

From: [Mr Joe Orawczyk](#)
Reply To: [Mr Joe Orawczyk](#)
To: process@fec.gov
Cc: secretary@fec.gov
Subject: Request for Comment on Enforcement
Date: 04/18/2013 02:19 PM

For the record and to whom it may concern,

For me to claim the status of a novice researcher of the FEC public records would be an overstatement. I'm merely an average voter who is endeavoring to understand the relation of money in politics as it effects the members of Congress who represent me in my State and district. I have attempted to download data as an Excel spreadsheet but have yet to figure out how. A downloadable public step by step "How To" manual or directive written with the average voter in mind would be beneficial to this end. So, as to your query relating to "... whether this agency is doing an effective job of enforcing the Act and Commission regulations," I recognize I lack the qualifications to respond beyond this response; Generally yes, but it could be better.

As to the topic of enforcement, Steve Weinberg observes in his book "The Reporter's Handbook" [pp. 101-102] that:

"Many states require lobbyists to register, but, as the federal level, the definitions contain loopholes. Tens of thousands of lobbyists are registered in state capitals. Yet much of the money they spend on travel, gifts and entertainment goes unreported. The lobby disclosure laws often are so confusingly drafted that it is hard to discuss who should report what. The [Washingtonian?] magazine mentioned Illinois, where 'representatives from Las Vegas descended on the state capital for rounds of meetings with state legislators. Casino operators told reporters they spent \$5.3 million lobbying for a pro-gambling bill. Lobby disclosure reports, however, indicated expenditures of just \$24,000.'"

Granted, the excerpt speaks more to Illinois and presumably Nevada rather than FEC records, but the point is startlingly clear. Public disclosure requirements are avoided as a matter of accepted and expected practice, and absent enforcement, will continue to be the norm. This undermines public confidence in our government, which in turn encourages voter apathy and thus enables further corruption for personal profit.

Failure to fund enforcement or otherwise limiting enforcement resources is by design of those who profit most from it. Thus, it is logical to focus enforcement on those who most oppose it. Regulations are not drafted to harm the political process; rather regulations are typically the consequence of prior harm conducted under the guise of the political process. Deregulation rarely benefits the public interest.

Accordingly, as a civic minded voter endeavoring to engage in and grasp the financial effects of our political process as it relates to politicians in my own backyard, I support any additional regulation(s) or interpretations thereof that improve transparency of the political process and the ability of the public and journalists to quickly obtain the data necessary to understand said process and effects. This includes a rule to compel sub-vendor disclosure, among other requirements. Such rule would better enable the public and the media to identify conflicts of interest through nepotism and other questionable practices so the voters may determine the importance of such disclosure to their own satisfaction.

Respectfully submitted,
Joe Orawczyk
P.O. 361, Yermo, CA 92398-0361