CLARK HILL

Charles R. Spies T 202.572.8663 F 202.572.8683 Email: cspies@clarkhill.com Clark Hill PLC 1001 Pennsylvania Avenue NW Suite 1300 South Washington. DC 20004 T 202.772.0909 F 202.772.0919

clarkhill.com

May 10, 2019

Jeff S. Jordan
Assistant General Counsel
Complaints Examination & Legal Administration
Federal Election Commission
1050 First Street, NE
Washington, DC 20463
VIA EMAIL at cela@fec.gov

Re: MUR 7594: Pelican PAC's response to complaint

Dear Mr. Jordan:

We represent Pelican PAC and William Vanderbook in his official capacity as treasurer (the "Respondents"), and we write in response to your letter regarding the Complaint filed in the above-referenced matter alleging that the Respondents accepted contributions from a foreign corporation. We'll make this blunt, as a lengthy response is not warranted here. The Complaint is meritless on its face. The fact that the Commission has not administratively dismissed it is simply ridiculous. The fact that the Commission has opened an enforcement matter with (presumably) over 300 respondents based on this meritless Complaint is an abuse of the complaint process and a waste of Commission resources. The fact that the Commission is devoting the taxpayer resources necessary to process a meritless matter with over 300 respondents, or expects those respondents to incur legal costs responding to it, is inconsistent with the Commission's important disclosure and enforcement mission and an indication of a severe breakdown in the complaint intake and internal respondent naming process.

The Commission's Office of General Counsel and Office of Complaints Examination and Legal Administration have the ability to administratively dismiss a frivolous matter through its Enforcement Priority System. They should have done so here, and now should promptly do so.

The Complaint alleges that Enbridge, Inc., an apparent Canadian company, "has made hundreds of contributions *directly* to American political campaigns and dozens of American political party committees." That statement is false. In actuality, Enbridge-DCP PAC, the

¹ Compl. at 1 (emphasis in original).

May 10, 2019 Page 2

connected committee of Enbridge (U.S.) Inc., made the contributions. Those contributions, based on a review of Enbridge-DCP PAC's periodic filings, appear to be derived through funds raised from Enbridge (U.S.) Inc.'s American employees. A domestic company making contributions through its connected PAC using funds derived from its American employees is on its face clearly permissible. Complainant at best has a severe misunderstanding of federal campaign finance law.

The Act and Commission regulations prohibit the making of, or **knowing** acceptance of, contributions from foreign nationals.² A foreign national is an individual who is not a U.S. citizen and who is "not lawfully admitted for permanent residence." The term also includes a foreign government, political party, or business entity.⁴ FEC regulations define "knowingly" as having actual knowledge or having awareness "of facts that would lead a reasonable person to conclude that there is a substantial probability that the source of the funds solicited, accepted or received is a foreign national" or being "aware of facts that would lead a reasonable person to inquire whether the source of the funds solicited, accepted or received is a foreign national" but failing to inquire.⁵

Here, the contributions from Enbridge-DCP PAC appear to be domestic funds raised by a domestic corporation's political committee, and were therefore legal. However, even if they were not, there is no allegation or indication that the Respondents herein **knowingly** accepted a foreign contribution. Enbridge-DCP PAC is a federally-registered political committee, and has been, with various name changes, since 2006. And, as stated, the funds used to make Enbridge-DCP PAC's contributions appear to have come from its American employees. In short, absent actual evidence to the contrary (which wasn't provided in the Complaint) no reasonable person could have concluded that there was even a risk that the funds were from a foreign source. Additionally, the Complaint does not allege any knowledge of facts that would have led a reasonable person to inquire about the source of the funds. That is because all facts indicate that the contributions were lawful.

This Complaint should be immediately reassigned to the Office of Complaints Examination and Legal Administration for dismissal through the Commission's Enforcement Priority System. Alternatively, because it is completely meritless, the Commission should find no reason to believe a violation occurred.

⁵ See 11 C.F.R. § 110.20(a)(4).



² See 52 U.S.C. 30121(a); 11 C.F.R. § 110.20.

³ See 52 U.S.C. 30121(b); 22 § U.S.C. 611(b).

⁴ See id.

May 10, 2019 Page 3

Thank you for your prompt consideration of this matter, and please do not hesitate to contact me directly at (202) 640-6684 with any questions.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles R. Spies Derek H. Ross

Counsel to Pelican PAC and William Vanderbook in his official capacity as treasurer



CASE.

MUR 7594

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION Washington, DC 20463

Statement of Designation of Counsel Provide one form for each Respondent/Witness

Note: You May E-Mail Form to: CELA@fec.gov

Name of Counsel: _	Charles R. Spies; De	rek H. Ross		
Firm:	Clark Hill PLC			
Address:	1001 Pennsylvania A	ve. NW, Suite 13	00 S	
	Washington, DC 200	04		
Telephone: (202)_572-8663	Fax: (_	202	572-8683
The above named inc				
	alf before the Comr		nunication	Treasurer
	To the 1970 Mill than a little of the think of the 1970 in the 197		iunication	
authorized to receive and to act on my beh Date RESPONDENT:	Signature Pelican PAC and	nission. William Vanderbr	ook in his o	Treasurer Title
and to act on my beh 1 28	Signature Pelican PAC and (Committee Name/Com	William Vanderbr	ook in his o	Treasurer Title

provisions of 52 U.S.C. § 30109(a)(12)(A). This section prohibits making public any notification or investigation conducted by the Federal Election Commission without the express written consent of the person receiving the notification or the person with respect to whom the investigation is made.