

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN CAMPAIGN FINANCE LAW



October 23-24, 2013

Objectives

- ▣ Update status of FEC litigation
- ▣ Discuss recent and upcoming rulemakings and policies
- ▣ Review recent legislative activity

Litigation and Policy Update: Topics to be Covered

Litigation and Policy Topics

- ▣ Independent Expenditures
- ▣ Electioneering Communications, Express Advocacy, and PAC Status
- ▣ Contributions
- ▣ Technology-Related Developments
- ▣ Other Corporate and Labor Activity
- ▣ Other Developments

Independent Expenditures and “Super PACs”

- ▣ *Citizens United*
- ▣ *SpeechNow, EMILY’s List, Carey*
- ▣ “Super PAC” Advisory Opinions
- ▣ *Stop This Insanity*

Citizens United v. FEC

- ▣ Independent expenditures = no corruption
- ▣ Allows corporations/unions to make:
 - ▣ Independent Expenditures
 - ▣ Electioneering Communications
- ▣ Upholds disclosure/reporting requirements
- ▣ Does not address corp./union contributions

I. Independent Expenditures and Super PACs

A. *Citizens United v. FEC*, 558 U.S. 310, 130 S. Ct. 876 (2010).

1. **Supreme Court found ban on corporate independent expenditures and electioneering communications to be unconstitutional.**
2. Essentially, the Court's ruling permits corporations and labor organizations to use treasury funds to make independent expenditures in connection with federal elections and to fund electioneering communications as defined in 2 U.S.C. 434(f).
3. The Supreme Court upheld the reporting requirements for independent expenditures and electioneering communications.
4. The court did not rule on the ban on corporate or union contributions.

***Citizens United* Rulemaking**

- ▣ Commission not enforcing ban on:
 - Corporations/Labor Unions making
 - ▣ Independent expenditures
 - ▣ Electioneering communications

- ▣ NPRM published December 2011

- ▣ Hearing held March 2012

B. *Citizens United* Rulemaking

1. Press Release (Feb. 5, 2010):

“The Commission will no longer enforce statutory and regulatory provisions prohibiting corporations and labor unions from making either independent expenditures or electioneering communications,” available at <http://www.fec.gov/press/press2010/20100205CitizensUnited.shtml>.

2. Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (published December 2011)


- a) NPRM asked for comments on proposed changes to Commission regulations to implement the Supreme Court’s ruling.
- b) Comments were due by February 3, 2012; Reply comments were due by February 17, 2012.
- c) Hearing was March 7, 2012.
- d) NPRM published in Federal Register at 76 Fed. Reg. 80803 (December 27, 2011). Available online at <http://sers.nictusa.com/fosers/showpdf.htm?docid=99892>.

3. More information:

<http://www.fec.gov/law/recentdevelopments.shtml#CorpLaborExpenditures>

Citizens United

Additional interim guidance on FECTube



SpeechNow v. FEC

- ▣ Allows:
 - Unlimited contributions by individuals to IEO PACs
- ▣ Distinguishes:
 - Limits on contributions to:
 - ▣ Candidates
 - ▣ Parties
 - ▣ PACs
- ▣ Upholds
 - Disclosure and reporting requirements

- C. *SpeechNow.org v. FEC*, 567 F. Supp. 2d 70 (D.D.C. 2008); *vacated* 599 F.3d 686 (D.C. Cir. 2010) (en banc).
1. SpeechNow, an unincorporated association registered as a “527” organization, wanted to make independent expenditures that contained express advocacy and wanted to accept contributions for that purpose only from individuals.
 2. SpeechNow alleged that the Act’s contribution limits and political committee disclosure requirements are unconstitutional as applied to its activities. Its main argument was that it presents no risk of corruption and therefore should not be limited to \$5,000 per year in the contributions it receives from individual donors.
 3. The U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit sitting *en banc* held contribution limits unconstitutional as applied to contributions received by independent expenditure-only groups (like SpeechNow), but upheld the Act’s “organizational and reporting requirements” for political committees.

EMILY's List v. FEC

- ▣ Challenge to solicitation and allocation rules
- ▣ D.C. Circuit ordered regulations be vacated
 - Opinion had broad language about nonconnected PAC's First Amendment rights
- ▣ Commission removed the regulations (3/2010)
 - Removed 11 CFR 100.57, 106.6(c) and 106.6(f)

- D.** *EMILY's List v. FEC*, 569 F. Supp. 2d 18 (D.D.C. 2008), *rev'd*, 581 F.3d 1 (D.C. Cir. 2009).
1. Nonconnected PAC challenged rules about solicitation and allocation for federal and non-federal activities at 11 CFR 100.57 and 106.6 as arbitrary and capricious, beyond the scope of the Commission's statutory authority, not promulgated with the proper notice and contrary to the First Amendment.
 2. The United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit ordered that the district court vacate the challenged regulations (9/18/09). The majority opinion broadly discusses the First Amendment rights of nonconnected PACs and states that non-profit entities can receive unlimited contributions from individuals or other nonprofits to use for independent expenditures.
 3. On 11/30/09, the district court ordered that the regulations be vacated, and in March 2010, the Commission adopted rules that removed 11 CFR 100.57 and 106.6(c) and (f). (75 FR 13223, March 19, 2010). See Final Rules at http://www.fec.gov/law/cfr/ej_compilation/2010/notice_2010-08.pdf.

Carey v. FEC

- ▣ National Defense PAC
 - Wanted to use separate bank accounts to accept:
 - Unlimited contributions to fund independent expenditures
 - FECA-limited contributions to contribute to candidates
- ▣ Result:
 - District court granted preliminary relief for plaintiffs, relying on *EMILY's List*
 - FEC negotiated final judgment in plaintiffs' favor
- ▣ Reporting guidance

- E.** *Carey v. FEC*, 791 F. Supp. 2d 121 (D.D.C. 2011).
1. National Defense PAC sought an advisory opinion allowing it to use separate bank accounts to accept unlimited contributions to finance independent expenditures and accept FECA-limited contributions to be used to make contributions. After not receiving the AO it sought, the PAC brought a lawsuit against the FEC.
 2. Relying on *EMILY's List* (summarized above), on 6/14/11 the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia preliminarily enjoined the Commission from enforcing certain provisions of the Act which limit the amount of contributions into a separate bank account for the purpose of making independent expenditures.
 3. The parties then negotiated a final resolution of the case and asked the court to enter a stipulated judgment and consent decree. The court signed the judgment on 8/19/11.
 4. The Commission issued a Statement on *Carey v. FEC* on 10/5/11 to provide reporting guidance for committees that maintain a non-contribution account. The statement is available at <http://www.fec.gov/press/Press2011/20111006postcarey.shtml>.
 5. **More information:**
<http://www.fec.gov/law/recentdevelopments.shtml#HybridPACs>.

