

NLWJC - Kagan

DPC - Box 006 - Folder 013

**Campaign Finance Reform -
Legislative Side - By - Sides**

DRAFT -- NOT FOR RELEASE

March 25, 1998
(House)

H.R. 3485 - Campaign Reform and Election Integrity Act of 1998
(Thomas (R) CA)

The Administration strongly opposes House passage of H.R. 3485, the "Campaign Reform and Election Integrity Act of 1998." Although the bill would ban so-called "Soft Money", increase disclosure of express advocacy campaigns, and provide for instant disclosure on the Internet, it does not meet the test of real reform. Unlike the legislation introduced by Representatives Shays and Meehan and its Senate companion bill sponsored by Senators McCain and Feingold, H.R. 3485 is neither comprehensive nor bipartisan legislation. It would increase the amount of money that is raised and spent on Federal elections and make the playing field between challengers and incumbents more uneven. In addition, the bill would be an unwarranted burden on workers and labor unions and be so cumbersome as to likely raise discriminatory barriers to the right to vote for many qualified U.S. citizens. If H.R. 3485 as reported were presented to the President, his senior advisers would recommend that it be vetoed for the reasons explained in this Statement of Administration Policy.

H.R. 3485 would make fundamental changes to Federal election law regarding the use of labor union dues or fees for political activities. The Supreme Court's decision in Communications Workers v. Beck, 487 U.S. 735 (1988), sets out the basic principles in this area of law. Under the Beck decision, workers cannot be required, consistent with the National Labor Relations Act, to pay agency fees for union activities that are not germane to collective bargaining, contract administration, and grievance adjustment. Workers may trigger their right to avoid these fees by objecting to them and opting out of union membership. Beck carefully balances the rights of dissenting workers with the rights of union members and the nature of labor unions as autonomous, democratically-governed organizations.

H.R. 3485 would not codify the principles of Beck; it would overturn them. Under this provision, a labor union would be prevented from using a worker's dues or fees for any political activity without prior written authorization from the worker. This "opt in" requirement is the exact opposite of the "opt out" procedure at issue in Beck. The requirement would be an unwarranted burden on workers and the union.

The Administration strongly opposes the Voter Eligibility Verification component of H.R. 3485 for the following reasons. This legislation would be so cumbersome as to likely raise discriminatory barriers to the right to vote for many qualified U.S. citizens, particularly minority and elderly citizens. Verification for citizenship, as opposed to immigration status, is highly burdensome on local and State election officials, as well as Federal agencies. Even if the system envisioned by the bill were workable, voter registration would be greatly impeded because of the

administrative burden in verifying everyone's citizenship. H.R. 3485 would render meaningless existing voter registration deadlines under State laws and thwart the protections of the National Voter Registration Act and the Voting Rights Act. In addition, there is already a citizenship question on the voter application forms of all States, in most (if not all) cases carrying a perjury penalty for false statements.

The bill also poses important civil rights problems. In 1986, Congress sought to guard against employment discrimination by requiring that the identity and immigration status of all employees be verified. H.R. 3485 lacks this safeguard. Some, but not all, voters may be subject to citizenship verification under this legislation without any regard to any underlying information indicating that a person is not a citizen. The potential for discriminatory abuse, particularly against minorities, is clear.

The system mandated by the bill will not result in accurate and timely information. The Social Security Administration (SSA) cannot confirm citizenship based on its records. Of its records created before 1981, 269 million reflect only unverified information on citizenship status, and new records are not routinely updated for changes in citizenship status. Only about 10 percent of Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) records contain Social Security numbers, and SSA does not maintain and cannot supply Alien Registration numbers. A forced linking of two databases, which were not designed for the purpose of voter eligibility determinations, would result in the denial of the right to vote for U.S. citizens.

