

TO: Laura Billman  
FROM: Chuck Muth  
DATE: March 26, 2018

This memorandum is in response to your letter of March 20 in which you rejected our very modest and legitimate counter-proposal suggestions for your proposed televised "debate" on April 11, 2018.

It's unfortunate, though not surprising, that Mr. Oscarson doesn't think enough of the voters of Assembly District 36 to stand before them in multiple public settings to defend his record, answer their questions, and make his case for continuing to (mis)represent them in the next legislative session.

If I had Mr. Oscarson's record, I'd probably be scared to death to face Mr. Hof in a public forum as well.

We will give you our official answer on whether or not we'll participate in your one-sided, totally scripted and tightly controlled April 11 debate this Friday, March 30, 2018.

In the meantime, your letter includes numerous examples of falsehoods and misinformation that I want to correct for the record...

- 1.) The fact that you and your campaign completely planned this proposed debate directly with the television station as to date, time and moderator without any input whatsoever from our campaign is the very definition of "collusion."
- 2.) We never in any way said Ms. O'Donnell wasn't "professional." We never said she wasn't "well known." And we never said she wasn't "well liked in the community." You made all of that up and should be ashamed of yourself for doing so.
- 3.) I have no idea what "organization that you claim endorses your candidate" you're referring to. If you're referring to the Nye County Republican Party you're simply and typically wrong. The Nye GOP does not endorse candidates - although it's true your candidate has been "excommunicated" from the party for breaking his word in 2015 by voting for the largest tax hike in state history.

4.) The notion that your candidate's schedule is too "busy" to engage with Mr. Hof in multiple public forums and debates throughout the district is beyond laughable. Frankly, for you to try to pass off such a ridiculous excuse for ducking the public is embarrassing.

5.) Contrary to your absurd claim, I never "dismissed the local press" and "a television station that is in a county where most of Assembly District 36 voters reside." All we proposed was that we take these discussions, debates or forums into other areas of the district in addition to the Pahrump core.

Do you have difficulty understanding plain English or are you just being intentionally deceptive?

6.) You claim "the purpose of a debate is to let the public judge a candidate by their knowledge of the issues and their solutions." Yet the very format and restrictions your campaign has insisted upon for this proposed show denies that to the public.

7.) As for your inclusion of Dr. Bradley in your invitation, we certainly understand your hidden purpose. It will simply reduce the amount of time in your sole, one-hour program that Mr. Oscarson will be on the hot seat in trying to defend his voting record.

That said, I will repeat – again since you seem to be having some difficulty comprehending plain English – that we specifically stated that we welcome the inclusion of Dr. Bradley in a series of public debates that your candidate steadfastly is running away from.

8.) As for your ridiculous suggestion that if I "wish to debate James, then please move into the district and file for office," no such notion was ever raised. Our entire counter-proposal was centered on the candidates themselves and only the candidates.

However, if you think it'd be productive and help the public make a fully informed decision in this race to have you and I debate in a public setting as advisers to the respective campaigns, just let me know and I'll be there with bells on.

Unless, of course, you're "too busy."

That said, we'll give you our answer to your April 11 debate invitation this Friday.

Sincerely yours,



Chuck Muth  
*Counsel on Government Relations*