“Super PAC” Advisory Opinions

- ▣ 2010-09 (Club for Growth)
- ▣ 2010-11 (Commonsense Ten)
- ▣ 2011-12 (Majority PAC)
- ▣ 2012-18 (National Right to Life Committee, Inc.)
- ▣ 2012-34 (Freedom PAC and Friends of Mike H)

F. “Super PAC” Advisory Opinions

In the wake of the *Citizens United*, *SpeechNow*, and *EMILY’s List* cases, the Commission was presented with advisory opinion requests that explored the boundaries of those advisory opinions (AOs) and, in some cases, what they meant when read together. All AOs are available at the Commission’s searchable system at <http://saos.nictusa.com/saos/searchao>.

1. **AO 2010-09 (Club for Growth)**
A corporation may establish, administer, and pay the costs of an “independent expenditure-only” committee that solicits and accepts funds from only individuals for independent expenditures – much like the one at issue in the *SpeechNow* case. Corporate payments for the administration and solicitation costs would be a contribution to the IE-only committee.
2. **AO 2010-11 (Commonsense Ten)**
An IE-only committee can accept unlimited contributions not just from individuals (as was the case in *SpeechNow*) but also from other political committees, corporations and labor organizations.
3. **AO 2011-12 (Majority PAC)**
Federal officeholders, candidates, and officers of national party committees can solicit funds for IE-only committees, but only up to \$5,000.

4. **AO 2012-18 (National Right to Life Committee, Inc.)**
Corporation's payment of establishment, administrative, and solicitation expenses of an IE-only political committee are contributions.
5. **2012-34 (Freedom PAC and Friends of Mike H)**
A former Senate candidate's campaign committee may use leftover campaign funds to contribute \$10,000 or more to an IE-only political committee.

Stop This Insanity, Inc. Employee Leadership Fund, et al v. FEC

- ❑ AO 2012-01 (Stop This Insanity, Inc. Employee Leadership Fund)
- ❑ A corporation's SSF wanted to use a non-contribution account to fund independent expenditures free of the usual restrictions
- ❑ The district court dismissed the case, distinguishing between SSFs and non-connected PACs

- G. ***Stop This Insanity, Inc. Employee Leadership Fund v. FEC***, 902 F. Supp. 2d.23 (D.D.C. 2012), *appeal filed*, No. 13-5008 (D.C. Cir. Jan. 2, 2013).
1. AOR 2012-01: request by a corporation's separate segregated fund ("SSF") to establish a non-contribution account and to solicit unlimited contributions from members of its restricted class, as well as other persons, in order to fund independent expenditures. The Commission could not reach a majority response.
 2. Stop This Insanity, its SSF the Leadership Fund, and a group of potential contributors filed a complaint in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia challenging the application of contribution and solicitation restrictions to a non-contribution account of an SSF as an unconstitutional limit on their First Amendment rights of freedom of speech and association.

3. On 11/5/12, the court denied the plaintiffs' request for a preliminary injunction and granted the Commission's motion to dismiss the case. The court distinguished between SSFs and nonconnected PACs, stating that an SSF may receive unlimited and undisclosed administrative support from a sponsoring organization, and in exchange, the SSF must limit its solicitations to a restricted class of individuals associated with the connected organization.
4. The plaintiffs appealed to the Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit and oral argument is scheduled for November 19.

II. Electioneering Communications, Express Advocacy and PAC Status

Electioneering Communications, Express Advocacy, and PAC Status

- ▣ *Real Truth About Abortion*
- ▣ *Free Speech*
- ▣ *AFF AO and Hispanic Leadership Fund*
- ▣ *Van Hollen*

Real Truth About Abortion (fka RTAO) v. FEC

- ▣ Challenge to:
 - FEC regulations and enforcement approach affecting independent groups

- ▣ Permissible:
 - Only-reasonable-interpretation test in FEC's definition of express advocacy
 - FEC's case-by-case approach to determining "major purpose"

- A. ***Real Truth about Abortion, Inc. (RTAA) v. FEC (formerly Real Truth about Obama, Inc. v. FEC)***, 796 F. Supp. 2d 736 (E.D. Va. 2011), *aff'd*, 681 F.3d 544 (4th Cir. 2012), *cert. denied*, 133 S. Ct. 841 (U.S. Jan. 7, 2013).
1. The plaintiff brought a pre-enforcement challenge to several FEC regulations and its approach to determining political committee status. RTAA asserted that 11 CFR 100.22(b), defining when a communication "expressly advocates" the election or defeat of a candidate, and the FEC's application of the Supreme Court's "major purpose" test for political committee status are overbroad, too vague, and in violation of the First and Fifth Amendments.
 2. The U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia granted the Commission's request for summary judgment. The court found that the Commission's definition of express advocacy at 11 CFR 100.22(b) is consistent with the Supreme Court's opinion in *FEC v. Wisconsin Right to Life, Inc.*, and that the Commission's "fact-intensive, case-by-case adjudication" of whether a group's major purpose is the election or defeat of federal candidates is lawful.
 3. On 6/12/12, the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit affirmed the district court's ruling. The Fourth Circuit concluded that section 100.22(b)'s definition of express advocacy was consistent with *Wisconsin Right to Life* and *Citizens United* and not unduly vague, and also held that the agency's approach to determining "major purpose" was permissible.
 4. On 1/7/13, the U.S. Supreme Court denied RTAA's request for certiorari.

Free Speech v. FEC

- ▣ AO 2012-11 (Free Speech)
- ▣ 10th Circuit Rejected Challenges to:
 - Only-reasonable-interpretation test in FEC's definition of express advocacy
 - Enforcement approach to political committee status
 - Clear indication test for determining solicitations under FECA
- ▣ *See also:* AO 2012-27 (National Defense Committee)

Free Speech v. FEC

Example: “Environmental Policy”

“President Obama opposes the Government Litigation Savings Act. This is a tragedy for Wyoming ranchers and a boon to Obama’s environmentalist cronies. Obama cannot be counted on to represent Wyoming values and voices as President. This November, call your neighbors. Call your friends. Talk about ranching.”