* * * * *

(Do Not Distribute Outside Executive Office of the President)

This Statement of Administration Policy was developed by the Legislative Reference Division (Gibbons), in consultation with the Departments of Justice (Silas), Labor (Greene), State (Harrison), and Transportation (Holmstrup), SSA (Warner), WH Counsel (Marshall), DPC (Weinstein), HR (Bond), and TCJS (Thompson).

NEC, NLRB, WH/LA, and GC did not respond to our request for views on this SAP.

H.R. 3485 was ordered reported, amended, by the House Oversight Committee on March 18, 1998, by a 5-3 party-line vote.

Administration Position to Date

The Administration has previously issued veto threats on two other bills containing provisions similar to those in H.R. 3485. H.R. 1625, the "Worker Paycheck Protection Act", is similar to Title I of H.R. 3485, and was the subject of a Labor Secretary veto threat in an October 8, 1997, Labor letter to the House Education and Workforce Committee. H.R. 1428, the "Voter Eligibility Verification Act", is similar to Title V of H.R. 3485, and was the subject of a Justice and SSA veto threat in a February 11, 1998, SAP sent to the House.

Provisions of H.R. 3485

Title I - Voluntary Contributions

H.R. 3485 would prohibit involuntary use of funds of employees and stockholders of national banks, corporations, and members of labor organizations for political activities. Unions, associations, and corporations would be required to obtain written authorization from members and shareholders before using fees, dues, or corporate funds for political purposes. An employee's authorization would remain effective until revoked by the individual.

Every 12 months, corporations and nonprofit organizations other than labor organizations would be required to provide their employees, stockholders, and members with proposed amounts for disbursement for political activities and each individual's applicable percentage of that amount.

Title II - Banning Noncitizen Contributions

H.R. 3485 would prohibit all noncitizen individuals (including legal permanent residents) from making contributions in connection with Federal elections. The bill would double the maximum penalty (i.e., from \$5,000 to \$10,000 per violation) for noncitizens who make such contributions and for individuals who accept or solicit contributions from noncitizens.

Title III - Improving Reporting and Enforcement

H.R. 3485 would: (1) require disclosure of financing for communications that identify a Federal candidate within 90 days of elections; (2) reduce the reporting deadline from 48 to 24 hours for transactions of \$1,000 or more made within 20 days of an election; (3) require electronic filing of campaign reports by committees that have aggregate contributions or expenditures of \$50,000 or more; (4) require disclosure of financing for telephone or electronic polls conducted within 90 days of elections; (5) require reporting of major campaign payments by consultants and agencies; and (6) ban acceptance of cash contributions over \$100. The required reports would be made to the Federal Election Commission (FEC).

Title IV - Excessive Spending by Candidates from Personal Funds

H.R. 3485 would modify limitations on contributions when candidates spend or contribute large amounts of personal funds. In a general election, if a candidate contributes between \$2,000 (the individual contribution limit) and \$150,000 in personal funds, then the political parties would be allowed to contribute to the opponent amounts matching all personal funds above the individual contribution limit. If a candidate contributes personal funds in excess of \$150,000, individual and party contribution limits would not apply to the opposing candidate, except that the opposing candidates could not accept aggregate contributions in excess of the amount of personal funds.

Title V - Election Integrity

Voter Eligibility Verification Pilot Program. The bill would require the Attorney General and the Commissioner of SSA to establish a pilot program in five States to verify the citizenship status of individuals registering or who have recently registered to vote. Federal, State, and local election officials could use this system on a voluntary basis to determine an individual's eligibility for voter registration or voting.

SSA would be required to conduct the initial verification of citizenship status through a search of its records. The Attorney General, in consultation with INS and SSA, would be required to "specify" a secondary verification process to respond to cases where the SSA search is unable to confirm an individual's citizenship status and eligibility to vote. The secondary verification process would be used to confirm the validity of the results of the SSA search and provide final confirmation regarding citizenship status.

