennis

PLEASE RESPECT MY FIRST AMENDMENT IN OUR CONSTITUTION

DO NOT REGULATE THE INTERNET !

Comments provided by :
segal, jesse

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 importantly though, it is unconstitutional.

Comments provided by :

Seibel, Craig

Please respect our freedom of speech by not regulating our first amendment rights on the internet.

Comments provided by :
Sellers, Dalyce

We need less regulation of our freedom, not more!

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 :

Sessions, Trey

stop

Comments provided by :
Sheppard, John

This is a violation of my freedom of speech. It would have dangerous ramifications to our constitutionally guaranteed free speech. This would be extremely costly for taxpayers and difficult to enforce. Plus it will put undue burden on small groups and individuals.

Comments provided by :
Shepps, Tammy

Do not regulate the Internet

Comments provided by :
Sherman, Vickie

The FEC is tasked with regulating money spent on elections, not political speech and ANY attempt to regulate free speech in America is a direct assault on our first amendment rights. Reversing the exemption for free postings online would have dangerous ramifications for constitutionally-guaranteed free speech and will not be tolerated. Additionally the FEC will not be authorized the massive funding from the US congress required to conduct such a massive Gestapho style assault on the constitution i.e. 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. We will not stand for any more, unconstitutional by definition, administrative law making and taxing of the American people.

Comments provided by :
Shipp, Andy

Please DO NOT regulate the internet mail. This is a violation of our first amendment. Freedom of Speech. These new regulations would be extremely costly for taxpayers and difficult to enforce. Your efforts would better be server by monitoring election spending.

Comments provided by :
Shotts, Norman

I do not want any more regulation on internet.

Comments provided by :
sidener, patrick

Please leave the Internet ALONE, it Does Not need Government Control; it Does not need to be Taxed. It is doing fine the way it is.

Comments provided by :
Simmons, Robert

The last time I checked I still am an American Citizen and still live in the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA which is a FREE COUNTRY. I am totally against the Control that anyone may want to put on our FREEDOM of SPEECH, whether on the internet or in any form of control when it comes to our speech. Whom ever may be trying to do this needs to be REMOVED from their position, whether they are elected or appointed, they are NOT being very supportive of our Constitution and the laws of our UNITED STATES.
SHAME, SHAME, ON THOSE PEOPLE.

Comments provided by :
Simmons, Sharon

Leave our internet free speech alone. This isn't a Police State nation, YET !!

Comments provided by :
Simpson, Faye

- ? 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 :
SIMPSON, ROBERT

We do not need more government regulations on the Internet. Keep the FCC out of the Internet.

Comments provided by :
Smith, Albert

As a citizen of this great Country, I implore you, DO NOT regulate the internet! This effort would be extremely cost prohibitive to the taxpayers! There is no definitive way to police and/or enforce this effort on a daily basis, and more importantly, it strips away our Freedom of Speech!! The internet is a source and resource for opinion, creativity, and communication! Do not take away our Rights under the US Constitution!!

Another legitimate point: the FEC deals with election law and issues NOT political opinion or any political matter!!

Comments provided by :
Smith, Cathleen

FEC: do not attack the First Amendment because you don't like what you see. There is no illegal use of the Internet as it relates to recent elections. Those who lost their shirt will certainly be discomfoted, but get over it. Do not abuse the law, do not abuse the power of your appointed position.

Comments provided by :
Smith, Edward

Privacy is a "Natural Right".

Comments provided by :
Smith, Jan

To whom it may concern,

A simple reminder:

?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.

Any actions or attempts to inhibit the freedom of speech of myself, others like me, and others that i disagree with, concerns me deeply. This is unconstitutional, and goes against the spirit of what our country was founded on and our founding fathers fought for.

Sincerely,

Sov. Joshua Smith.

Comments provided by :

Smith, Joshua

The FEC has no right to to take away our Freedom of Speech!!