- B. *Free Speech v. FEC*, Civ. No. 12-127 (D. Wy. March 19, 2013), *aff'd*, --- F.3d ---, 2013 WL 3192086 (10th Cir. June 25, 2013).**
- 1. AO 2012-11 (Free Speech)**

Two advertisements by nonprofit association are express advocacy because they identify a federal candidate with a position on an issue (President Obama/financial bailouts) and instruct viewers to vote against those who take that position on the issue. See *Free Speech v. FEC*.
 2. Similar to *RTAA v. FEC*, this case challenges the regulatory definition of express advocacy in 11 CFR 100.22(b) and the FEC's approach to determining political committee status and when a "solicitation" for "contributions" subject to FECA is made.
 3. Free Speech submitted an advisory opinion request asking whether eleven proposed advertisements about President Obama were express advocacy, whether four proposed donation requests would be "solicitations," and whether the group's proposed activities would require it to register as a political committee. AO 2012-11: Two of eleven Free Speech ads are express advocacy, four are not, and two of the proposed donation requests are not "solicitations."
 4. Free Speech filed suit in the U.S. District Court for the District of Wyoming, arguing that the FEC's regulatory definition of express advocacy as well as its methods of determining "major purpose" and when "solicitations" occur violate the First Amendment.
 5. The district court denied preliminary relief on 10/3/12 and permanent relief on 3/19/13. The court concluded that the FEC's regulatory definition of express advocacy and its case-by-case application of the major purpose test are essential in identifying the communications and entities that are subject to FECA disclosure requirements, which help the electorate make informed decisions. The court also ruled that the FEC's standard for determining when a request for funds "solicits" a "contribution" under FECA is not vague or overbroad.
 6. On 6/25/13, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 10th Circuit affirmed the district court's dismissal of Free Speech's complaint and adopted the district court's opinion as its own.

Hispanic Leadership Fund v. FEC

- ▣ See AO 2012-19 (American Future Fund)
- ▣ Challenge to:
 - FECA's regulation of electioneering communications
- ▣ Whether advertisements included references to “clearly identified” federal candidate

- C. ***Hispanic Leadership Fund, Inc. v. FEC***, 897 F. Supp. 2d 407 (E.D. Va. 2012). This is another constitutional challenge based on whether FECA applies to a group of proposed advertisements, in this case whether proposed television ads qualified as "electioneering communications" based on whether they included references to "clearly identified" federal candidates under 2 U.S.C. 434(f). That in turn depends on whether the candidate's identity is "apparent by unambiguous reference" under 2 U.S.C. 431(18).

1. **AO 2012-19 (American Future Fund)**
 - a) Two broadcast advertisements referencing “Obamacare” and “Romneycare” are electioneering communications because they clearly identify a federal candidate during the electioneering time periods. See *Hispanic Leadership Fund v. FEC*.
 - b) The Commission was unable to approve a response about whether five of eight proposed television ads by American Future Fund referenced a clearly identified federal candidate. The five ads used phrases such as “this Administration” and “the White House” (with visual depictions of the White House), and one included an unidentified audio clip of President Obama’s voice.
2. HLF filed a complaint in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia. HLF wanted to produce essentially identical ads and claimed that its proposed ads were not electioneering communications because they did not reference a clearly identified candidate, but said it was harmed by uncertainty as to whether electioneering communication disclosure requirements applied.
3. On 10/4/12, the district court held that three of the five HLF ads referenced a clearly identified federal candidate and were thus electioneering communications. The court found that an ad criticizing the oil policies of “the White House” and “the Administration” and an ad that referred to “the parents of government run healthcare” together with a textual reference to “the White House” both clearly identified President Obama. But the court held that the ad with the audio clip of Obama’s voice did not clearly identify him unless there was an evidentiary showing that the candidate’s voice was well-recognized. The court rejected HLF’s as-applied challenge to the electioneering communications provisions.
4. Neither party appealed the district court’s decision.

Van Hollen v. FEC

- ▣ Challenge to rules on:
 - Disclosure of contributors to corporations and unions making electioneering communications
- ▣ Alleges:
 - Regulation requires too little disclosure because
 - Only persons giving “for the purpose of furthering electioneering communications” must be disclosed
- ▣ D.C. Cir. decision and remand


- D.** *Van Hollen v. FEC*, 851 F. Supp. 2d 69 (D.D.C.), *rev'd and remanded*, 694 F.3d 108 (D.C. Cir. 2012).
1. Challenge to FEC regulations on the disclosure of donations given to fund electioneering communications.
 2. Representative Van Hollen claims that 11 CFR 104.20(c)(9), which requires the disclosure of any donation of \$1,000 or more to corporations (including nonprofits) or labor organizations when the donation “was made for the purpose of furthering electioneering communications” is arbitrary, capricious and contrary to law.
 3. Van Hollen argues that FECA requires corporations and unions to disclose all donations they receive of \$1,000 or more unless the donations for electioneering communications have been segregated in a separate bank account.
 4. On 3/30/12, the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia found that BCRA clearly requires every person who funds electioneering communications to disclose all contributors. The court also stated that Congress did not delegate authority to the FEC to narrow BCRA’s disclosure requirement through agency rulemaking.

5. But on 9/18/12, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit found that the lower court had erred in holding that Congress “spoke plainly” when it enacted BCRA, thus foreclosing any regulatory construction of the statute by the FEC. The appeals court reversed and remanded the case with instructions to “refer the matter to the FEC for further consideration.” The district court directed the Commission to inform the court whether the Commission “intends to pursue rulemaking or defend its current regulation.”
6. On 10/4/12, the Commission notified the district court that the agency would not initiate a rulemaking and would continue to defend the current regulation at 11 CFR 104.20(c)(9). But on 10/5/12, the Center for Individual Freedom filed a rulemaking petition asking the Commission to revise the regulation, and the district court stayed the case while the Commission considered the petition. On 3/11/13, the Commission informed the court that it would not do a rulemaking at this time, and on 3/12/13, the court lifted the stay. Supplemental briefing before the district court has been completed and argument is scheduled for October 29.

III. Contributions

Contributions

- ▣ Biennial Limit
- ▣ Government Contractors
- ▣ Personal Use

 Information Division
2013-14 Election Cycle

Recent Developments

McCutcheon v. FEC

- ▣ Challenge to Biennial aggregate limits on:
 - Individual contributions to -
 - ▣ Candidates
 - ▣ Non-candidate committees
- ▣ District court dismissed case
- ▣ Now before United States Supreme Court

- A. ***McCutcheon v. FEC***, 893 F. Supp. 2d 133 (D.D.C. 2012) (three-judge court), *noting probable jurisdiction*, 133 S. Ct. 1242 (U.S. Feb. 19, 2013).
1. Plaintiffs Shaun McCutcheon and the RNC argue that the biennial aggregate contribution limits at 2 U.S.C. 441a(a)(3), which currently mean individuals can give \$48,600 to candidates and \$74,600 to non-candidate committees, are unconstitutionally low and violate the First Amendment.
 2. A three-judge panel of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia dismissed the action. The district court re-affirmed that contribution limits are subject to intermediate scrutiny, not strict scrutiny, because they primarily implicate the First Amendment rights of association, not expression, and contributors remain able to express their associational interest in other ways.
 3. The district court held that the government had justified the aggregate contribution limits as a means of preventing circumvention of base contribution limits imposed to further the government's interest in deterring corruption and its appearance. The court found no "danger signs" that the limits were not closely drawn to achieve the governmental anti-corruption interest. The court also noted that despite the aggregate limits, individuals remain free to volunteer, join political associations and engage in independent expenditures.
 4. On 10/9/12, Plaintiffs filed a notice of appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court, and on 2/19/13, the Supreme Court noted probable jurisdiction, agreeing to review the case. The Supreme Court held oral argument on October 8, 2013.