In situations where the secondary verification process is unable to confirm citizenship status, voting officials are required to notify individuals of the results of the inquiry, their right to correct erroneous information, and any other process which may be used to establish eligibility. During this notification period the voting official may either reject or provisionally accept the registration application, consistent with State law, pending final confirmation of citizenship.

The pilot program would be required to: (1) permit telephonic and electronic inquiries; (2) contain appropriate safeguards to prevent unauthorized disclosure of information or use of the system; and (3) protect individuals from possible resulting discriminatory practices.

H.R. 3485 would permit States to require voter registration applicants to provide the last four digits of their Social Security numbers. The bill specifically states that it does not authorize the development of a new database or the issuance of a national identification card.

Other Measures to Protect Election Integrity. H.R. 3485 would require a "citizenship" question on every voter registration form and require voter registration cards to request information on birthplace and naturalization. The bill would allow States to place voters on an inactive list if they have not voted or responded to a notice in two general elections

Title VI - Revision and Indexing of Contribution Limits and Penalties

H.R. 3485 would: (1) increase individual contribution limits to Federal candidates from \$1,000 to \$2,000; (2) increase individual contribution limits to political committees from \$20,000 to \$60,000; (3) increase individual aggregate contribution limits from \$25,000 to \$75,000; (4) index an individual's contribution limits to parties and the aggregate limit for contributions to all federal committees retroactively for inflation; (5) index maximum FEC fines retroactively for inflation; and (6) prospectively index all contribution limits for inflation.

Title VII - Restrictions on Soft Money

H.R. 3485 would prohibit national political party committees and individual candidates for Federal office from soliciting, receiving, or spending "soft money". "Soft money" is money that may influence the outcome of Federal elections, but is raised and spent outside the scope of Federal election laws. Presidential and Vice Presidential candidates could not receive funds from the Presidential Election Campaign Fund unless the candidates agree not to solicit "soft money". The bill would also regulate political advertisements by third-party groups during the final three months of an election season.

Pay-As-You-Go Scoring

H.R. 3485 would not affect direct spending or receipts and therefore is not subject to the pay-as-you-go requirements of the Omnibus Budget and Reconciliation Act of 1990. The CBO report is not available.

Legislative Reference Division
March 25, 1998

Campaign finance -
Legislative side-by-side

Draft
Draft

***Side-by-Side Comparison of Key Provisions in Leading
Campaign Finance Reform Proposals***

Provision	Old McCain-Feingold (S.25)	New McCain-Feingold (S.25)
Voluntary Spending Limits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General election limits range from \$950,000 to \$5.5 million. Exact amount within the range determined by formula based on a state's voting age population. • Primary election limit is the lesser of 67% of general election limit or \$2.75 million. • Runoff limit is 20% of general election limit. • General and primary limits are indexed. • Exceptions allowed for taxes; • Exceptions allowed for independent expenditures and non-complying candidate expenditures (see below). 	No Provision
Incentives for Candidates who Comply with Voluntary Spending Limits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 30 minutes of free, prime time broadcast time; • all other radio and television broadcast time purchased within 30 days of the primary election and 60 days of the general election provided at 50% of lowest rate charged; • reduced mailing rates (3rd class special non-profit rate) for two mailings to entire state voting age population. 	No Provision

<p>Disincentives for Candidates who do not comply with Voluntary Spending Limits</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complying candidates have individual contribution limits raised from \$1,000 per election to \$2,000 per election. • Non-complying candidates receive no reduction in rates for broadcast advertisements. • Complying candidates allowed to raise and spend up to twice the spending limits (ad still retain incentives) if non-candidates who exceeds spending cap. • Fines and repayment for complying candidates who exceed limits. 	
<p>Qualification Requirements for Complying Candidates</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statement vowing compliance with all limits. • Raise 10% of general election limit or \$250,000 from individuals without counting personal funds or out-of-state contributions that exceed 40% of general election limit. 	<p>No Provision</p>
<p>Limit on Individual PAC Contributions to Candidates</p>	<p>Bans PACs but if ban is unconstitutional, then current \$5,000 per election limit t a candidate reduced to \$1,000.</p>	<p>No Provision</p>