Comments provided by :
snyder, 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 :

Spangler, Cynthia

no offense but where in the world do you see that you have the authority to get involved with the internet, you need to back away until you find where in the constitution, that gives you the authority.

Comments provided by :
Speer, Joe

PLEASE NOTE MY OPPOSITION TO INTERNET REGULATION BY 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.

SINCERELY; DALE SPEISER

Comments provided by :
Speiser, Dale

I am against this proposed rule for the following reasons. The FEC is tasked with regulating money spent on elections, not political speech. Reversing the exemption for free postings online will violate the First Amendment of our Constitution. Also doing so would not only cost a fortune, but the FEC would have to have 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 scheme sounds just like something from 1984 by George Orwell. Big Brother anyone? We are not the Chinese who's government does the same thing to suppress the population.

Comments provided by :
Spurr, Michael

Internet free speech is a constitutional right. It is foundational in nature and cannot and WILL not be treaded upon.
Thanks!

Comments provided by :
St. Lawrence, Amy

IT IS ASTOUNDING HOW MANY OF OUR FREEDOMS ARE BEING TAKEN AWAY FROM US! NOW YOU THINK YOU HAVE THE RIGHT TO REGULATE THE INTERNET? SUCH ARROGANCE!! DO YOU HONESTLY THINK THAT THE MAJORITY OF THE CITIZENS OF THE UNITED STATES ARE IDIOTS AND IT IS YOUR DUTY, YEA YOUR OBLIGATION TO DIRECT OUR EVERY MOVE? WHAT IS NEXT? A REQUIREMENT THAT WE ADVISE YOU OF HOW MANY TIMES WE GO TO THE BATHROOM EACH DAY? STAY OUT OF MY LIFE. I'VE BEEN DOING A PRETTY GOOD JOB OF RUNNING IT FOR 75 YEARS!!!!

Comments provided by :
Stallings, Laverne

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 short, stop this stupid insanity!

Comments provided by :

Stanford, Herman

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

Comments provided by :
Stanton, Paul

This new proposed legislation runs directly counter to First Amendment and the spirit of the Bill of Rights. Free speech is a sacred, integral right of the people in this, our cherished republic. The FEC is tasked with regulating specific election matters -- not online internet speech. To give such awesome power to an executive agency is unacceptable and disruptive to the separation of powers. The American people will not stand for impermissible intrusion into this most fundamental freedom. The American people will stand, and continue standing, to defend such freedoms from government overreach.

Comments provided by :
Starks, Marquis

Dear Commissioners:

Your job as 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.

Remember, more regulations are not helping the American people economically.

Do you want to see more money in the American people's pocket? Or, do you want to continue to see the decline of the American people by more regulations?

I hope you answer the former because you, too, are American Citizens and I would assume you want to see your fellow American's grow prosperous again!

Sincerely,

Comments provided by :
Stebner, Amelia

The recent elections certainly indicated that the will be heard. Please ensure that you are not restricting the voice of the people. Do not attempt to sensor our speech on your political agenda. The people do not believe in your agenda.

Comments provided by :
Stephens, Erik

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 :

Stolarski, Edward

The insanity just doesn't stop with you liberal-democrats. last i looked we are a free Country that doesn't sensor political speech. I can guarantee you if you morons get your way you'd be eliminating all speech you don't agree with and left-winged-speech will be left alone. God willing you far left liberals will be continued to be voted out of office along with your lunatic ideas. We dont live in North korea or the form Soviet Union.

Go to Hell!

Sincerely yours

William Stonich

Comments provided by :

Stonich, William

Why would the FEC try to regulate internet political free speech? It is out of your bailiwick of political spending, unconstitutional and impossible to enforce. Even attempted enforcement would require a huge bureaucracy with its incumbent additional deficient government spending. This appears to be an attempt at empire building.

Comments provided by :
Stout, Gregory

To Whom It May concern,

I do not believe it is the primary job of the FEC to regulate political opinions on the internet, this would be a violation of the our right to free speech.

Please stick to what you're supposed to be doing...regulating money that is spent on elections.

