



FED
OCT 21 12 11 PM '97

California Reform Party Congressional Committee

John Evans
Treasurer
P O Box 81486
Bakersfield, CA 93380-1486

Telephone (805) 393-4345
Fax (805) 393-4345

Supplement to AOR 1997-18

October 6, 1997

Federal Election Commission
999 "E" Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20463

Subject: AOR 1997-18

Mr. N. Bradley Litchfield
Associate General Council

Dear Mr. Litchfield:

This refers to your letter dated August 21, 1997, which requested additional clarification of various points raised in my last response. This also refers to our telephone conversation on this same matter.

First I would like to address the purpose of the California Reform Party Congressional Committee. Article II Section 1 of the By-Laws states that the purpose of the California Reform Party Congressional Committee is to:

- A. Ensure, as far as possible, the election of members of the Reform Party of California to the United States House of Representatives.
- B. To provide a vehicle to raise funds and provide support to the candidates of the Reform Party of California to the United States House of Representatives.
- C. To provide training and support to those candidates who wish to participate.
- D. To provide and implement a coordinated campaign.

Second I would like to give you a time line on our committee activities.

A. Our first meeting was held in Sacramento on January 24, 1996 in which five (5) of the Congressional candidates were represented along with one member of the Board of Directors of the Reform Party of California. It was agreed to form a Congressional Committee.

B. On February 24, 1996 the second meeting was held in Los Angeles in which six (6) Congressional candidates were represented. Mr. Michael Farris, Chairman of the

Reform Party/CA and two Board of Director members were in attendance. At this meeting Mr. John Place was elected as Chairman and Mr. John Evans was elected Treasurer. The by-laws were presented for approval.

C. During March 1996 all California Reform Party Congressional candidates were provided with FEC filing forms. (I.E.) FEC Form 1-- Statement of Organization, FEC Form 2-- Statement of Candidacy, FEC Form 3-- Report of Receipts and Disbursements along with instructions. They were also provided the Instructions and Forms for completing the required Financial Disclosure Statement.

D. On June 30, 1996 the Committee had received a majority of members approval of the By-Laws. At this time seven (7) of the ten (10) Congressional candidates had expressed a desire to be members of the Committee.

E. On July 22, 1996, as treasurer, I filed with the FEC a Statement of Organization. On August 26, 1996, in reply to a FEC request, an amendment was filed which showed that the Committee was not Connected or Affiliated to any other Committee.

F. During the National Convention, held in Long Beach, California, the Committee held a National Press Conference attended by six (6) candidates.

During 1996 the Reform Party of California and the National Reform Party were being formed and had neither the organizational or financial means to assist the Federal candidates. This was not done due to not wanting to help, but out of necessity.

On March 24, 1997 the Committee ask for an advisory opinion as to being **A** State Party Committee of the National Reform Party. The Committee did not want to be **THE** State Committee of the National Reform Party. If there can be only one State Party Committee then this should be reserved for the Reform Party of California only.

On July 31, 1997 in response to an inquire from the FEC it was stated that the committee is not affiliated with any other state committee and has not and will not support any other Reform Party candidates. These answers were in reply to specific questions from the FEC of which the questions and answers were ambiguous and misleading.

The Commission is authorized under the Act to make formal finding that an organization qualifies as a State committee. If the Commission can authorize only one State party in each state then this honor should go to the Reform Party of California. It is only through their efforts to get the Reform Party on the California ballot that the Congressional candidates were able to become candidates and without which there would be no CRPCC. At no time has the CRPCC wished to supersede the RP/CA as the State Committee.

In response to your letter of August 21, 1997 I would like to address your concerns.

1. As stated above this question is somewhat ambiguous. The CRPCC as a committee will not directly support other Federal or State candidates except Congressional candidates that wish to participate, as this could violate FEC rules and

regulations. Unlike the DCCC and the RCCC the CRPCC will not pick which candidates it will support and which it will not support. Any Reform Party Congressional candidate who meets Federal and State election requirements and wishes our help will receive it.

Each member, on their own, can support and be active in other Reform Party Committees or candidates committees. This is our Constitutional right. I personally will support, independent from the CRPCC, every Reform Party candidates from President to local dog catcher that qualify under the election laws and are qualified for the office.

2. As stated "What the CRPCC is requesting is to be a Local Party Committee". The Committee would be responsible for the day-to-day operation of the political party at the District level, the 52 Congressional Districts, in the State of California. The Commission can make a finding as part of an advisory opinion request in connection with a specific proposed activity a requester wishes to conduct which involves its status as a local committee.

In the August 1996 Campaign Guide for Political Party Committees under Contribution Limits it states that "A state party committee shares its limits with local committees in the same state, unless a local committee's independence can be demonstrated." I believe that the CRPCC has demonstrated its independence. The FEC in different Advisory Opinions has granted State Party Status without having a National Party and as such should grant the CRPCC Local Party Status without having a State Party Committee. If and when the Reform Party/CA obtains its status as the State Party Committee of the Reform Party it can be determined to Affiliate or not.

I would like to restate that the Reform Party/CA should be the State Party Committee of the Reform Party. The CRPCC candidates would not be on the ballot in California if it was not for the actions of the Reform Party/CA.

Respectfully submitted,



John Evans
Treasurer