- B.** *James v. FEC*, ___ F. Supp. 2d ___, 2012 WL 5353565 (D.D.C. 2012) (three-judge court), *appeal filed*, 81 U.S.L.W 3329 (U.S. Nov. 30, 2012).
1. Similar to *McCutcheon v. FEC*, in the *James* suit an individual challenges the constitutionality of 2 U.S.C. §441a(a)(3)(A) and its aggregate biennial limit on contributions to candidates, which is currently \$48,600.
 2. On 9/19/12, the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia stayed the *James* suit until it resolved *McCutcheon*. After the district court dismissed *McCutcheon*, it also dismissed *James*, finding no basis to distinguish between the two cases.
 3. On 11/1/12, Plaintiffs filed a notice of appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court. On 2/4/13, the FEC filed its motion to dismiss or affirm.

Wagner v. FEC

- Challenge to:
 - Prohibition on contributions by individual federal government contractors
- District court finds ban does not violate:
 - First Amendment
 - Equal Protection aspect of Fifth Amendment
- Remand: Jurisdictional issue
- *See also* AO 2012-16 (King)

- C.** *Wagner v. FEC*, 901 F. Supp. 2d 101 (D.D.C. Nov. 2, 2012), *vacated*, 717 F.3d 1007 (D.C. Cir. May 31, 2013), *questions certified by*, No. 11-1841 (D.D.C. June 5, 2013).
1. Challenge to the prohibition on contributions by federal government contractors as applied to individual contractors.
 2. Plaintiffs claim that 2 U.S.C. § 441c violates the First Amendment and the Equal Protection component of the Fifth Amendment.

3. On 11/2/12, the United States District Court for the District of Columbia upheld the Act's prohibition on contributions by individual federal contractors. The district court held that the ban is consistent with the First Amendment because it is closely drawn to serve the government's important interest in preventing actual and apparent corruption. The court also held that the contractor contribution ban does not violate the Fifth Amendment because individual contractors are not similarly situated to other persons who can generally make contributions, specifically federal employees and persons associated with corporations.
4. On 5/31/13, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit vacated the district court's ruling. The Court held that parties enumerated in 2 U.S.C. § 437h -- the Commission, the national committee of a political party, and individual voters -- must initiate litigation over the constitutionality of the Act under that provision, with its attendant procedures of fact-finding and certification of nonfrivolous merits questions by the district court to the en banc court of appeals. Because the plaintiffs in Wagner (who are individual voters) ultimately chose to proceed under federal question jurisdiction and ordinary judicial review procedures, i.e., a merits determination by the district court and appeal in the first instance to a three-judge panel of the court of appeals, the Court determined that it lacked jurisdiction. It remanded to the district court with instructions to make findings of fact and certify constitutional questions.
5. On 6/5/13, the district court issued an order certifying the following two questions to the en banc D.C. Circuit: (1) whether the contractor contribution ban violates the First Amendment; and (2) whether the ban violates the equal-protection guarantee of the Fifth Amendment. In addition, the district court made findings of fact.
6. The *en banc* D.C. Circuit has postponed further proceedings in the case until after the Supreme Court has ruled in *McCutcheon*.

Personal Use

- ▣ FEC v. Craig:
 - Using campaign funds for certain legal expenses = personal use
- ▣ Advisory Opinions:
 - AO 2013-11 (Miller)
 - AO 2013-05 (Gallegly)
 - AO 2012-34 (Freedom PAC; Friends of Mike H)
 - AO 2012-05 (Lantos)

- D. FEC v. Craig, ___ F. Supp. 2d ___, 2013 WL 1248271 (D.D.C Mar. 28 2013)**
1. Commission's complaint alleges defendants violated 2 U.S.C. § 439a(b) by spending more than \$200,000 in campaign funds to pay legal expenses not incurred in connection with Mr. Craig's campaign for federal office or with his ordinary and necessary duties as a Senator, resulting in impermissible personal use.
 2. Defendants moved to dismiss the suit arguing that the use of campaign funds for Mr. Craig's legal expenses was expressly permitted under the statute and not subject to the prohibition against personal use.
 3. On 3/28/13, the United States District Court for the District of Columbia denied the defendants' motion to dismiss. The Court found that Senator Craig's legal expenses were not ordinary and necessary expenses in connection with his duties as an officeholder. The Court also found that the campaign funds at issue were converted to Senator Craig's personal use because the legal bills would have existed irrespective of his duties as an officeholder.
 4. The parties are now in the process of briefing dispositive motions to the district court.
- E. Personal Use Advisory Opinions**
1. **AO 2013-13 (Miller)**
Asks whether a candidate may use campaign funds to post an appellate bond in civil litigation over the release of the candidate's personal employment records to the news media.
 2. **AO 2013-05 (Gallegly)**

A House member who is retiring may use campaign funds to pay for official and campaign documents.

3. AO 2012-34 (Freedom PAC and Friends of Mike H)

A former Senate candidate's campaign committee may contribute leftover campaign funds to IE-only political committee

4. AO 2012-05 (Lantos)

The principal campaign committee of a late Congressman may donate the balance of its funds to a foundation set up to continue the late Congressman's work in advancing human rights.

IV. Technology-Related Developments

Technology-Related Developments

- ▣ Contributions by Text
- ▣ Electronic Contribution
Redesignation Interpretive Rule
- ▣ Text and Internet Communications
Disclaimers ANPRM
- ▣ Tech Modernization ANPRM

Contributions by Text

- 2012-17 (m-Qube I)
- 2012-26 (m-Qube II)
- 2012-28 (CTIA II)
- 2012-30 (Revolution Messaging)
- 2012-31 (AT&T)
- 2012-35 (GTSG)



A. Text Contributions

The Commission issued AOs analyzing contributions made or initiated by text message.

1. **AO 2012-17 (m-Qube I)**
A vendor may provide political committees the option to accept individual contributions via text message because its business practices are consistent with the recordkeeping and reporting requirements of the Act.
2. **AO 2012-26 (m-Qube II)**
Campaigns that receive texted contributions are solely responsible for determining the eligibility of contributors, and must satisfy their responsibilities under the Act.
3. **AO 2012-28 (CTIA-II)**
Trade association and its members may offer their text-to-donate services to political committees without assuming responsibility for the legality of the resulting contributions under the Act when the contributions are processed by a connection aggregator.
4. **AO 2012-30 (Revolution Messaging)**
A telecommunications company may use text messaging technology to process campaign contributions in excess of \$50 per billing cycle and \$200 per calendar year or election cycle. It may also share premium common short codes among various federal campaigns and committees when processing such transactions.