Thank you,

Scott W Strickland

Comments provided by :
Strickland, Scott

The FEC's job is regulating money spent on elections, not political speech. The 1st Amendment Right that we share as Americans is part the framework and fabric of this nation. Political muzzling is 3rd Reich stuff, not American. Consider the current dissatisfaction with the Federal Government before taking this country further down the path to ruin. We do not need more regulation.

Comments provided by :
Strong, Nick

The proposed regulations on the internet are shocking to me. This is not the purpose of the FEC! What your doing is UNCONSTITUTIONAL. This will require hiring a ton of people, who will spend there time keeping tabs on people excerising the first amendment! This will be extremely costly to boot!

Please keep the one place where freedom exists in this country free. Leave our internet alone!

Comments provided by :
Struys, Jonpaul

Please do not take away our personal freedom. I do not want y'all to censor me, nor do I want to censor y'all. I'm in complete agreement with the Chairman of the FEC who called the proposal, of the 3 Democrat FEC Commissioners, to regulate online posts and conversations for political content is ?nothing short of a Chinese censorship Board.?

Please be brave enough to keep this great country the land of the free!

Comments provided by :

Stupka, Dan

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 :
Sullivan, Daniel

I am concerned about attempts by the FEC to regulate internet comments. The constitution guarantees freedom of expression and free speech is central to representative government. Special interest groups must not be allowed to hijack freedom. The current regulations are more than adequate.

Comments provided by :
Swan, Kathy

Do the right thing for the USA...Don't mess with the internet,it IS FREE SPEECH!!!

Comments provided by :
Tagge, Peter

Regulation 2014-01 is a thinly veiled attempt by the FEC to control political speech of American citizens. It is unconstitutional on its face and those who proposed it should be terminated and banned from government employment. This proposal is exactly what our founders warned us against. As one who has sworn to defend our constitution against enemies foreign or domestic I will take whatever steps necessary to prevent this proposed regulation from being approved. The FED is dabbling in areas where it does not belong. You need to stop approval of this regulation NOW.

Comments provided by :
Taliaferro, Ernest

FEC: The idea of regulating any personal comments or conversations on the internet is one of the worse things the American government has ever thought about doing. Somehow the people in the various sections of the current government is trying to go even further than any before to stop Freedom of Speech in the USA. As commissioners of the FEC, you must stop this proposal and allow the Constitutional dictates to prevail.

This is going too far...and the American people will rise up and decree that is the case.

I implore you to reconsider this ruling and continue to let people have the FREEDOM they were promised and deserve.

If the government gets into controlling the Internet it will not only squelch the everyday conversations of the people but the ingenuity of people who have brought about new ways to buy and sell, etc. and improved commerce in America.

Comments provided by :
Tempfel, Karen

The current status of our internet is fine. We need no further regulating or restrictions. I am very satisfied with my internet experience and am objecting to any interference from the FCC or any other federal regulatory agency. Thank you.

Comments provided by :
Thomas, Barbara

DO NOT CHANGE THESE ITEMS!!!!!!

Comments provided by :
Thomas, Frederick

Please do not try and control the internet. The government seems to always screw up everything it tries to control. For example: Amtrack, the VA, the post office, Obamacare, Medicare, etc. the list is endless.

Thank you for listening,
Tom (&Sue) Thompson

Comments provided by :
Thompson, Tom

I am absolutely OPPOSED to any effort of the FEC or FCC to control content on the Internet.

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

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."

? 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 NOT what a free country is supposed to be about, and I oppose any effort by the federal government to censor, or otherwise regulate content on the Internet. I have contacted my representatives about this as well.

Comments provided by :
Thurman, James

I am strongly against any effort on your part to regulate internet communications. This would be a direct violation of the First Amendment and would place an undue burden on both individuals and groups. It would require a huge workforce to manage costing unnecessary taxpayer dollars in the millions at best. Stop violating our Constitutional rights!

