



FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20463

Anne Loftfield, Treasurer  
Ruth McClung for Congress  
P.O. Box 40544  
Tucson, AZ 85717

**FEB 25 2015**

RE: MUR 6405

Dear Ms. Loftfield:

On October 28, 2010, the Federal Election Commission notified Ruth McClung for Congress and you in your official capacity as treasurer of a complaint alleging violations of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended. On February 10, 2015, the Commission found, on the basis of the information in the complaint, and information provided by other respondents, that there is no reason to believe that Ruth McClung for Congress and you in your official capacity as treasurer received an excessive contribution in the form of a coordinated communication. Accordingly, the Commission closed its file in this matter.

Documents related to the case will be placed on the public record within 30 days. See Statement of Policy Regarding Disclosure of Closed Enforcement and Related Files, 68 Fed. Reg. 70,426 (Dec. 18, 2003) and Statement of Policy Regarding Placing First General Counsel's Reports on the Public Record, 74 Fed. Reg. 66132 (Dec. 14, 2009). The Factual and Legal Analysis, which explains the Commission's finding, is enclosed for your information.

If you have any questions, please contact Tracey L. Ligon, the attorney assigned to this matter, at (202) 694-1650.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Mark Allen".

Mark Allen  
Acting Assistant General Counsel

Enclosure  
Factual and Legal Analysis

**FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION**

**FACTUAL AND LEGAL ANALYSIS**

**RESPONDENTS:** Friends of John McCain Inc. and Keith A. Davis  
in his official capacity as Treasurer  
John McCain  
Ruth McClung for Congress and Anne Loftfield in  
her official capacity as Treasurer  
Ruth McClung  
Kelly for Congress and Kristen L. Smith in her  
official capacity as Treasurer  
Jesse Kelly

**MUR: 6405**

**I. INTRODUCTION**

This matter was generated by a complaint filed with the Federal Election Commission (the "FEC" or "Commission") by the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee, alleging violations of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended (the "Act"), by Friends of John McCain Inc. and Keith A. Davis in his official capacity as treasurer ("McCain Committee"), John McCain, Ruth McClung for Congress and Anne Loftfield in her official capacity as treasurer ("McClung Committee"), Ruth McClung, Kelly for Congress and Kristen L. Smith in her official capacity as treasurer ("Kelly Committee"), and Jesse Kelly.<sup>1</sup>

In October 2010, Senator John McCain's authorized campaign committee aired two television advertisements in which McCain and then-Arizona Senator Jon Kyl appeared together and urged the election of the Republican candidates in Arizona's 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> Congressional districts, Ruth McClung and Jesse Kelly, respectively, and the defeat of

---

<sup>1</sup> On September 1, 2014, the Act was transferred from Title 2 of the United States Code to new Title 52 of the United States Code.

McClung's and Kelly's opponents.<sup>2</sup> The Complaint alleges that the McCain campaign coordinated the advertisements with McClung and Kelly, which resulted in McCain making an excessive in-kind contribution to each. Further, the Complaint alleges that the advertisement caused McCain's authorized committee to "violate[] the conditions" of its authorized committee status because 52 U.S.C. § 30102(e)(3) (formerly 2 U.S.C. § 432(e)(3)) prohibits a political committee that "supports . . . more than one candidate" from being an authorized committee.<sup>3</sup>

In response to the Complaint, the McCain Committee denies that the advertisements were coordinated, and argues that the Complaint does not explain how the "coordinated communications" conduct standards were met or allege any coordination-related facts. McCain Resp. at 2 (Dec. 13, 2010). With respect to the allegation that the committee violated its authorized committee status, the McCain Committee argues that the ads at issue were consistent with its status because the communications ultimately supported Senator McCain's candidacy and because the committee was permitted to sponsor independent communications that referenced other candidates. *Id.* at 2-6.

For the reasons set forth below, the Commission (1) finds no reason to believe that McCain and the McCain Committee made, and McClung, the McClung Committee, Kelly, and the Kelly Committee received an excessive contribution in the form of a coordinated communication; and (2) dismisses the allegation that the McCain Committee violated 52

---

<sup>2</sup> McCain was a candidate for re-election in 2010; Kyl, therefore, was not a candidate in the 2010 election. McClung and Kelly each lost their election.

<sup>3</sup> Because of Senator McCain's knowledge of campaign finance law, the Complaint requests that the Commission determine whether the violations were knowing and willful. Compl. at 3-4 (Oct. 21, 2010).

U.S.C. § 30102(e)(3) (formerly 2 U.S.C. § 432(e)(3)) by running ads that “support” another candidate.