5. **AO 2012-31 (AT&T)**
A wireless cell phone service provider may charge political committees a lower rate for fundraising by text message than it charges to commercial content providers, without making a prohibited corporate contribution.
6. **AO 2012-35 (GTSG)**
An e-commerce transaction company may receive small-dollar contributions initiated via text message and paid for by credit or debit card, deduct its fee and forward the net amount to its political committee customers.

Redesignation of Contributions – Interpretive Rule

- ▣ Redesignation of contributions:
 - Must be written
 - Must be signed
- ▣ Electronic redesignation may suffice if it ensures:
 - Contributor identity
 - Contributor intent

- B. Interpretive Rule on Electronic Contributor Redesignations**
The interpretive rule describes the particular method of electronic redesignation approved by the Commission in the course of a recent audit:
http://www.fec.gov/law/cfr/ej_compilation/2011/notice_2011-02.pdf

ANPRM on Internet/ Text Disclaimers

- ▣ Comments were due in 2011
- ▣ Grew out of several AOs:
 - 2010-19 (Google)
 - 2011-09 (Facebook)
- ▣ *See also* (for additional technical/
disclaimer issues):
 - 2011-13 (DSCC)
 - 2013-xx (Revolution Messaging)

C. **Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPRM) on Text and Internet Communication Disclaimers**

1. ANPRM asks whether the Commission should begin a formal rulemaking to revise its regulations on disclaimers on certain Internet and text communications and, if so, what changes should be made to those regulations.
2. Published in the *Federal Register* on October 13, 2011. Available at <http://sers.nictusa.com/fosers/showpdf.htm?docid=97168>.
3. The pending advisory opinion request from Revolution Messaging relates to whether banner ads in mobile phone apps qualify for the “small items” exception to the political-committee disclaimer requirements.

ANPRM on Technological Modernization

- ▣ Possible updates to address electronic transactions, including:
 - Credit and debit cards
 - Internet-based payment processing
 - ▣ *See also:* AOs 2012-08 (Repledge), 2012-22 (skimmerhat), 2012-09 (Points for Politics), 2012-03 (ActRight)
 - Text Contributions
 - “Signatures” and “writings,” including electronic redesignations

D. Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPRM) on Technological Modernization

1. ANPRM asks whether the Commission should begin a formal rulemaking to revise its regulations to address contributions and expenditures made by electronic means (such as by credit card, debit card, internet-based payment processing and text messaging); to eliminate or update references to outdated technologies; and to address other technological modernization issues.
2. Published in the *Federal Register* on May 2, 2013. See <https://www.federalregister.gov/articles/2013/05/02/2013-10326/technological-modernization>
3. The comment period closed on June 3, 2013. Comments received are available at <http://sers.nictusa.com/fosers/viewreg.htm?regno=2013-01>.

Other Corporate/Labor Activity

- ▣ SSFs: Restricted Class
- ▣ SSFs: Affiliation
- ▣ LLPs

SSFs: Restricted Class/Administration Advisory Opinions

- ▣ 2012-02 (Wawa)
- ▣ 2012-15 (American Physical
Therapy Assn.)
- ▣ 2013-12 (SEIU)

V. Other Corporate and Labor Activity

A. SSF: Restricted Class / PAC Administration

A corporation may solicit contributions from its restricted class (i.e. executive or administrative personnel, stockholders and their families), and to its SSF.

1. **AO 2012-02 (Wawa)**

Salaried managers who supervise hourly employees are members of the restricted class.

2. **AO 2012-15 (American Physical Therapy Assn.)**

Corporations owned by individual members of a membership organization (that also qualifies as a trade association) may provide payroll deduction to enable member-employees to contribute to the membership organization's SSF. The membership organization must pay the corporations in advance for their services.

3. **AO 2013-12 (SEIU)**

A labor organization may obtain its restricted class members' authorizations for payroll-deduction contributions to the organization's SSF through recorded telephone calls.

SSFs: Affiliation Advisory Opinions

- ▣ 2012-12 (Dunkin' Brands)
- ▣ 2012-21 (Primerica, Inc.)
- ▣ 2012-23 (Snake River)
- ▣ 2013-08 (AVMA)

B. Affiliation

1. **AO 2012-12 (Dunkin' Brands)**

SSF may solicit and accept contributions from non-corporate franchisees/licensees (and their executive and administrative personnel), because its franchisees/licensees are “affiliated.”

2. **AO 2012-21 (Primerica, Inc.)**
Corporations and their PACs are disaffiliated after spin-off.
3. **AO 2012-23 (Snake River)**
With prior approval, a group of trade associations may solicit their corporate members’ executives and stockholders for contributions to the SSF of an affiliated cooperative.
4. **AO 2013-08 (AVMA)**
Veterinary students who join student chapters of the American Veterinary Medical Association while in veterinary school are members of the AVMA’s restricted class.

NPRM on LLPs

- ▣ Stems from AO 2008-05 (Holland & Knight)
- ▣ Rules for LLPs electing corporate tax status
- ▣ Comments were due February 11, 2013

C. Treatment of LLPs

1. **AO 2008-05 (Holland & Knight)**
2. Revises rules on partnerships so that LLPs opting for association treatment (“Corporate LLPs”) would be treated as corporations under Part 114.
 - a) Would no longer be able to make contributions or attribute them to their partners;
 - b) Would be able to establish SSFs.
3. Comments were due by February 11, 2013.

4. NPRM published in Federal Register on at 77 FR 74121 (December 13, 2012). Available online at <http://sers.nictusa.com/fosers/showpdf.htm?docid=103514>.

Other Developments

- ▣ Ultimate Payees of Political Committee Disbursements
- ▣ Bitcoins
- ▣ Contributions by Same-Sex Spouses

Interpretive Rule

Reporting Ultimate Payee of Disbursements

- ▣ Reporting disbursements via intermediaries :
 - Reimbursements (such as to staffers)
 - Credit card bills
 - Candidate's own payments
- ▣ Published in the *Federal Register* on July 8, 2013



VI. Other Developments

A. Interpretive Rule on Political Committee Reporting of Ultimate Payees of Disbursements (78 FR 40625 July 8, 2013)

Clarifies the reporting requirements for disbursements made through intermediaries in three specific situations:

1. When a political committee reimburses an individual who used personal funds to pay committee expenses over \$200 to a vendor;
2. When a political committee's payment of its credit card bill includes charges of over \$200 to a single vendor; and
3. When a candidate uses personal funds to pay committee expenses aggregating over \$200 to a single vendor without receiving reimbursement.

Bitcoins

AO 2013-15 (Conservative Action Fund)

- Permissibility
- Valuation
- Reporting
- Disbursements

B. Bitcoins: AO 2013-15 (Conservative Action Fund)

Addresses whether political committees may accept Bitcoin contributions and, if so, how to value, report, and disburse them.