Comments provided by :
Tilford, Pam

Dear Commission,

Let me make this perfectly clear: keep your hands off my domestic liberty to use the internet in any lawful manner I wish.

The Federal Government cannot be trusted to protect my privacy, data and the monitoring thereof. Regardless of the Agency title (IRS, NSA, NLRB, FTC, FEC, etc) the Federal Gov't has a full scale assault against the domestic sovereignty and liberties of the citizens of the United several States.

It is time to STOP! William R. Tinnerman

Comments provided by :
Tinnerman, William

The government has no right or authority to regulate or censor the freedom of speech or the freedom of the press via the internet. The freedom to communicate is a basic freedom protected by the constitution. I will oppose any bills or regulations that limit, obstruct or censor those freedoms. Karen Toft

Comments provided by :
Toft, Karen

I am opposed to any regulation of content on the Internet. This would be a violation of the right to free speech.

Comments provided by :

Tope, Barbara

Regarding the regulation of online posts related to 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 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.

Rich Trapp

Comments provided by :
Trapp, Rich

the government must stay out of the internet. it is a fully functional system created by the free market system and doesn't need to be dragged down by any type of federal or state intrusions. it would be a loose loose situation for any governing body to attempt any type of controls or regulation on the internet.

Comments provided by :
treacy, liesel

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.

Leave us alone!!

Comments provided by :

Turner, Steven

Leave my right to my opinion alone. The internet is not yours to dictate nor is my right to state my opinion your right. Back off and hands off...government is no longer by the people, but by a tyrannical group of self-serving individuals that seek unilateral control of everything.

Comments provided by :
tuten, Sharon

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 :

Tuttle, Theresa

- ? 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 :
Twist, Bernadette

Regulating the internet is a violation of the First Amendment.

Comments provided by :
valcourt, joseph

Continuing to limit our free speech is unconscionable! Please stop wasting taxpayer dollars and work on cleaning up TV and radio as you originally were supposed to do.

Keep the internet free. Let us decide what we want to read or post. We are not "stupid."

Comments provided by :
Van Valin, Elizabeth

I cannot afford to pay you to monitor my speech. Please don't tax me anymore Bro!

Comments provided by :
Vance, Paul

The FEC is supposed to be concerned about regulating money spent on elections, not regulating free speech. Reversing the exemption for free postings on-line is an infringement of our Constitutional right to free speech. Besides the obvious large cost of trying to "monitor" postings on the internet, such behavior is not an American value, but one of Communists and dictators who fear the free thinking and free speech of the public. What was the child's mantra of yesteryear? "Sticks and stones may break my bones, but words can never hurt me". That still works. And if you think it does not, politicians with their lies and fraudulent ads against each other is a bigger problem than postings on the internet. It's not the public that needs to be controlled, but rather politicians. What politicians say and actually do always gets categorized as "political", but when the public does the same, then suddenly it is illegal and the citizenry is arrested. Your proposals are further examples of "mission creep" in government.

Comments provided by :
VanDyk, Todd

On my behalf, I am writing this to pledge the FEC to not regulate the internet since it's a crucial part of people's lives every single day. Whether it's personal, business, or even political, it should be the way the people should have the right to use it and express their beliefs. If it passes, it will place a burden on these individuals, it will be costly for taxpayers, make it more difficult to enforce, it'll let the FEC regulate the money that were spent on elections and not for political speeches. Worst of all, to reverse the exemption for free postings online would have dangerous consequence for the 1st amendment especially if free speech was constitutionally-guaranteed. With all of that said, I'm pledging the FEC to not place regulations on the internet and let it be a free source for all. Thank you.

Comments provided by :
VanHazinga, Joel

Do not tax the internet. It is used by businesses, students,
and for personal use. The same as a library.

Comments provided by :
Vanskee, Kimberley

As a free American I do not want the FEC regulating anything to hinder my freedom of speech.

Comments provided by :
Vest, Kevin

The FEC is tasked with regulating money spent on elections, not political speech. They are not tasked with policing individuals, and internet sites to look for anyone exercising their constitutionally-guaranteed free speech because they posted their opinions online.