## II. FACTUAL AND LEGAL ANALYSIS

### A. Factual Background

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

Senator McCain was a candidate for re-election in 2010. Ruth McClung and Jesse Kelly were 2010 Congressional candidates in Arizona’s 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> Congressional districts, respectively. On or about October 18, 2010, the McCain Committee began airing two television advertisements titled “Vote Ruth McClung” and “Vote Jesse Kelly,” featuring Senator McCain and his fellow Arizona Senator, Jon Kyl. McCain and Kyl are seated next to each other in front of a solid black background and speak directly to the camera for the duration of the advertisements. For the first five seconds of each advertisement, a caption appears at the bottom of the screen identifying the Senators as “Arizona Senators Jon Kyl and John McCain.”

The scripts of the advertisements are as follows.

#### Script for “Vote Ruth McClung”

- McCain: Arizonians are struggling, yet Raul Grijalva voted for the failed stimulus, Obamacare, and tax increases that have devastated our state and nation.
- Kyl: Grijalva even led the call for a boycott of our own State that costs Arizona jobs and millions of dollars, hurting us all.
- McCain: We urge you to elect Ruth McClung. She’ll do what’s right for Arizona.<sup>4</sup> I’m John McCain and

<sup>4</sup> While McCain recites this sentence the following text appears on the screen: “Please elect Ruth McClung. What’s right for Arizona.” (emphasis in original).

I approve this message.

See [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MEDoaGQE8\\_I](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MEDoaGQE8_I).

Script for "Vote Jesse Kelly"

- McCain: While Arizona families are struggling, Gabrielle Giffords voted for the failed liberal Pelosi-Obama agenda.
- Kyl: She voted for the failed stimulus package and Obamacare, and received a grade of "F" from the National Taxpayers Union for supporting so much spending and debt.
- McCain: Gabrielle Giffords is out of step with Arizona. And that's why we need Jesse Kelly in Congress.<sup>5</sup> I'm John McCain and I approve this message.

See <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pWYD1JuRYWw.html/>.

At the end of each advertisement, the following written message appears on the screen along with footage of Senator McCain outdoors, looking into the camera:

VOTE TUESDAY  
November 2<sup>nd</sup>

ARIZONA'S  
JOHN McCAIN  
U.S. SENATE

JohnMcCain.com  
Text McCain to 69872 (MYUSA)

AUTHORIZED BY JOHN McCAIN, PAID FOR BY FRIENDS OF JOHN McCAIN.

The McCain Committee disclosed that it made independent expenditures for "media" and "media production" totaling \$183,744 on October 19, 2010, in support of Ruth McClung

---

<sup>5</sup> While McCain recites this sentence the following text appears on the screen: "Please elect Jesse Kelly. What's right for Arizona." (emphasis in original).

and Jesse Kelly (\$91,872 for each). *See Friends of John McCain Inc. 2010 Post-Gen. Report* at 267-70 (Dec. 2, 2010).

## B. Analysis

The Complaint alleges that the McCain Committee coordinated the television advertisements with McClung and Kelly, respectively, resulting in the McCain Committee making an excessive in-kind contribution to each campaign and violating the conditions of its authorized committee status. Compl. at 3. Under the Act, a candidate's authorized campaign committee may contribute up to \$2,000 per election to another candidate's authorized campaign committee.<sup>6</sup> 52 U.S.C. § 30102(e)(3)(B) (formerly 2 U.S.C. § 432(e)(3)(B)). A contribution includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money or anything of value made by any person for the purpose of influencing a federal election. 52 U.S.C. § 30101(8)(A)(i) (formerly 2 U.S.C. § 431(8)(A)(i)). The term "anything of value" includes in-kind contributions. 11 C.F.R. § 100.52(d)(1). In-kind contributions include expenditures made by any person "in cooperation, consultation, or concert, with, or at the request or suggestion of, a candidate, his authorized political committees, or their agents." 52 U.S.C. § 30116(a)(7)(B)(i) (formerly 2 U.S.C. § 441a(a)(7)(B)(i)).