Aggregate PAC Contribution Limits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •If PAC ban struck down, complying candidates can raise no more than 20% of spending limit from PACs. 	No Provision
Aggregate Limit on Individual Contributions to Candidates	No provision	No Provision
In-state/Out-of-state Contribution Limits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Complying candidates must raise 60% of spending limits from in-state individual contributors. • Small states exception would allow this requirement to be met if 60% of all contributors reside in-state. 	No Provision
Use of Personal Funds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Complying candidates limited to the lesser of \$250,000 or 10% of general election spending limit. 	If candidates agree to limit personal contributions to their campaigns to \$50,000, they are eligible to receive funds under 441a(d) of Federal Elections Campaign Act (FECA). If candidates chooses not to comply, th are not eligible for any state or natio party funds.

<p>Independent Expenditures</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If more than \$10,000 in independent expenditures is made against a complying candidate, the complying candidate may spend an equal amount without violating spending caps. • Strict reporting and disclosure requirements in making independent expenditures. • Clarifies that independent expenditures must be truly independent (especially with respect to political parties) and broadens the definition of express advocacy to include all campaign-related communications. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarifies that independent expenditures must be truly independent (especially with respect to political parties) and broadens the definition of express advocacy to include all campaign-related communications. • Strict reporting and disclosure requirements in making independent expenditures. Contributions of \$1,000 made 20 days before an election shall be reported to the FEC within 24 hours. Contributions of \$10,000 or more made 20 days before an election shall be reported to the FEC within 4 hours. • Expand definition of coordination expenditure to bring within the limits currently within the Federal Election Campaign Act. • Expanded definition of coordination expenditures for actions taken by both parties and individuals. Most activities under this proposal would have to be truly independent.
<p>Soft Money</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eliminates the use of soft money in federal elections. • No national or state party committee, may solicit, receive, or spend any funds to impact a federal election which are not subject to current federal law limitations. • Provides for state party grassroots funds for voter registration, GOTV, sample ballots and voter files. • Increases individual aggregate contribution limit from \$25,000 per year to \$30,000 per year to allow funding for grassroots fund. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eliminates the use of soft money in federal elections. • No national or state party committee may solicit, receive, or spend any funds to impact a federal election which are not subject to current federal law limitations. • Provides for state party grassroots funds for voter registration, GOTV, sample ballots and voter files. • Increases individual aggregate contribution limit from \$25,000 per year to \$30,000 per year to allow funding for grassroots fund.


Foreign Money	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individuals not qualified to vote are prohibited from making contributions to federal candidates. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Foreign nationals may directly indirectly make contributions, in connection with local, state, or federal elections, to any political committee candidate for Federal office. It is also unlawful for a person to solicit, accept or receive a contribution from a foreign national. • Any individual who is 17 years old or younger is prohibited from making contributions to a candidate or political party.
Bundling	Bans bundling during election year.	Bans bundling during election year.
Franked Mail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bans franked mass mailings during an election year. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bans franked mass mailings during election year.

FEC Enforcement Provisions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FEC random audit authority. • FEC injunctive authority. • Electronic filing. • FEC expedited procedures authority. Increase penalties for willful violations. 	FEC random audit authority. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FEC injunctive authority. • Electronic filing. • FEC expedited procedures authority. Increase penalties for willful violations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FEC random audit authority. • FEC injunctive authority. • Electronic filing. FEC independent litigation authority • FEC expedited procedures authority • Increase penalties for willful violations.
----------------------------	---	--	--

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

February 13, 1997

MEMORANDUM TO INTERESTED PARTIES

FROM: Paul Weinstein 
SUBJECT: Comparison of leading campaign finance reform proposals

Enclosed is the latest side-by-side on congressional campaign finance reform bills. This version includes H.R. 600, recently introduced by Congressman Farr.