Comments provided by :
Vetter, Frieda

free speech is my constitutional right in any form written Internet verbal

Comments provided by :
Villase?or , Carleen

Stop making decisions and laws invading my privacy. I am old enough to make my own decisions.

Comments provided by :
VonGunten, Blanche

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 :

Vose, Sally

STOP attacking the First Amendment

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 :

Voss, Joel

Free Speech!!! Do we want to go down the same road as Nazi Germany Enabling Act? Please do not go down this road!

Comments provided by :
Vrooman, Randy

I am fed-up with our Federal government regulating my life. Now you want to regulate my freedom of speech through the Internet -- STOP!

You need to take those free on-line courses offered by Hillsdale College to teach you the fundamentals of what it means to be an American. I am dead serious when I suggest such an idea. Go to the Hillsdale College website to register.

In the interim, KEEP YOUR HANDS OFF THE INTERNET!

(signed) John Wagner
Ann Arbor, MI

Comments provided by :
Wagner, 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.

This will place an undue burden on small groups and individuals. These new regulations would be extremely costly for taxpayers and difficult to enforce.

Beyond the difficulty and expense of enforcing, its just plain wrong.

My father fought in WWII to ensure we would never be subjected to this kind of overreach and silencing.

Comments provided by :
Walker, Kerry

Dear Sirs,

I am not interested in you regulating the internet. Please see my comments below:

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.

Regards,
Paul Walker

Comments provided by :
Walker, Paul

LEAVE THE INTERNET ALONE!! It is not necessary to surrender all our rights. The idea of regulating the internet is preposterous. Stop your plans to regulate the internet. It is wrong!!!!!!!!!!

Comments provided by :
Wallingford, John

Do NOT take over and regulate the internet!!Leave the internet free and available for all to use. Regulating the internet is nothing short of Chinese censorship. Do NOT take away our 1st Amendment rights!

Comments provided by :
Walters, Arvilla

The broad scope of these proposed regulations for monitoring the general public's postings online is a bit scary as this type of action aligns us with countries like China and Russia that seek to limit the voice of their populace, especially if it goes against the desires of those in power. I want to keep our country free and aligned with the vision of our founding fathers. I don't think more regulations are good for our nation and we definitely DO NOT need larger and more intrusive government overreach.

Even the chairman of the FEC called this proposal "nothing short of a Chinese censorship Board."

"The FEC is tasked with regulating money spent on elections, not political speech. We don't need government regulating every aspect of our daily life.

"Reversing the exemption for free postings online would have dangerous ramifications for constitutionally-guaranteed free speech. This would make it so that only those with the money to afford it could feed masses their thought process. Everyone should be free to state their opinion and ideas.

"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 am pretty sure there are better ways we can be spending money in our government. The GOA would agree I am sure.

-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 energy prices ALWAYS on the increase I don't think that the general public can afford to be footing the bill for more erroneous spending.

Comments provided by :

Walters, Lene

REGULATING ONLINE POSTS AND CONVERSATIONS:

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 :
Wambolt, Richard

The FEC should not make any regulations that will stop free speech on the internet.
The government cannot be a censor to punish those who have different ideas.
This is another way to take control of our lives. As the IRS targeted those who
have different ideas, this is another attempt to stop opponents free speech.

Comments provided by :
Ward, Nancy

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 :

Ward, 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.

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 :

Webster, Brad

I strongly oppose ANY regulations proposed that will regulate political speech on the internet (or elsewhere)! One of our most precious freedoms is the freedom of political speech, which was one of our Founders' top priorities. Potential loss of this is so dangerous that I cannot believe it is even being considered by ANYONE in government. WE ARE NOT CHINA...yet! America will not survive without freedom of speech in all forms: vocal, written, internet. Suppression of speech=suppression of thought=loss of basic protection of inalienable rights.

Comments provided by :
Weckel, Sharon

YOU SHOULD NOT TRY TO ABRIDGE THE FIRST AMENDMENT!

