

LNC Executive Committee Meeting

Teleconference July 6, 1999

Present: David Bergland, Chair
Hugh Butler, Vice Chair
Steve Givot, Secretary (joined the meeting at 8:34 PM)
Mark Tuniewicz
Joe Dehn

Staff: Steve Dasbach, National Director

Also present: John Buttrick (AZ), At-Large Representative

The meeting was called to order by Bergland at 8:30 EDT.

Item: Comments to FEC

(Discussion of this topic is continued from the Executive Committee meeting of June 22, 1999 at which more details were discussed.)

Bergland led a discussion of what written comments should be submitted in response to the FEC's request for comments in response to a petition it had received.

Dehn said that our position should support cutting regulations and increasing exemptions.

Bergland asked Dehn whether he favored making comments beyond the narrow issues related to the proposed rulemaking.

Dasbach said that he believed that it would be appropriate to make a general statement regarding the party's position on government regulation of campaigns and elections.

Dehn said that our comments might also state that we do not support the current debate-related regulations because we do not support regulation as a means to address perceived problems.

Bergland said that Dehn's and Dasbach's approaches are not mutually exclusive. He said that he would like to include a discussion of the corrupt and bogus nature of the current regulatory scheme.

Givot said that he liked the approach taken by the LPNJ in its testimony on state regulation.

Dasbach said that we first need to decide what decision by the FEC we would like to see enacted. Givot and Butler agreed.

Bergland said that the LP was in a conundrum. While the LP might benefit from certain actions by the FEC, the LP does not support government action to implement that result.

Givot said that there were three possible actions which the FEC might take: increase regulation, maintain the current regulations, or reduce regulation. He asked others which of these outcomes the LP would like to see happen.

Bergland said that if the FEC changes the rules as the petitioners have requested, that the LP would greatly benefit.

Tuniewicz said that he was not certain that the LP should comment at all. He said that there seems to be a lack of consensus among Executive Committee members. He pointed out that the LP would likely have many other opportunities to comment on other, similar legislation, so there is no need to take a position on this particular issue.

Dasbach said that the current regulation requires debate sponsors to establish objective criteria. He said that debate sponsors do not comply with this regulation.

Bergland said that a statement can be made that the current requirement of objective criteria has not been adhered to in the past. We could go on to say that this is evidence that having an organization such as the FEC to implement such regulations is not viable.

Dasbach said that we should also say that adoption of FEC-established debate inclusion criteria is also not a good solution.

Givot said that he opposes taking a position to increase regulation even if it benefits the LP and that he opposes taking a position calling for more strict enforcement of current regulations.

Bergland said that we could point out that the FEC is not enforcing its current regulation and that to do so is unworkable.

Dasbach said that if we do not have a position that we support on this issue, it is probably a waste of our time to make written comment.

Considerable discussion ensued on the detail of the current law and whether the LP should make any written comment at all.

Tuniewicz moved to adjourn. The motion failed.

Givot moved that the LP file no response to the FEC's request for comments.

Tuniewicz seconded.

The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:21 PM EDT.