Under 11 C.F.R. § 109.21, a communication is coordinated if it: (1) is paid for by a person other than the candidate or candidate's committee; (2) satisfies one or more of the four content standards set forth at 11 C.F.R. § 109.21(c); and (3) satisfies one or more of the six conduct standards set forth at 11 C.F.R. § 109.21(d). Expenditures for communications that

---

<sup>6</sup> The Complaint cites to the contribution limit at 52 U.S.C. § 30116(a)(1) (formerly 2 U.S.C. § 441a(a)(1)); however, the applicable limit for contributions by an authorized campaign committee to another authorized campaign committee is at 52 U.S.C. § 30102(e)(3)(B) (formerly 2 U.S.C. § 432(e)(3)(B)).

are coordinated with a candidate or a candidate's authorized committee are considered contributions to that candidate. 52 U.S.C. § 30116(a)(7)(B)(i) (formerly 2 U.S.C. § 441a(a)(7)(B)(i)). Thus, if the McCain Committee coordinated the advertisements with the Kelly or McClung committees, the costs of the advertisements are an in-kind contribution from the McCain Committee, and could not exceed the \$2,000 contribution limit.

The available information does not show that the communications were coordinated. The first prong of the coordinated communication test is satisfied because the McCain Committee is a third-party payor with respect to the portion of the ads that benefitted the Kelly and McClung committees. The second prong, the content standard, is also satisfied because each advertisement contains express advocacy under 11 C.F.R. § 100.22(a). See 11 C.F.R. § 109.21(c)(3). Commission regulations set forth that "expressly advocating" includes any communication that uses phrases such as "vote for the President," "re-elect your Congressman," "Smith for Congress," *inter alia*. 11 C.F.R. § 100.22(a). The "Vote Jesse Kelly" advertisement expressly advocated the election of Kelly by asking the viewer to "Please elect Jesse Kelly;" and the "Vote Ruth McClung" advertisement expressly advocated McClung's election by stating "We urge you to elect Ruth McClung."

Although the payment and content prongs of the coordinated communications regulations appear to be satisfied in this matter, the available information does not indicate that the conduct prong is met. The conduct prong is satisfied where any of the following types of conduct occurs: (1) the communication was created, produced, or distributed at the request or suggestion of a candidate or his campaign; (2) the candidate or his campaign was materially involved in decisions regarding the communication; (3) the communication was

created, produced, or distributed after substantial discussions with the campaign or its agents; (4) the parties contracted with or employed a common vendor that used or conveyed material information about the campaign's plans, projects, activities or needs, or used material information gained from past work with the candidate to create, produce, or distribute the communication; (5) the payor employed a former employee or independent contractor of the candidate who used or conveyed material information about the campaign's plans, projects, activities or needs, or used material information gained from past work with the candidate to create, produce, or distribute the communication; or (6) the payor republished campaign material. *See* 11 C.F.R. § 109.21(d).

The available information does not present specific facts indicating that the conduct prong is met, and the McCain Committee has specifically denied that the conduct prong is satisfied under 11 C.F.R. § 109.21(d). In a sworn declaration, Mark A. Buse, campaign manager for the McCain Committee during the 2010 general election period, denies that the advertisements at issue were created at the request or suggestion of, or with the material involvement of, any agent of Jesse Kelly for U.S. Congress or Ruth McClung for Congress. *See* McCain Resp., Buse Decl. ¶¶ 4-7. Buse also avers that the McCain Committee did not employ the services of any former employee or independent contractor of Jesse Kelly for U.S. Congress or Ruth McClung for Congress, and had no common vendors with the campaigns. *See id.* ¶¶ 8-9.

Given these denials and the absence of any other information indicating coordination, it does not appear that the advertisements at issue constituted coordinated communications that resulted in excessive contributions. Accordingly, the Commission finds no reason to



believe that McCain and the McCain Committee made, and that Ruth McClung and Ruth McClung for Congress or Anne Loftfield in her official capacity as treasurer or Jesse Kelly and Kelly for Congress and Kristen L. Smith in her official capacity as treasurer received an excessive contribution in the form of a coordinated communication.

The Complaint also alleges that the McCain Committee jeopardized its authorized committee status by providing “support” to the McClung and Kelly campaigns in violation of 2 U.S.C. § 432(e)(3) (now 52 U.S.C. § 30102(e)(3)), an allegation that may not require coordination between the committees. In response to this allegation, the McCain Committee argues that the advertisements at issue were consistent with its authorized committee status because the communications “ultimately furthered Senator McCain’s candidacy, and references to other candidates were critical to that objective” and because the Committee is permitted to sponsor independent communications that reference other candidates.

