

APR 29 5 11 PM '98

George Stephanopoulos

MURs 4544; 4407

1

This request quite literally encompasses any advertisement by the DNC, including those relating strictly to state or local elections, which are obviously beyond the scope of the Commission's jurisdiction. The same request appears in Document Request Number 2, except that it relates to advertisements developed or created by the November 5 Group.

Document Request Numbers 3 and 4 are even broader in that they relate to advertisements by any State Democratic Party. State Democratic Parties clearly play a role in non-federal elections over which the Commission lacks jurisdiction.

Interrogatory Numbers 1 through 4 are similarly overbroad in that they deal with all advertisements paid for by the DNC or a State Democratic Party, thereby encompassing activity beyond the scope of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended, 2 U.S.C. §431 *et seq.* ("FECA").

Interrogatory Number 5 is perhaps the most outrageous in that it requests information about each meeting and conversation during which there was discussion "...concerning the planning, organization, development and/or creation of television, radio or print advertisements." The request is ridiculously overbroad in that it does not specify the type of advertisements sought or who paid for them.

Further, the Commission appears to be requesting identical information, such as invoices, from numerous individuals and entities. This duplication will only serve to burden respondents and create a paper logjam at the Commission. For the sake of order and efficiency, the Commission should consider limiting its document requests to eliminate the redundancy.

B. The Commission's request is outside the scope of its jurisdiction, and therefore, is contrary to law.

The Commission subpoena specifically refers to several advertisements aired by the DNC during 1995 and early 1996. These advertisements are clearly outside the scope of the Commission's jurisdiction.

The Commission has dealt with legislative issue advocacy ads in its advisory opinions and enforcement proceedings. In determining the treatment of such ads under the FECA, the Commission has in the past always applied a two-prong test to the content of a communication in order to determine whether it is issue advocacy or candidate-related. The Commission has thus reviewed the content (i.e., text and images) of an ad and found them to be candidate-related only if "the communication both 1) depicted a clearly identified candidate and 2) conveyed an electioneering message...." FEC Advisory Opinion 1985-14, Fed. Election Camp. Fin. Guide (CCH) ¶5766 (1985). This test has been repeatedly relied upon in Commission Advisory Opinions and enforcement proceedings. See FEC Advisory Opinion 1995-25, Fed. Election Camp. Fin. Guide (CCH) ¶6162 (1995) (hereinafter "AO 1995-25"), MUR 2216 (August 1, 1989), MUR

2370 (June 5, 1986), MUR 4246 (May 6, 1997) and the MUR which eventually led to FEC v. Colorado Republican Campaign Committee, 839 F. Supp. 1448 (D. Colo. 1993); 59 F. 3d 1015 (10th Cir. 1995) *rev'd*, 116 S. Ct. 2309 (1996).


In AO 1995-25 the Commission sanctioned as issue advocacy a series of RNC media ads which specifically criticized President Clinton on certain legislative issues. The Commission acknowledged in its opinion that such ads were intended to gain popular support for the Republican legislative agenda and to influence the public's positive view of Republicans. The Commission in its opinion specifically concluded that the "stated purpose" of the ads "encompasses the related goal of electing Republican candidates to Federal office." AO 1995-25 The DNC issue ads were specifically designed to and did comply with the Commission's holding in AO 1995-25.

The Commission's efforts to limit expenditures for communications which do not contain express advocacy have been repeatedly rebuffed by the courts, many of which have held that the Federal Election Campaign Act does not cover communications which lack express advocacy. Most recently the Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, citing to the Commission's "string of losses" on this issue, summed up all existing case law on the topic by concluding that those cases "unequivocally require 'express' or 'explicit words of advocacy of election or defeat of a candidate.'" FEC v. Christian Action Network, 894 F. Supp. 946 (W.D. Va. 1995), *aff'd*, No. 95-2600 (4th Cir. 1996); *see also* Pierce v. Underwood, 487 U.S. 552, 568-71 (1988); Maine Right to Life Committee v. FEC, 914 F. Supp. 8, 10-12 (D. Me 1996).

Conclusion

The Commission should quash the subpoena issued to George Stephanopoulos, because it is overbroad and outside the scope of its jurisdiction, thus contrary to law.

Sincerely,


Lyn Utrecht
General Counsel


Eric Kleinfeld
Chief Counsel