Contributions by Same-Sex Spouses

- ▣ AO 2013-02 (Winslow I)
- ▣ AO 2013-06 (DSCC)
- ▣ AO 2013-07 (Winslow II)
 - Spousal contribution rule
 - Candidates' spousal assets
 - Restricted-class membership

C. **Contributions by Same-Sex Spouses: AO 2013-02 (Winslow I), AO 2013-06 (DSCC), and AO 2013-07 (Winslow II)**

1. AO 2013-02 (Winslow I) had concluded that the Commission's rule regarding attribution of joint spousal contributions could not be applied to same-sex spouses because of the Defense of Marriage Act.
2. Shortly after the Supreme Court declared the Defense of Marriage Act unconstitutional, the Commission superseded AO 2013-02 (Winslow I) in AOs 2013-06 (DSCC) and 2013-07 (Winslow II). These AOs explained that the Commission would look to state law to define the terms "spouse" and "family" in the Act and in Commission regulations. Same-sex couples legally married under state law are therefore spouses and families for these purposes, which include the Commission's regulations regarding spousal contributions, a candidate's use of spousal assets, and membership in a restricted class.

VII. Pending Legislation



Response to *Citizens United*

H.R. 148, DISCLOSE 2013 Act

Rep. Van Hollen MD-8

- ▣ Introduced January 3, 2013
- ▣ Enhances Disclosure
- ▣ Extends Stand by Your Ad
- ▣ Revises IE and EC Definitions
- ▣ Requires Corporate Disclosure to Shareholders
- ▣ Expands Lobbyist Disclosure of Campaign Expenditures



 Information Division
2013-14 Election Cycle

Recent Developments

A. **RESPONSE TO *CITIZENS UNITED***

1. **H.R. 148, *DISCLOSE 2013 Act***

(Rep. Chris Van Hollen of Maryland (8th C.D.))

This bill is entitled the *Disclosure of Information on Spending on Campaigns Leads to Open and Secure Elections Act of 2013* or the *DISCLOSE 2013 Act*. It would:

- Require Additional Disclosure
Covered organizations would be required to disclose *campaign-related disbursements* of \$10,000 or more. *Covered organizations* include corporations, labor organizations, § 501(c)s, Super PACs and § 527s. *Campaign-related disbursements* include ECs, IEs, or related transfers, which include transfers to or from entities that have made \$50,000 in ECs or IEs in last two years.
- Extend Independent Expenditure definition to functional equivalent of express advocacy
- Expand Electioneering Communications time period
- Extend Stand by Your Ad. Super PACs and other entities would be subject to these requirements, with new requirements for Top Five Funders list for TV ads and Top Two Funders for radio ads.
- Require Corporate Disclosure to Shareholders

- Expand Lobbyist Disclosure of Campaign Expenditures
- Requires reporting of IEs and ECs under Lobbyist Disclosure Act.

Referred to the Committee on House Administration and House Judiciary Subcommittee on the Constitution And Civil Justice.

Previous Congresses: 111th (2009-10): H.R. 5175, S. 3295 and S. 3628; 112th (2011-12): H.R. 4010, S. 2219 and S. 3369.

Response to *Citizens United*

S. 791 , Follow the Money Act of 2013

Senators Wyden of Oregon
& Murkowski of Alaska



- ▣ Introduced April 23, 2013
- ▣ Expands disclosure
- ▣ Amends FECA to define *Independent Political Actor* as entity that makes *Independent Federal Election-Related Activity Expenditures*, as defined in the Internal Revenue Code

2. **S. 791, *Follow the Money Act of 2013*** **(Sen. Ron Wyden of Oregon and Sen. Lisa Murkowski of Alaska)**

This bill would expand disclosure by:

- Amending FECA to define *Independent Political Actor* as an entity that makes *Independent Federal Election-Related Activity Expenditures* of \$10,000 or more in an election cycle, receives \$10,000 in contributions for that purpose or solicits 500 or more persons for such contributions.
- Amending the Tax Code to define *Independent Federal Election-Related Activity Expenditure* as a payment made “solely or substantially” for the purpose of influencing or attempting to influence the nomination or election of any individual to any Federal office, including a public communication that promotes, attacks, supports or opposes a candidate.

- Requiring *Independent Political Actors* to appoint treasurers and *responsible individuals*, who would bear personal financial liability for violations by the *Independent Political Actors*.
- Requiring *Independent Political Actors* to disclose all donors, or if they establish separate accounts, only donors of \$1,000 or more would need to be disclosed.
- Requiring reporting of contributions prior to depositing if by check, within 48 hours if by credit card, or within ten days of receipt otherwise. *Independent Federal Election-Related Activity Expenditure* would be reported on the candidate schedule—quarterly, plus pre and post election reports.
- Require all political committees to report contributions on the schedule stated above.
- Require Senators to file campaign finance reports with the FEC, which would make them subject to mandatory e-filing.

This bill would also:

- Authorize the FEC to promulgate an exception to public disclosure of donors for those at risk of substantial injury.
- Prohibit Federal political committees from providing funds to *Independent Political Actors*.
- End separate reporting of independent expenditures and electioneering communications.
- Expand the disclaimer requirements for radio and television communications by *Independent Political Actors* to include their registration numbers, the top three funders and the city of residence of the top three funders.
- Expand the disclaimer requirements for political robocalls by *Independent Political Actors* to include the same information and a staffed telephone numbers to answer questions.
- Require an annual rulemaking by the FEC to consider disclaimer requirements, including for communications using new technologies.
- Create a mechanism at the FEC for candidates to disavow communications.
- Impose an excise tax of 10% on unreported *Independent Federal Election-Related Activity Expenditure* on the *Independent Political Actor* and 2.5% on its responsible individual.
- Provide for loss of tax exempt status for failure to register as an *Independent Political Actor* or failure to report *Independent Federal Election-Related Activity Expenditures*.

- Provide for the Secretary of the Treasury and the FEC to prescribe joint regulations, and if such regulations are not prescribed by September 31, 2014, would permit the Secretary of the Treasury alone to issue regulations.
- Authorize criminal penalties for Federal employees who discriminate based on reported campaign finance information.

Referred to the Senate Committee on Finance.

Response to *Citizens United*

*H.R. 195, Ethics in Foreign
Lobbying Act of 2013*



Rep. Marcy Kaptur OH-9

- ▣ Introduced January 4, 2013
- ▣ Prohibits contributions/expenditures by committees controlled by foreign-owned corporations
- ▣ Requires FEC to establish a clearinghouse of public information

 Information Division
2013-14 Election Cycle

Recent Developments

3. **H.R. 195, “Ethics in Foreign Lobbying Act of 2013” (Rep. Marcy Kaptur of Ohio (9th C.D.))**

The bill would amend FECA to prohibit contributions and expenditures by multicandidate political committees controlled by foreign-owned corporations. Bill would also require the FEC to establish a clearinghouse of public information regarding the political activities of foreign principals and agents of foreign principals that includes all reports filed pursuant to the Lobbying Disclosure Act, the Foreign Agents Registration Act, and the Ethics in Government Act.

