

Campaign Finance Law and the U.S. Supreme Court

Federal campaign finance law is composed of three primary components:

- Contribution limits
- Disclosure and disclaimer requirements
- Source restrictions

While the Federal Election Campaign Act (FECA) sets forth the statutory provisions governing these components, several Supreme Court rulings have had a significant impact on the regulatory scope of FECA.¹

- 1972

FECA of 1971
Established reporting and disclosure requirements
- 1974

FECA of 1974
Made significant amendments in response to Watergate; established the Federal Election Commission (FEC)
- 1976

Buckley v. Valeo
Upheld FECA's limits and disclosure requirements and invalidated IE limits
- 1976

FECA of 1976
Made amendments in response to *Buckley*
- 2002

Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 2002 (BCRA)
Made comprehensive amendments to FECA, including disclaimer and disclosure requirements
- 2003

McConnell v. FEC
Invalidated FECA's ban on minors' contributions and requirement that parties choose between coordinated and independent expenditures; upheld major BCRA provisions
- 2008


Davis v. FEC
Invalidated FECA's increased contribution limits for candidates whose opponents significantly self-finance
- 2010

Citizens United v. FEC
Invalidated FECA's ban on corporate and union IEs and electioneering communications, partially overruling *McConnell*; upheld disclaimer and disclosure requirements
- 2012

Bluman v. FEC
Summarily affirmed a lower court ruling that upheld FECA's ban on foreign money
- 2014


McCutcheon v. FEC
Invalidated FECA's aggregate contribution limits
- 2022

FEC v. Ted Cruz for Senate
Invalidated FECA's cap on contributions used to repay candidate loans




Contribution limits


FECA establishes contribution limits, which refer to how much a donor can contribute



Contribution: Involves giving money to an entity, such as a candidate's campaign committee




Independent Expenditures (IE): Involves spending money directly for advocacy of the election or defeat of a candidate, independently of any candidate or political party




What has the Supreme Court said about contribution limits?

The Supreme Court held that limits on contributions and expenditures implicate First Amendment free speech rights and that such limits must serve the governmental interest in avoiding quid pro quo corruption or its appearance




Disclaimer and disclosure requirements


FECA contains disclaimer and disclosure requirements



Disclaimers: Requires that statements of attribution appear directly on campaign-related communications




Disclosure: Requires that political committees register with the FEC and comply with periodic reporting requirements




What has the Supreme Court said about disclaimer and disclosure requirements?

The Supreme Court held that disclaimer requirements “insure that the voters are fully informed about the person or group who is speaking”




Source restrictions


FECA contains several bans, referred to as source restrictions, on who may make campaign contributions



Corporate/Union Contributions: Bans contributions directly from treasury funds; must establish a political action committee (PAC) to make contributions



Foreign Money: Bans contributions and IEs by foreign nationals



What has the Supreme Court said about banning foreign money?

The Supreme Court summarily affirmed a three-judge federal district court ruling that upheld FECA's foreign money ban against a First Amendment challenge and that identified a compelling governmental interest in limiting foreign citizens' influence over U.S. elections

¹ For more information, see CRS Report R45320, *Campaign Finance Law: An Analysis of Key Issues, Recent Developments, and Constitutional Considerations for Legislation*, by L. Paige Whitaker (2023).

Information as of May 31, 2024. Prepared by L. Paige Whitaker, Legislative Attorney; Amanda M. Black, Paralegal Specialist; and Juan Pablo Madrid, Visual Information Specialist.

Author Information

L. Paige Whitaker
Legislative Attorney

Amanda M. Black
Paralegal Specialist

Disclaimer

This document was prepared by the Congressional Research Service (CRS). CRS serves as nonpartisan shared staff to congressional committees and Members of Congress. It operates solely at the behest of and under the direction of Congress. Information in a CRS Report should not be relied upon for purposes other than public understanding of information that has been provided by CRS to Members of Congress in connection with CRS's institutional role. CRS Reports, as a work of the United States Government, are not subject to copyright protection in the United States. Any CRS Report may be reproduced and distributed in its entirety without permission from CRS. However, as a CRS Report may include copyrighted images or material from a third party, you may need to obtain the permission of the copyright holder if you wish to copy or otherwise use copyrighted material.