

No. 77724-1

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

VOTERS EDUCATION COMMITTEE *et al.*,
Plaintiffs/Appellants,

v.

STATE OF WASHINGTON *ex rel.* WASHINGTON STATE PUBLIC
DISCLOSURE COMMISSION *et al.*,
Defendants/Respondents,

and

DEBORAH SENN,
Intervenor.

**BRIEF *AMICUS CURIAE* OF THE CAMPAIGN LEGAL CENTER
IN SUPPORT OF RESPONDENTS**

HUGH D. SPITZER, WSBA No. 5827
FOSTER PEPPER PLLC
111 Third Avenue, Suite 3400
Seattle, WA 98101
206-447-4400

J. GERALD HEBERT
PAUL S. RYAN
EVA HOWE
CAMPAIGN LEGAL CENTER
1640 Rhode Island Ave., NW
Suite 650
Washington, DC 20036
202-736-2200

Counsel of Record

*Attorneys for Amicus Curiae
Campaign Legal Center*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. STATEMENT OF INTEREST	1
II. STATEMENT OF THE CASE	1
III. ARGUMENT.....	3
A. The VEC admittedly exists for the purpose of influencing candidate elections and is a “political committee” under Washington state law	5
1. By registering with Internal Revenue Service as a Section 527 political organization, the VEC publicly declared that its purpose is to influence candidate elections	5
2. The VEC made payments for the purpose of opposing the election of a state candidate. As a result, it became a “political committee” under Washington state law	6
3. In its brief, the VEC characterizes its advertising as “election-related speech”—conceding its intent was to influence a candidate election.....	7
B. U.S. Supreme Court decisions in <i>Buckley</i> and <i>McConnell</i> make clear that the VEC’s election-related speech may constitutionally be regulated.....	9
1. The U.S. Supreme Court in <i>Buckley</i> made clear that disclosure requirements for Section 527 political organizations such as the VEC raise no vagueness problems	9
2. The <i>Buckley</i> distinction between “express advocacy” and “issue advocacy” led to widespread circumvention of campaign finance laws and was declared “functionally meaningless” by the U.S. Supreme Court in <i>McConnell</i>	11
3. The U.S. Supreme Court in <i>McConnell</i> made clear that the statutory terms “support” and “oppose”—which serve as the foundation of Washington’s definition of “political committee”—are not unconstitutionally vague	15
4. Washington’s statutory definition of “political	

	committee” clearly and constitutionally encompasses the VEC	17
IV.	CONCLUSION.....	20

