

1. According to the *Heritage* Spending Clause explanation what are the two purposes of Congressional spending? The only two purposes for Congressional spending is to pay off debts and as stated in the preamble, provide for a common defense and general welfare of the US. Together, these two purposes have been known to make up the "Spending power" of the United States' government.
2. What were the contrary positions of Hamilton as opposed to Madison and Jefferson? Hamilton would argue for an expansive reading of the "spending clause", but Jefferson and Madison would adopt a more restrictive policy of the "spending clause". In fact, every president adopted the more restrictive "spending clause" interpretation until the Civil War.
3. What was Hamilton's more moderate or "intermediate" view on Congressional spending? His more moderate view is that the statement "common Defence and general welfare" is not a way of limiting power to tax. It also wasn't to spend to further the powers elsewhere as pointed out in Article 1, Section 8.
4. How did several Presidents respond to Congressional efforts to spend for internal improvements? At first, the body wasn't allowed to, under the Constitution, to open roads and canals in any state. However, George Washington would try to open the road across Cumberland Gap as he saw that it was strategically crucial to construct to benefit the nation directly. On the other hand, projects that indirectly benefit the nation were ruled as unconstitutional. For example, Jefferson's 1806 State of the Union Address would amend the Constitution to make sure that those "general" benefits (indirect) were never to receive the funding as it was seen as unconstitutional.
5. How did *United States v Butler* (1936) change this? This was a New Deal era case in which both parties relied on a Hamiltonian position. The majority and dissenting opinions of the Court accepted the legitimacy of Hamilton's position. However, the majority still ruled that the particular tax and regulatory problem at issue in the case was unconstitutional because its purpose regulated and controlled agricultural production. They stated that it was "a matter beyond the powers delegated to the federal government". This type of view would resemble more with Madison's interpretation of than Hamilton's on spending power.
6. What is the four part test created with *South Dakota v Dole* (1987)? The four-prong test was adopted to assess the constitutionality of spending conditions. There were four prongs or guidelines of the test. The first one was that the spending power must benefit the "general welfare" in Congress's judgement. The second one was to determine if the conditions placed were ambiguous. The third one was to seek if they were related to any particular national projects or programs already being funded. The final one is to determine the chance that there are other constitutional provisions that give an independent bar to the conditional grant of federal funds.