Please contact me with any comments or questions.

Side-by-Side Comparison of Key Provisions in Leading Campaign Finance Reform Proposals

	McCain Feingold (S.25)	Shays Meehan (H.R. 493)	Daschle (S.11)	Farr (H.R. 600)
Voluntary Spending Limits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General election limits range from \$950,000 to \$5.5 million. Exact amount within the range determined by formula based on a state's voting age population. • Primary election limit is the lesser of 67% of general election limit or \$2.75 million. • Runoff limit is 20% of general election limit. • General and primary limits are indexed. • Exceptions allowed for taxes; • Exceptions allowed for independent expenditures and non-complying candidate expenditures (see below). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$600,000 per House election cycle. • Election limit increased by 30% if the candidate wins primary with less than 10% of the vote. • Runoff limits is 20% of general election limit; • Election limit is indexed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General election limits range from \$1.2 million to \$5.5 million. Exact amount within the range determined by formula based on a state's voting age population. • Primary election limit is the lesser of 67% of general election limit or \$2.75 million. • Runoff limit is 20% of general election limit. • General and primary limits are indexed. • Exceptions allowed for legal and accounting fund and taxes; • Exceptions allowed for independent expenditures and non-complying candidate spending (see below). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$600,000 spending limit per 2-year cycle. • Special election limits of \$600,000 • An additional \$200,000 may be spent in the general election by a candidate who won primary by 20% or less. • An additional \$200,000 may be spent by a candidate who must face a runoff election after a primary and before a general election. • A candidate may make additional expenditures aggregating not more than \$200,000 in the election cycle if the candidate wins a contested primary election by a margin of 20% or less. • Exemptions from limits when a non-participating opponent raises or spends more than 30% of the cycle limit. • General and primary limits are indexed.

<p>Incentives for Candidates who Comply with Voluntary Spending Limits</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •30 minutes of free, prime time broadcast time; •all other radio and television broadcast time purchased within 30 days of the primary election and 60 days of the general election provided at 50% of lowest rate charged; • reduced mailing rates (3rd class special non-profit rate) for two mailings to entire state voting age population. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Radio and television broadcast time purchased within 30 days of the primary election and 60 days of the general election provided at 50% of lowest rate charged; • reduced mailing rates (3rd class special non-profit rate) for three mailings to voting age population of the Congressional district. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Radio and television broadcast time purchased within 30 days of the primary election and 60 days of the general election provided at 50% of lowest rate charged; • reduced mailing rates (3rd class special non-profit rate) for two mailings to entire state voting age population. • Funding from Secretary of the Senate to offset non-complying candidate expenditures. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Broadcast time purchased provided at 50% of the lowest rate in the last 30 days of a primary and in the last 60 days of a general election period; •broadcaster will be exempted from requirements if their signal is nationwide or if the requirement would impose economic hardship on the licensee; •makes campaigns of participating candidates eligible for 3rd class, bulk, non-profit rate mailings, with no limits on the dollar amount or value of the postage purchased at this rate under this provision.
---	---	---	--	---