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 :

Wegner, Larry

I strongly urge you not to implement this proposed regulation. I believe it is unconstitutional, and therefore an unlawful assault against freedom of speech. I will be urging my representative and senators in Congress to stop this infringement and scale back the power and scope of the FEC as an agency that wastes too much tax payer money on activities that are unnecessary and a danger to liberty.

Comments provided by :

Welch, David

Free speech is one of the cornerstones of our country. I very much object to limiting free speech on the internet or anywhere else.

Comments provided by :
Welch, Libby

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 :
Welton, David

To whom it may concern,
I don't like the idea of you telling me what I may say on the internet.
In my estimation I would prefer you cease and desist on the matter you're
contemplating.

Thank you

Comments provided by :
Wesoloski, Lou

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 :

Westbrook Ph.D., Keith

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 not strive to implement regulations that limit our free speech.

Thank you.

Mark Whitcomb

Comments provided by :
Whitcomb, Mark

Free speech is free speech and any and all restrictions are often imposed for political power.
I am strongly opposed to this Regulation.
Stop it.

Larry White

Comments provided by :
White, Larry

Stop trying to regulate and censor the internet. How dare you try to stifle free speech. Whether it is political or not. First amendment. Stop dismantling the constitution!!!

Comments provided by :
whyko-marolda, wendy

Posting comments online is exactly the same as speaking in a public forum. The internet is the epitome of freedom and speech online should never be regulated. The FEC is tasked with regulating money in elections, not political speech, which is guaranteed by the First Amendment to the Constitution.

Comments provided by :
Wichmann, Andrew

Regulating free postings on the internet of political commentary would be an imposition on my free speech rights.

Comments provided by :
Wilkinson, Wayne

Really! you are considering regulating what I can say about politicians and politics? Just what comments are you going to censor? Only the ones that "Dear Leader" finds offensive? Leave the internet alone! Free speech is exactly that free! It is a shame such action is even considered as a legitimate proposal.

Comments provided by :
Willey, Rick

Please leave the Internet alone. The Federal Government can not handle what they are trying to do now. Why do you think you have to control everything, when you cant even control what you are supposed to be controlling. And we sure do not need China involved with the control . They are not our friends and you just keep giving them more control of our lives

Comments provided by :
Williams, Ralph

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 need an army of regulators to police YouTube and other internet sites on a daily basis to look for potential violations, and subject them to inquiries simply because they posted opinions online. This will place an undue burden on small groups and individuals. These new regulations fly in the face of the 1st Amendment and would be extremely costly for taxpayers and difficult to enforce.

Comments provided by :
Williamson, 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 :

Wilson, 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 :

Wilson, Jewel

The Federal Elections Commission (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 need an army of regulators to police YouTube and other internet sites on a daily basis to look for potential violations, and subject them to inquiries simply because they posted opinions online.

This is an expensive and unnecessary government intrusion. I am able to discern and interpret the online postings without government intervention.

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 :
Winchell, Dale

Do NOT limit free speech--political or otherwise--on the internet or on any other forum. First Amendment rights must not be altered--ever.

Comments provided by :
Wind, Judith

I am adamantly opposed to Reg 2014-01. Such regulations is nothing less than blatant censorship of political speech and is something that a dictatorship would seek to implement. Such regulation is diametrically opposed to a free society and smacks of a "Big Brother" government. Such regulation is not needed nor is it necessary. Such regulation will effectively muzzle our Constitutional right of free speech. Such regulation is nothing less than a political move by leftists, radicals, statists, socialists and communists to control the people. Do not implement Reg 2014-01!!

Comments provided by :
Windham, Robert

The way I understand it, the FEC was put in place in order to regulate money spent on elections, not political speech. In that regard, it is my opinion that reversing the exemption for free postings on-line would have dangerous ramifications for constitutionally-guaranteed free speech.

