



"Carolyn P. Landis" <cplandis@bigplanet.com> on 04/01/2004 04:27:40 PM

To: politicalcommitteestatus@fec.gov
cc:

Subject: Comment on NPRM March 11, 2004

please find attached a letter commenting on the NPRM issued March 11, 2004 in the Federal Register. The word document includes my US mail address, my e-mail address, and my full name.

If you have any trouble opening the attachment, please reply. I will send the comment via certified US mail.

Carolyn P. Landis
251 Crandon Boulevard #161
Key Biscayne, FL 33149
(305) 361-5228 tel
(305) 361-6768 fax
cplandis@bigplanet.com



- CPL correspondence to FEC 2004.doc

Carolyn Press Landis

*251 Crandon Boulevard #161, Key Biscayne, FL 33149
(305) 361-5228 tel (305) 361-6768 fax cplandis@bigplanet.com*

April 1, 2004

Ms. Mai T. Dinh
Assistant General Counsel
Federal Election Commission
politicalcommitteestatus@fec.gov

Dear Ms. Dinh:

This is a response to the Notice of Proposed Rule-Making issued by the Commission in the Federal Register Thursday, March 11, 2004. According to the NPRM, the Commission seeks comment on proposals to amend its regulations to: 1) incorporate the major purpose test into the regulatory definition of "political committee" in 11 CFR 100.5(a); 2) delay the effective date for any final rules until after the next general election; and 3) change the definition of basic terms such as "political committee", "expenditure", and "contribution".

Only if it is strictly applied, should the "major purpose test" be incorporated into the regulatory definition of "political committee" i.e. the major (to the exclusion of others) purpose of any political committee must be the "nomination and election of a candidate". A conservation group publicly identifying candidates who have backed conservation issues should not meet the "major purpose" test. Criticism of the incumbent President or Members of Congress should not meet the "major purpose" test. Voter registration by minority advocacy groups should not meet the "major purpose" test.

I recommend that the effective date for any final rules be set after the elections of November 2004. Campaigns are already underway for those elections, and changing the rules before the elections would be extremely disruptive.

Changes in the definition of basic terms pose the greatest danger for civil liberties. I recommend that the definitions remain unchanged and strictly interpreted. If the definitions are broadened, any public communication regarding the position of candidates might be interpreted to reclassify a nonprofit organization as a "political committee".

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments to the Commission.

Sincerely,

Carolyn P. Landis
cplandis@bigplanet.com