<p>Disincentives for Candidates who do not comply with Voluntary Spending Limits</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Complying candidates have individual contribution limits raised from \$1,000 per election to \$2,000 per election. • Non-complying candidates receive no reduction in rates for broadcast advertisements. • Complying candidates allowed to raise and spend up to twice the spending limits (ad still retain incentives) if non-candidates who exceeds spending cap. • Fines and repayment for complying candidates who exceed limits. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Complying candidates have individual contribution limits raised from \$1,000 per election to \$2,000 per election. • Complying candidates allowed to raise and spend up to twice the spending limits (and still retain incentives) if non-candidate exceeds spending cap. • Fines and repayment for complying candidates who exceed limits. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Complying candidates have individual contribution limits raised from \$1,000 per election to \$2,000 per election. •Complying candidates can receive (and spend) up to twice the spending limits (and still retain incentives) if non-complying candidate exceeds spending cap by more than 200% , •If non-complying candidate exceeds cap by more than 200% complying candidate may raise and spend an additional amount of up to 100% of spending cap. • Fines and repayment for complying candidates who exceed limits. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Non-participating candidates who raise or spend more than 30% of the cycle limits must file report with the FEC, which must then notify other candidates within 48 hours; •imposes 35% tax on contributions of principal campaign committees whose candidates exceed the spending limits; •revenues from this provision shall be directed to the FEC for compliance activities. •Non-participating candidates shall not be entitled to the lowest rate for TV broadcast time.
--	---	--	--	---

<p>Qualification Requirements for Complying Candidates</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Statement vowing compliance with all limits. • Raise 10% of general election limit or \$250,000 from individuals without counting personal funds or out-of-state contributions that exceed 40% of general election limit. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Statement vowing compliance with all limits. • Raise 10% of general election limit (\$60,000) from individuals with only the first \$200 of each contribution counting toward the threshold and 60% of threshold amount (\$36,000) raised from in-state contributors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Statement vowing compliance with all limits. Raise 5% of general election limits from individuals. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Statement vowing compliance with all limits. •Raise 10% of general election limit counting only the first \$200 in contributions from individuals; •No public benefits to candidates who do not use closed captioning in TV ads. •Violation of any of the spending limits makes a candidate ineligible for public benefits.
<p>Limit on Individual PAC Contributions to Candidates</p>	<p>Bans PACs but if ban is unconstitutional, then current \$5,000 per election limit to a candidate reduced to \$1,000.</p>	<p>Current \$5,000 per election PAC limit to a candidate reduced to \$1,000.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Bans PACs but if ban unconstitutional, then current \$5,000 per election limit remains unchanged. • Lowers an individual's contribution to a PAC from \$5,000 to \$1,000. 	<p>Sets a maximum limit of \$8,000 from a single PAC per cycle;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •\$5,000 of which is allowed for one election. •eliminates Leadership PACs.
<p>Aggregate PAC Contribution Limits</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •If PAC ban struck down, complying candidates can raise no more than 20% of spending limit from PACs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Complying candidates can raise no more than 25% (\$150,000) of spending limits from PACs). 	<p>No provision</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Limit of \$200,000 per cycle from all PAC sources; •PAC receipts limit is 33 1/3% of spending limit, plus an extra \$100,000 if runoff and \$66,600 if close primary winner.

<p>Aggregate Limit on Individual Contributions to Candidates</p>	<p>No provision</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complying candidates can raise no more than 25% (\$150,000) of spending limit from contributions greater than \$250. 	<p>No provision</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •changes aggregate limit to election cycle basis; •raises limit to \$100,000, of which no more than \$25,000 may go to candidates per year.
<p>In-state/Out-of-state Contribution Limits</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Complying candidates must raise 60% of spending limits from in-state individual contributors. • Small states exception would allow this requirement to be met if 60% of all contributors reside in-state. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Complying candidates must raise 60% of spending limit from in-state, individual contributors. 	<p>No provision</p>	<p>No provision</p>
<p>Use of Personal Funds</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Complying candidates limited to the lesser of \$250,000 or 10% of general election spending limit. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Complying candidate limited to 10% of general election limit (\$60,000) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Complying candidates limited to \$25,000 per cycle. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Complying candidates limited to \$50,000 per cycle.