The FEC would then have to hire legions of regulators to police Internet sites, such as YouTube, etc. on a daily basis to look for potential infractions, and subject them to inquiries simply because they posted opinions on-line.

In turn, this will place an undue burden on small groups and individuals and would be extremely costly for taxpayers due to the complexities and difficulties of enforcement.

Central government continues to grow at taxpayer expense, while freedoms seem to diminish almost daily. This is one new regulatory scheme that should not be put into place.

Thank you.

Comments provided by :
Winship, Dennis

This is nothing more than an attempt to limit my freedom of speech. I am not interested in more regulation. The internet is for everyone and everyone's views. With Net Neutrality this will be reduced to only those whose views that fall in line. This is not freedom of speech!

Comments provided by :
Winship, Jeff

I DO NOT want anyone monitoring my freedoms in my life.

speech....internet....phone....mail or anyother method.

You want to monitor, then move to another country.

This is AMERICA where we are FREE!

Debra Wise

Comments provided by :

Wise, Debra

The constitution makes no reference to any of the actions your commission proposes at the Federal level. Should the people desire to take such actions, the constitution makes it clear that those powers belong to the people and the states.

Comments provided by :
Wish, James

The government keeps digging away at our freedoms...it is time for some element of government to remember they are to govern with the interest of the people uppermost in their rulings...taking away another of our freedoms is absolutely NOT the way to go! Please help keep us a free nation, able to speak our minds.

Comments provided by :
Witte, Jean

Regulating political speech is not the purview of the FEC or indeed, any part of the executive branch. The government must trust the American people in that they can discern the good information from the bad in reaching their decisions.

Comments provided by :
Wolf, Douglas

Greetings: Please don't limit the freedom of the internet. Charles R Wolfe M.D.

Comments provided by :
Wolfe, 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 :

Wolff, Chris

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 :

Wooden, John

Stop trying to regulate free speech. It is a constitutional right.
You are trying to regulate our free speech. STOP.

You are trying to control any political speech on the internet.

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."

The USA is not a communist country. It is a free country. So stop trying to regulate and control the people. This is not right. America has fought hard to be free and stay free. No one should control our free speech.

Stop the FEC's war on the First Amendment. Many people have died to protect all freedoms. Not to be regulated and controlled by others.

Comments provided by :
Woten, Tammy

Dear FEC,

Can I please request that we do not regulate the internet. This is a violation of my freedom of speech. It also creates additional fees and taxes for taxpayer because the monitoring and policing of the internet will be very costly due to the additional personnel need to police it. This will all be put on the taxpayers backs and any business owner who's business relies on the internet for income. Please do not regulate a valuable communication tool that everyone can use to stay in touch, run a business, do school work, find an address, etc..

Comments provided by :

Yeager, Bruce

For heavens sake...leave our freedom of speech alone unless you are afraid of the truth being told! Truth..what's that?
Democrat and liar go together.

Comments provided by :
Zarzana, Carol

Dear Sirs,

As a citizen of the United States it pains me that you are trying to slowly erode the very freedoms that we enjoy in this country, the very freedoms that thousands of men and women died for.

Once again we are being asked to defend our freedoms from people who would willingly give them up or take them away to silence an opposing viewpoint. Democracy and free speech are crucial elements of the fabric of our country. Take those away and we are no better than ISIS or other extremist groups.

The FEC role is to regulate money spent on elections, not free political speech even if it is not what the current administrations view point is. It is not within your scope nor should it be to censor our right to believe and voice what we would like.

This potential decision to eliminate free postings online would completely circumvent the Constitution of the United States and illegally take away our guaranteed freedom of speech.

We cannot afford, nor should there be a need for the FEC or any regulatory body to have to unleash an army of regulators to police YouTube, newspaper editorials 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 would be very difficult to enforce as it would be based on subjective data, could be and would be enforced in a very biased manner and could be taken way out of context just to prove a point.

Please refrain from attacking our First Amendment Rights of Freedom of Speech.

Sincerely, Timothy Verdouw

Comments provided by :
Verdouw, Timothy