*Referred to the Committee on House Administration and House
Judiciary Committee.*

Responses to *Citizens United*

- ▣ H.R. 1338 – Rep. Dingell – Direct Challenge to *Citizens United*
- ▣ Proposed Constitutional Amendments:
H. J. Res. 12, 13, 14, 20 and 32
- ▣ SEC disclosure changes:
 - S. 824 – Sen. Menendez & H.R. 1734 – Rep. Capuano
 - H.R. 1112 – Rep. Grayson
 - H.R. 1626 – Rep. Wagner
 - H.R. 2214 – Rep. Meng
- ▣ H.R. 2670 – Rep. Cartwright

4. H.R. 1111, “*Business Should Mind Its Own Business Act*”
5. H.R. 1112, “*Corporate Propaganda Sunshine Act*”
6. H.R. 1113
7. H.R. 1114, “*End Political Kickbacks Act of 2013*”
8. H.R. 1115
9. H.R. 1116, “*End the Hijacking of Shareholder Funds Act*”
10. H.R. 1117, “*America is for Americans Act*”
11. H.R. 1118, “*Pick Your Poison Act*”
(Rep. Grayson of Florida (9th C.D.))

These bills propose a variety of limitations on corporate expenditures, contributions to Super PACs and electioneering communications made permissible by *Citizens United*.

Referred to the Committees on Financial Services, House Administration, Judiciary and Ways and Means.

12. **H.R. 1338, “Restoring Confidence in Our Democracy Act”
(Rep. Dingell of Michigan (12th C.D.))**
This bill would amend FECA to impose contribution limits on Super PACs, prohibit corporate and labor organization electioneering communications and independent expenditures.

Referred to the Committee on House Administration.

13. **H.R. 2670, “Openness in Political Expenditures Now Act”
(Rep. Cartwright of Pennsylvania (17th C.D.))**
This bill requires corporations and labor organizations to disclose to their shareholders or members the amounts disbursed for certain political activity and limits expenditures for political activity by social welfare organizations.

Referred to Committee on House Administration and House Ways and Means.

14. **Constitutional Amendments**
H. J. Res. 12, (Rep. Kaptur of Ohio (9th C.D.))
H. J. Res. 13, (Rep. Kaptur of Ohio (9th C.D.))
H. J. Res. 14, (Rep. Kaptur of Ohio (9th C.D.))
H. J. Res. 20, (Rep. McGovern of Massachusetts (2nd C.D.))
H. J. Res. 21, (Rep. McGovern of Massachusetts (2nd C.D.))
H.J. Res. 25, (Rep. Edwards of Maryland (4th C.D.))
H. J. Res. 29, (Rep. Nolan of Minnesota (8th C.D.))
H.J. Res. 31, (Rep. Schiff of California (28th C.D.))
H.J. Res. 32, (Rep. Schrader of Oregon (5th C.D.))
H.J. Res. 34, (Rep. Deutch of Florida (21st C.D.))
These bills propose Constitutional amendments to reverse Citizens United and provide Congress with broader authority to regulate campaign finance.

Referred to the House Committee on Judiciary.

Pending Bill: Senate E-Filing

S. 375, Senate Campaign Disclosure Parity Act



Senator Tester of Montana

- ▣ Requires the electronic filing of Senate reports
- ▣ Senate Rules Committee mark up held on July 24, 2013 -- Bill reported to Senate
- ▣ Same language in S. 1371, Appropriations Bill

B. SENATE ELECTRONIC FILING

1. S. 375, “Senate Campaign Disclosure Parity Act” (Senator Tester of Montana)

This bill would require Senate candidates to file designations, statements, and reports in electronic form.

Referred to the Senate Rules and Administration Committee. Mark up held July 24, 2013. Reported out of committee without amendment and placed on Senate Legislative Calendar under General Orders. Calendar No. 148.

2. S. 1371, “Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act 2014” (Sen. Tom Udall (New Mexico))

This bill includes language that makes FEC point of entry for Senate Reports, which would make them subject to electronic filing requirements.

Pending Bill: Public Funding

H.R. 94

Rep. Tom Cole of OK-4



- ☐ Ends convention funding
- ☐ Marked up by Committee on House Administration on June 4, 2013
- ☐ S. 118 (Sen. Coburn of OK)

Pending in Senate



C. PUBLIC FUNDING

1. H.R. 94 (Rep. Cole of Oklahoma (4th C.D.))

This bill amends the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prohibit the use of public funds for political party conventions. In 112th Congress, H.R. 359 was introduced on January 20, 2011; passed the House, 239-160, on February 14, 2011.

Referred to Committee on House Administration, and reported to the House on June 4, 2013.

2. S. 118 (Senator Tom Coburn of Oklahoma)

This bill would amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prohibit the use of public funds for political party conventions.

Referred to Senate Rules Committee.

Pending Bill: Public Funding

H.R. 95

Rep. Tom Cole of OK-4



- ▣ Ends \$3 income tax check-off
- ▣ Terminates Public Funding for Presidential Campaigns and Conventions
- ▣ Marked up June 4, 2013
- ▣ In 112th, H.R. 359 passed House 239-160 on February 14, 2011

3. H.R. 95 (Rep. Cole of Oklahoma (4th C.D.))

This bill would amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to terminate the taxpayer election to designate \$3 of income tax liability for financing of presidential election campaigns, the Presidential Election Campaign Fund, and the Presidential Primary Matching Payment Account. This would also terminate the funding of party conventions. In the 112th Congress, H.R. 359 passed House 239-160 on February 14, 2011.

Referred to Committee on House Administration and the Committee on Ways and Means. House Administration reported the bill to the House on June 4, 2013

Pending Bill: Public Funding

H.R. 260

Rep. Gregg Harper MS-3



- ▣ Terminates Public Funding for Presidential Campaigns and Conventions
- ▣ Terminates Election Assistance Commission
- ▣ In 112th Congress, H.R. 3463 passed in House by vote of 235 to 190 on December 1, 2011

4. **H.R. 260 (Rep. Gregg Harper of Mississippi (3rd C.D.))**
This bill would terminate the Election Assistance Commission and assign most of its functions to the Federal Election Commission. It also would terminate the Presidential election public funding programs. In 112th Congress, H.R. 3463 passed the House of Representatives by a vote of 235 to 190 on December 1, 2011.

Referred to the Committee on House Administration.

Pending Bill: Public Funding

H.R. 1724

Kids First Research Act



Rep. Gregg Harper MS-3

- ▣ Terminates Public Funding for Presidential Campaigns and Conventions
- ▣ Uses funds for Pediatric Health Research

5. H.R. 1724, *Kids First Research Act of 2013* (Rep. Gregg Harper of Mississippi (3rd C.D.))

This bill would terminate the Presidential election public funding programs and would use the funds currently in the programs to fund a 10-year Pediatric Research Initiative Fund administered by the National Institutes of Health.