<p>Independent Expenditures</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •If more than \$10,000 in independent expenditures is made against a complying candidate, the complying candidate may spend an equal amount without violating spending caps. • Strict reporting and disclosure requirements in making independent expenditures. • Clarifies that independent expenditures must be truly independent (especially with respect to political parties) and broadens the definition of express advocacy to include all campaign-related communications. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •If more than \$25,000 in independent expenditures is made against a complying candidate, the complying candidate may raise and spend an equal amount without violating spending caps. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strict reporting and disclosure requirements in making independent expenditures. • Clarifies that independent expenditures must be truly independent (especially with respect to political parties) and broadens the definition of express advocacy to include all campaign-related communications. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •If independent expenditures are made against a complying candidate, the complying candidate may receive (and spend) an equal amount without violating spending caps. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strict reporting and disclosure requirements in making independent expenditures. • Clarifies that independent expenditures must be truly independent (especially with respect to political parties) and broadens the definition of express advocacy to include all campaign-related communications. •Broadcasters must provide adjacent broadcast time for candidates to respond to independent expenditures. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •If more than \$2,500 in independent expenditures is made against a complying candidate, the complying candidate may spend additional funds without regard to the spending limits cap <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •party committees can match independent expenditures without the expenditure counting against that party's contribution limit to the candidate. •Clarifies the definition of independent expenditures to contain express advocacy and independent with respect to political parties.
--	--	--	--	--

<p>Soft Money</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Eliminates the use of soft money in federal elections. • No national or state party committee, may solicit, receive, or spend any funds to impact a federal election which are not subject to current federal law limitations. • Provides for state party grassroots funds for voter registration, GOTV, sample ballots and voter files. •Increases individual aggregate contribution limit from \$25,000 per year to \$30,000 per year to allow funding for grassroots fund. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Eliminates the use of soft money in federal elections. • No national or state party committee, may solicit, receive, or spend any funds to impact a federal election which are not subject to current federal law limitations. • Increases individual aggregate contribution limit to parties from \$20,000 to \$25,000 per year. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Eliminates the use of soft money in federal elections. • No national or state party committee, may solicit, receive, or spend any funds to impact a federal election which are not subject to current federal law limitations. • Provides for state party grassroots funds for voter registration, GOTV, sample ballots and voter files. Individual aggregate limits increased to \$60,000/year with no more than \$25,000/year for individual candidates; • \$20,000/year for state parties and state grassroots funds combined, and \$20,000/year for national parties. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Eliminates the use of soft money in federal elections. •creates a new separate segregated fund established and maintained by state political party committee for making expenditures in connection with federal elections. •national and congressional party committee must disclose all financial activity; •political committees must maintain a non-federal account and must disclose all financial activity including separate schedules for State Party Grassroots Funds; •prohibits federal candidates or officeholders from raising any money for a tax exempt group which they establish, maintain, or control, and which devotes significant activities to voter registration and GOTV drives.
<p>Foreign Money</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Individuals not qualified to vote are prohibited from making contributions to federal candidates. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Individuals not qualified to vote are prohibited from making contributions to federal candidates. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Foreign nationals and permanent residents prohibited from directing contributions. • Minors' contributions count against parents' limits. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Foreign nationals prohibited from directing contributions •Minors' contributions count against parents' limits.

Bundling	Bans bundling	Bans Bundling	No provision	Bans all bundling except for non-affiliated, non-connected PACs that do not lobby.
Franked Mail	•Bans franked mass mailings during an election year.	•Bans franked mass mailings during an election year.	•Bans franked mass mailings during an election year.	No provision
FEC Enforcement Provisions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •FEC random audit authority. •FEC injunctive authority. •Electronic filing. •FEC expedited procedures authority. Increase penalties for willful violations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •FEC random audit authority. •FEC injunctive authority. •Electronic filing. FEC independent litigation authority •FEC expedited procedures authority •Increase penalties for willful violations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •FEC random audit authority. •FEC injunctive authority. •Electronic filing. FEC independent litigation authority •FEC expedited procedures authority •Increase penalties for willful violations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •FEC random audit authority. •FEC injunctive authority. •Electronic filing. FEC independent litigation authority •FEC expedited procedures authority •Increase penalties for willful violations.