

# New Hampshire



39 Overall Rank

D- Overall Grade

New Hampshire	Overall Rank	To Governor	To State Senate	To State House	To Parties	To PACs
Individual Giving	36	33	29	12	37	31
		\$1,000/election	\$1,000/election	\$1,000/election	\$5,000/year	\$5,000/year
PAC Giving	17	32	31	15	1	
		\$1,000/election	\$1,000/election	\$1,000/election	Unlimited	
Party Giving	43	48	49	36		
		\$1,000/election	\$1,000/election	\$1,000/election		
Union Giving	50	50	50	50		
		Prohibited	Prohibited	Prohibited		
Corporate Giving	13	16	11	11		
		\$1,000/election	\$1,000/election	\$1,000/election		

Inflation Adjustment: No

When it comes to political speech, New Hampshire fails to live up to its motto, “live free or die.” New Hampshire is one of just a handful of states that continues to impose spending limits on campaigns, which were ruled unconstitutional in the seminal 1976 Supreme Court case, *Buckley v. Valeo*. New Hampshire circumvents *Buckley* by making the expenditure limits “voluntary” while severely restricting contributions to candidates that refuse. Since spending limits constitute a First Amendment violation of their own, the Index grades New Hampshire

on the limits imposed on candidates who do not agree to limit their spending.

Interestingly, New Hampshire is one of only two states (Tennessee) that prohibit unions from contributing to candidates while permitting businesses to give – a distinction that if challenged may not survive court scrutiny. The political freedom of Granite State residents would benefit greatly if the state removed its outdated expenditure limit program, and dramatically raised its very low contribution limits.