The Act provides that “[n]o political committee which supports or has supported more than one candidate may be designated as an authorized committee.” See 52 U.S.C. § 30102(e)(3)(A), (B) (formerly 2 U.S.C. § 432(e)(3)(A), (B)); 11 C.F.R. § 102.13(c)(1), (2). Neither the Act nor the corresponding regulations define the term “support,” but 52 U.S.C. § 30102(e)(3)(B) (formerly 2 U.S.C. § 432(e)(3)(B)) does specify that “the term ‘support’ does *not* include a contribution by any authorized committee in amounts of \$2,000 or less to an authorized committee of any other candidate.” 52 U.S.C. § 30102(e)(3)(B) (formerly 2 U.S.C. § 432(e)(3)(B)); see also 11 C.F.R. § 102.13(c)(2). The question presented by this allegation is whether 52 U.S.C. § 30102(e)(3)(B) (formerly 2 U.S.C. § 432(e)(3)(B)) prohibits an authorized committee of a federal candidate — in this case the McCain Committee — from

“supporting” another federal candidate by paying for independent communications that expressly advocate that candidate’s election.

Although this precise question has not been addressed by the Supreme Court, the Supreme Court has clarified the state of the law concerning independent expenditures in a number of other contexts.<sup>7</sup> Specifically, in *Buckley v. Valeo*, the Supreme Court struck down limits on independent expenditures for most individuals and groups. See 424 U.S. 1 (1976). In doing so, the Court distinguished between the potential for corruption that attaches to contributions and coordinated expenditures, and those that might develop from independent expenditures, finding that independent expenditures do not present a danger of corruption. See *id.* at 20-47.<sup>8</sup>

Subsequently, in *Colorado Republican Federal Campaign Committee v. FEC* (*Colorado I*), 518 U.S. 604 (1996), the Court found that the potential for or appearance of

---

<sup>7</sup> The Commission has determined in an enforcement matter that 2 U.S.C. § 432(e) (now 52 U.S.C. § 30102(e)) precluded a candidate’s “principal campaign committee from making expenditures on behalf of another candidate, thus supporting more than one candidate, and still remaining a principal campaign committee.” See Conciliation Agreement ¶ IV.13, MUR 2841 (Jenkins) (Dec. 11, 1992) (finding probable cause to believe that an authorized committee violated Section 432(e) by paying for newspaper ads endorsing and advocating the nomination of another candidate). In a subsequent enforcement matter, the Commission rejected OGC’s recommendation based on the Commission’s reasoning in MUR 2841, though the four Commissioners did not agree on the reasoning for that decision. See MUR 3676 (Stupak) (Jan. 11, 1995) (rejecting OGC’s recommendation that an authorized committee, which made an independent expenditure supporting another candidate, violated 2 U.S.C. § 432(e)(3) and thereby jeopardized its own authorized committee status).

<sup>8</sup> In a subsequent enforcement matter, MUR 3676 (Stupak), Commissioner Thomas issued a Statement of Reasons dated February 8, 1995, in which he stated that, “[i]n light of the Supreme Court’s decision in *Buckley v. Valeo*, its immediate impact on Congress, the scant legislative history of § 432(e)(3) [now 52 U.S.C. § 30102(e)(3)], and the incongruous results which flow from the Office of General Counsel’s construction, I cannot believe that Congress intended § 432(e)(3) [now 52 U.S.C. § 30102(e)(3)] to prohibit the making of independent expenditures by authorized political committees.” Thomas Statement of Reasons at 5 (citing *Public Citizen v. U.S. Dep’t of Justice*, 491 U.S. 440, 454 (1989) (quoting *Church of the Holy Trinity v. United States*, 143 U.S. 457, 459 (1892) (“‘Frequently words of general meaning are used in a statute, words broad enough to include an act in question, and yet a consideration of the whole legislation, or of the circumstances surrounding its enactment, or of the absurd results which follow from giving such broad meaning to the words, makes it unreasonable to believe that the legislator intended to include the particular act.’”)).

corruption — which the *Buckley* Court found sufficient to justify limiting contributions — was not present to an extent that would justify limiting independent spending by political parties on behalf of their candidates. *Id.* at 617-19. Accordingly, the Court concluded that the First Amendment precludes application of limits to independent campaign expenditures by political parties. *Id.*

Recently, in *Citizens United v. FEC*, the Supreme Court reaffirmed that “independent expenditures, including those made by corporations, do not give rise to corruption or the appearance of corruption,” and thus cannot constitutionally be limited. 558 U.S. 310, 357 (2010).

It is unlikely that independent spending by authorized committees would be deemed more potentially corrupting than independent expenditures by individuals, political parties, or corporations, each of which has been found to have a constitutional right to make unlimited independent expenditures. Therefore, the Commission dismisses the allegation that John McCain and Friends of John McCain Inc. and Keith A. Davis in his official capacity as treasurer violated 52 U.S.C. § 30102(e)(3)(A) (formerly 2 U.S.C. § 432(e)(3)(A)).