

Campaign Reform

Year	Pres.	House	Senate	Democrats	Republicans	
1900	R	R	R			
1904	R	R	R			
1908	R	R	R	We pledge the Democratic party to the enactment of a law prohibiting any corporation from contributing to a campaign fund and any individual from contributing an amount above a reasonable maximum, and providing for the publication before election of all such contributions.		
1912	R	D	R	We pledge the Democratic party to the enactment of a law prohibiting any corporation from contributing to a campaign fund and any individual from contributing any amount above a reasonable maximum.	We favor such additional legislation as may be necessary more effectually to prohibit corporations from contributing funds, directly or indirectly, to campaigns for the nomination or election of the President, the Vice-President, Senators, and Representatives in Congress.	
1916	D	D	D	We favor the prohibition of individual contributions, direct and indirect, to the campaign funds of congressmen, senators or presidential candidates, beyond a reasonable sum to be fixed in the law, for both individual contributions and total expenditures, with requirements for full publicity.		
1920	D	R	R			
1922	R	R	R			Teapot Dome Scandal
1924	R	R	R		The sale of influence resulting from the holding of public position or from association while in public office or the use of such influence for private gain or advantage is a perversion of public trust and prejudicial to good government. It should be condemned by public opinion and forbidden by law.	
1928	R	R	R	We favor publicity in all matters affecting campaign contributions and expenditures.	One of the most effective remedies for this abuse is publicity in all matters touching campaign contributions and expenditures.	
1932	R	R	R	Continuous publicity of political contributions and expenditures; strengthening of the Corrupt Practices Act and severe penalties for misappropriation of campaign funds.		
1936	D	D	D			
1940	D	D	D			
1944	D	D	D			
1948	D	R	R			
1952	D	D	D	We advocate new legislation to provide effective regulation and full disclosure of campaign expenditures in elections to Federal office, including political advertising from any source		
1956	R	D	D	The Democratic Party pledges itself to provide effective regulation and full disclosure of campaign expenditures and contributions in elections to Federal offices.		
1960	R	D	D	The Democratic Party favors realistic and effective limitations on contributions and expenditures, and full disclosure of campaign financing in Federal elections. . . We deplore efforts to divide the United States into regional, religious and ethnic groups.		
1964	D	D	D			

Campaign Reform

1968	D	D	We are alarmed at the growing costs of political participation in our country and the consequent reliance of political parties and candidates on large contributors, and we want to assure full public information on campaign expenditures. To encourage citizen participation we urge that limited campaign contributions be made deductible as a credit from the federal income tax.	We favor a new Election Reform Act that will apply clear, reasonable restraints to political spending and fund-raising, whether by business, labor or individuals, ensure timely publication of the financial facts in campaigns, and provide a tax deduction for small contributions.	
1971	R	D			Federal Election Campaign Act
1972	R	D	We recommend a statutory ceiling on political gifts at a reasonable limit. Publicly owned communications facilities such as television, radio and the postal service should be made available, but on a limited basis, to candidates for federal Office.		Watergate break-in
1974	R	D			Ford signs campaign finance reform law
1976	R	D	The Democratic Party has led the fight to take the presidency off the auction block by championing the public financing of presidential elections. The public has responded with enthusiastic use of the \$1 income tax checkoff. Similar steps must now be taken for congressional candidates. We call for legislative action to provide for partial public financing on a matching basis of the congressional elections, and the exploration of further reforms to insure the integrity of the electoral process.		
1980	D	D	The limitations on campaign contributions and the public financing of Presidential elections are two reforms which have worked very well. Business political action committees continue to spend excessively, however. . . Close the loophole that allows private spending in Presidential elections contrary to the intent of the election law reforms.	Republicans support public policies that encourage political activity by individual citizens. We support the repeal of those restrictive campaign spending limitations that tend to create obstacles to local grass roots participation in federal elections. We also oppose the proposed financing of Congressional campaigns with taxpayers' dollars as an effort by the Democratic Party to protect its incumbent Members of Congress with a tax subsidy.	
1984	R	R	We must work to end political action committee funding of federal political campaigns. To achieve that, we must enact a system of public financing of federal campaigns. At the same time, our Party should assure that a system of public financing be responsive to the problem of under representation of women and minorities in elective offices.	Republicans believe that strong, competitive political parties contribute mightily to coherent national policies, effective representation, and responsive government. Forced taxpayer financing of campaign activities is political tyranny. We oppose it. . . In light of the inhibiting role federal election laws and regulations have had, Congress should consider abolishing the Federal Election Commission.	
1988	R	D		Republicans want to broaden involvement in the political process. We oppose government controls that make it harder for average citizens to be politically active. We especially condemn the congressional Democrats' scheme to force taxpayer funding of campaigns.	

