From: Dawn Stanko
To: USOGE
Subject: Proposed Rule: Legal Expense Fund Regulation (RIN 3209-AA50)
Date: Tuesday, June 21, 2022 9:17:39 AM

Dear Sirs

I oppose the OGE's proposed legal expense fund regulation as drafted. OGE should remove the exception that makes the compliance with the regulation optional. I find it ridiculous that I even have to type this. If a regulation is optional then it's not a regulation, right? I recall being told that ignorance to the law is not an excuse. Like playing Monopoly, if one doesn't agree with the rules of the game, then it's another game, NOT Monopoly. If a regulation is optional then it's not a regulation.

Replace the proposed recusal requirement with a broader 5-year recusal requirement that prevents donors of cash gifts from influencing decisions, policies or regulations affecting them or the industries in which they substantial interests, otherwise this is just Corruption. Let see what other countries have issues with corruption, China, Russia, Belarus etc. To spell it out for those whose education is lacking, COUNTRIES OTHER THAN DEMOCRACIES, BECAUSE WE HAVE THE RULE OF LAW!

Allow nonprofit charities (501(c)(3) organizations) on an equal footing with large law firms by allowing them to hire legal counsel for whistleblowers. The outside money is CORRUPTING our government and it's officials, instead of SERVING THE CITIZENS. Of which I am one, and we all pay to have a common government to provide protection against the corruption of foreign governments. Do I have to list them again, or can you remember from the paragraph previous?

I wish to leave a better country for my children and grandchildren, and we must protect them from the "legal minds" that think the laws are for other people who don't have enough money to buy their rights.

Dawn Stanko
9828 Concord Rd
Dublin, OH 43017