Referred to the Committees on House Administration, Energy and Commerce, and Ways and Means.

Pending Bill: EAC

H.R. 1994

Rep. Gregg Harper MS-3



- ▣ Terminates Election Assistance Commission
- ▣ Marked up on June 4, 2013

6. **H.R. 1994, “*Election Assistance Commission Termination Act*,” (Rep. Harper of Missouri (3rd C.D.))**
This bill would terminate the Election Assistance Commission, but assign only one of its functions to the Federal Election Commission. The FEC would be responsible for the multistate voter registration form under the *National Voter Registration Act of 1993*, known as the “*Motor Voter Act*.”
- Referred to Committee on House Administration, and reported to the House on June 4, 2013.***

Pending Bill: Public Funding

H.R. 268

Rep. John P. Sarbanes MD -3



- ▣ Introduced January 15, 2013
- ▣ Establishes public funding for House candidates
- ▣ Revises disclosure period of ECs and certain taxes on political organizations

**7. H.R. 268, “Grass Roots Democracy Act of 2013”
(Rep. Sarbanes of Maryland (3rd C.D))**

This bill establishes public funding for House candidates, modifies bundler disclosure requirements and expands the Electioneering Communication period from 60 to 120 days. The bill also amends the Internal Revenue Code to repeal alternative tax on political organizations with taxable income and tax exemption on proceeds of political fundraisers. The bill also includes mandatory electronic filing of reports and statements with the FEC, which would include reports filed by Senate candidates.

Referred to the Committee on House Administration, House Ways and Means Committee, and Energy and Commerce Committees.

Pending Bill: Public Funding

H.R. 269, Fair Elections Now Act

Rep. John Yarmuth KY-3



- ▣ Introduced January 15, 2013
- ▣ Establishes public funding for House elections
- ▣ Identical to bill in 112th (Rep. Larson)

8. **HR 269, “Fair Elections Now Act”**
(Rep. Yarmuth of Kentucky (3rd C.D.))
This bill would provide for the public financing for Congressional campaigns.

Referred to the Committee on House Administration.

Pending Bill: Public Funding

H.R. 270, The Empowering Citizens Act

Rep. David Price NC-4



- ▣ Introduced January 15, 2013
- ▣ Reforms Presidential public funding
- ▣ Establishes public funding for House elections

**9. H.R. 270, “*The Empowering Citizens Act*”
(Rep. Price of North Carolina (4th C.D.)**

This bill would amend the Internal Revenue Code to reform the system of public financing for Presidential elections. The bill also establishes a system of public financing for Congressional elections and promotes the disclosure of disbursements made in coordination with campaigns for election for Federal office.

Referred to the Committee on House Administration and the House Ways and Means Committee.

Pending Bills: Leadership PACs

S. 64

Senator Vitter of Louisiana

- ☐ Prohibits authorized committees and leadership PACs from employing spouse or immediate family of candidate



H.R. 465

Rep. Mike Capuano MA-7

- ☐ Prohibits the conversion of leadership PAC funds to personal use



D. LEADERSHIP PACS

1. S. 64 (Senator Vitter of Louisiana)

This bill would prohibit authorized committees and leadership PAC's from employing the spouse or immediate family members of any candidate or federal office holder connected to the committee.

Referred to the Senate Rules and Administration Committee.

2. H.R. 465 (Rep. Capuano of Massachusetts (7th C.D.))

This bill would amend FECA to prohibit the conversion of leadership PAC funds to personal use.

Referred to the Committee on House Administration.

Pending Bill: Death of Candidate

Permits candidates to designate individual to disburse committee funds in event of candidate's death

H.R. 186

Rep. Walter Jones Jr. NC-3



- ▣ Introduced January 4, 2013
- ▣ *Passed* House in 112th Congress as H.R. 406
- ▣ *Passed* House in 111th Congress as H.R. 749
- ▣ *Passed* House in 110th Congress as H.R. 3032

E. DEATH OF A CANDIDATE

H.R. 186 (Rep. Walter B. Jones, Jr., of North Carolina (3rd C.D.))

This bill would amend the FECA to permit candidates to designate an individual who would be authorized to disburse funds of the authorized campaign committees of the candidate in the event of the death of the candidate.

Referred to the Committee on House Administration.

Passed the House of Representatives in the 112th, 111th and 110th Congresses.

See also Advisory Opinion 1992-14 (Burton) on arranging for the transfer of campaign funds in the event of the candidate's death.

Pending Bills: Limits

H.R. 464

Rep. Mike Capuano MA-7

- ☐ Reduces limit on contributions to candidates from \$2,000 to \$1,000



H.R. 1681

Rep. Brian Higgins NY-26

- ☐ Limits expenditures for House campaigns to \$500,000 per election cycle



F. LIMITS

1. **H.R. 464 (Rep. Capuano of Massachusetts (7th C.D.))**

This bill would reduce limit on contributions to candidates from \$2,000 to \$1,000 (prior to inflation adjustment).

Referred to the Committee on House Administration.

2. **H.R. 1681, *Restoring Confidence Through Smarter Campaigns Act* (Rep. Higgins of New York (26th C.D.))**

This bill would amend FECA to limit expenditures for House campaigns to \$500,000 per election cycle.

Referred to the Committee on House Administration.

Pending Bill: FEC Website

H.R. 648

Rep. Ted Deutch FL -21



- ▣ Introduced February 13, 2013
- ▣ Requires FEC to disclose contents of political advertisements on its website

G. FEC WEBSITE

H.R. 648 (Rep. Ted Deutch of Florida (21st C.D.))

This bill would require the FEC to establish and operate a website through which members of the public may view the contents of certain political advertisements. It also would require the sponsors of such advertisements to furnish the contents of the advertisements to the FEC.

Referred to the Committee on House Administration.

Stay Current

FEC *Record* Newsletter, FEC *Weekly Digest* & FEC Web Site

 Information Division
2013-14 Election Cycle

Recent Developments

VIII. Stay Up to Date:

- A. **FEC RECORD:** <http://www.fec.gov/pages/fecrecord/fecrecord.shtml>
- B. **FEC Weekly Digest**
- C. **FEC Web Site**
 - 1. **Litigation:** <http://www.fec.gov/law/litigation.shtml>
 - 2. **New/Current Statutes:** <http://www.fec.gov/law/feca/feca.shtml>
 - 3. **Rulemakings:** http://www.fec.gov/law/law_rulemakings.shtml
 - 4. **Updates:** <http://www.fec.gov/law/recentdevelopments.shtml>

WORKSHOP EVALUATION

Help Us Help You!

Please complete an evaluation
of this workshop.