Campaign Reform

1992 R	D	D		We will require congressional candidates to raise most of their funds from individuals within their home constituencies. This will limit outside special-interest money and result in less expensive campaigns, with less padding for incumbents. To the same end, we will strengthen the role of political parties to remove pressure on candidates to spend so much time soliciting funds. We will eliminate political action committees supported by corporations, unions, or trade associations, and restrict the practice of bundling. . . To restore competition in elections by attacking the unfair advantages of incumbency, we will stop incumbents from warding off challengers merely by amassing huge war chests. Congressional candidates will be forbidden from carrying campaign funds from one election to the next. We will oppose arbitrary spending limits—cynical devices which hobble challengers to keep politicians in office.	
1996 D	R	R	The President and the Democratic Party support the bipartisan McCain-Feingold campaign finance reform bill. It will limit campaign spending, curb the influence of PACs and lobbyists, and end the soft money system. Perhaps most important of all, this bill provides free TV time for candidates, so they can talk directly to citizens about real issues and real ideas.	We will eliminate made-in-Washington schemes to rig the election process under the guise of campaign reform. True reform is indeed needed: ending taxpayer subsidies for campaigns, strengthening party structures to guard against rogue operations, requiring full and immediate disclosure of all contributions, and cracking down on the indirect support, or "soft money," by which special interest groups underwrite their favored candidates.	
2000 R	R	R	Al Gore supports John McCain's campaign for political reform. In fact, the McCain-Feingold bill is the very first piece of legislation that a President Al Gore will submit to Congress - and he will fight for it until it becomes the law of the land. . . Then he will go even further - much further. He will insist on tough new lobbying reform, publicly-guaranteed TV time for debates and advocacy by candidates, and a crackdown on special interest issue ads. Most boldly of all, Al Gore has proposed a public-private, non-partisan Democracy Endowment which will raise money from Americans and finance Congressional elections - with no other contributions allowed to candidates who accept the funding.	Stop the abuses of corporate and labor "soft" money contributions to political parties. . . Level the playing field by forbidding incumbents to roll over their leftover campaign funds into a campaign for a different office. . . Require full and timely disclosure on the Internet of all campaign contributions — so the media and the public can immediately know who is giving how much to whom.	
2001 R	R	D			
2002 R	R	D			McCain Feingold Act
2004 R	R	R			
2008 R	D	D	We support campaign finance reform to reduce the influence of moneyed special interests, including public financing of campaigns combined with free television and radio time. We will have the wisdom to put the public interest above special interests. As a national party, we will not take any contributions from Political Action Committees during this election.		
2010 D	D	D			SC decides Citizens United v. FEC

Campaign Reform

2012 D	R	D	<p>Mitt Romney's opposition to commonsense campaign finance is nothing less than support for corporate and special-interest takeovers in our elections. . . We support campaign finance reform, by constitutional amendment if necessary. We support legislation to close loopholes and require greater disclosure of campaign spending. President Obama and the national Democratic Party do not accept contributions from federal lobbyists this cycle. We support requiring groups trying to influence elections to reveal their donors so the public will know who's funding the political ads it sees.</p>	<p>The rights of citizenship do not stop at the ballot box. They include the free speech right to devote one's resources to whatever cause or candidate one supports. We oppose any restrictions or conditions that would discourage Americans from exercising their constitutional right to enter the political fray or limit their commitment to their ideals. . . We insist that there should be no regulation of political speech on the Internet.</p>	
2016 D	R	R	<p>Democrats support a constitutional amendment to overturn the Supreme Court's decisions in <i>Citizens United</i> and <i>Buckley v. Valeo</i> . We need to end secret, unaccountable money in politics by requiring, through executive order or legislation, significantly more disclosure and transparency—by outside groups, federal contractors, and public corporations to their shareholders. We need to amplify the voices of the American people through a small donor matching public financing system.</p>	<p>The rights of citizenship do not stop at the ballot box. Freedom of speech includes the right to devote resources to whatever cause or candidate one supports. We oppose any restrictions or conditions that would discourage citizens from participating in the public square or limit their ability to promote their ideas, such as requiring private organizations to publicly disclose their donors to the government. Limits on political speech serve only to protect the powerful and insulate incumbent officeholders. . . We support repeal of federal restrictions on political parties in McCain-Feingold, raising or repealing contribution limits, protecting the political speech of advocacy groups, corporations, and labor unions, and protecting political speech on the internet.</p>	
2020 R	D	R	<p>Money is not speech, and corporations are not people. Democrats will fight to pass a Constitutional amendment that will go beyond merely overturning Citizens United and related decisions like <i>Buckley v. Valeo</i> by eliminating all private financing from federal elections. . . We will bring an end to "dark money" by requiring full disclosure of contributors to any group that advocates for or against candidates, and bar 501(c)(4) organizations from spending money on elections</p>		