

The Lobbyist's Last Laugh

*How K Street Lobbyists Would Benefit From the McCain-Feingold
Campaign Finance Bill*



U.S. PIRG

July 5, 2001

The Lobbyist's Last Laugh

The Hidden Beneficiaries of the McCain-Feingold Campaign Finance Bill

Executive Summary

No place is more infamous than K Street, Washington D.C. Home to powerhouses such as Akin Gump and PricewaterhouseCoopers,¹ K Street is not only a breeding ground for influential lobbyists and political consultants, but the place where beltway insiders craft public policy and broker thousands of deals. Yet, despite giving almost a quarter of a million dollars to candidates, Political Action Committees (PACs) and parties in the last election cycle, K Street did not mount a campaign against the McCain-Feingold campaign finance bill as it went to the floor of the Senate earlier this year. The reason lies in the fine print of the bill.

The McCain-Feingold bill seeks to limit the undue political access and influence granted to wealthy special interests. At the heart of the bill is a ban on the unlimited “soft money” contributions to political parties, a modest yet laudable reform that could potentially curb the spending of some moneyed interests. However, lobbyists operate under a different form of currency – “hard money.”

Hard money can be given directly to candidates and has the potential to be much more corrupting to the democratic process than soft money. Large hard money contributors can collectively determine which candidates run for office and win elections. Voters are often forced to choose between two candidates pre-selected by a minority of wealthy hard money donors. Soft money, on the other hand, is given to parties, not candidates, and only comes into play in a handful of high-profile races. It has little to no role in primary elections, which is the place where many grassroots candidates lose or are forced out of the race by opponents backed by large hard money donors.

The McCain-Feingold bill does nothing to reduce the influence that large hard money donors have on election outcomes. In fact, during Senate debate, the bill was amended to include higher limits on hard money contributions to candidates and parties. Because of these increases in the bill, it is no wonder lobbying firms kept quiet during the debate. They, and the clients they represent, are among the chief beneficiaries of the legislation.

This study is the first of its kind to track individual contributions from lobbyists employed by the top firms in the country. While limited in its scope, the findings expose how lobbying firms and other moneyed interests use the hard money system for political gain and should raise a red flag for legislators considering proposals to increase existing hard money contribution limits.

Key Findings

This report examines how the McCain-Feingold bill would impact the political giving of the country's largest lobbying firms. The analysis considers the 144 firms that reported an income of at least \$1 million during 1998 or 1999, as identified by the Center for Responsive Politics.² These firms represent large corporations or entire industries willing to pay top dollar to lobby for

or against policy that impacts their bottom line. The following findings are based on contributions of \$200 or more³ given in the last election cycle by employees of these large firms:

- ❖ Lobbyists from top firms gave a total of \$24 million in the last election cycle, \$22.2 million, or 92 percent, in hard money and \$1.4 million in soft.
- ❖ Maximum individual contributions, limited to \$1,000 per candidate per election, made up 66 percent of the money given by lobbyists to federal candidates.
- ❖ Under McCain-Feingold, employees from top lobbying firms could have increased their total donations to candidates and parties by \$8.7 million, or 58 percent in the last election cycle.⁴

Political Giving in the Last Election Cycle

The 2000 elections were the most expensive election cycle in the history of the country. According to data released by the Federal Election Commission (FEC), fundraising by congressional candidates jumped 32 percent over the last presidential election cycle, party fundraising increased by 37 percent, and PAC contributions increased by 19 percent.⁵ Soft money contributions to political parties made up approximately one-fifth of the total money raised by candidates and parties.⁶

Almost all of the political contributions made by the largest lobbying firms were hard money donations. Of the \$24 million contributed by lobbyists* from the top 144 firms, 92 percent of the money given was hard money and 6 percent was soft. The remaining 2 percent of contributions went to joint fundraising committees (can be either hard or soft money).

Of the \$22.2 million contributed in hard money, candidates received 58 percent, PACs 32 percent, and parties 9 percent.

Breakdown of Hard Money Contributions from Top Lobbying Firms in 1999-2000

Recipient	Amount Received	Percent of Total
House Candidate	\$5,020,119	22.6%
Senate Candidate	\$4,796,170	21.6%
Presidential Candidate	\$3,130,653	14.1%
Independent Expenditure	\$300	0.001%
PAC	\$7,196,576	32.4%
Party	\$2,043,533	9.2%
Total:	\$22,187,351	

Ernst & Young topped the list for the most contributions given by employees in the last election cycle. In 1999, Ernst & Young reported almost \$3 million in lobbying receipts from communications, automotive, oil and other industries.⁷ Three firms gave more than a million in employee contributions and 72 gave more than \$100,000. The 10 biggest givers are listed below.

* The word “lobbyist” is used to refer to employees of top lobbying firms throughout the report.

Top 10 Lobbying Firms for Political Donations in 1999-2000

Lobbying Firm	Rank*	Total Given	Hard \$	Soft \$	Joint \$	% Hard
Ernst & Young	45	\$2,006,586	\$1,975,769	\$20,317	\$10,500	98%
PricewaterhouseCoopers	6	\$1,492,923	\$1,479,281	\$7,392	\$6,250	99%
Akin, Gump et al	4	\$1,121,625	\$1,088,375	\$7,750	\$25,500	97%
Verner, Liipfert et al	3	\$739,064	\$719,514	\$3,550	\$16,000	97%
Cassidy & Assoc	1	\$665,219	\$542,037	\$116,182	\$7,000	81%
Brownstein, Hyatt et al	75	\$589,621	\$319,741	\$251,380	\$18,500	54%
Patton Boggs LLP	2	\$580,634	\$537,850	\$36,284	\$6,500	93%
Vinson & Elkins	64	\$525,577	\$519,327	\$0	\$6,250	99%
Mayer, Brown & Platt	46	\$438,950	\$434,450	\$3,000	\$1,500	99%
Holland & Knight	59	\$424,486	\$417,029	\$457	\$7,000	98%

* Rank is based on 1999 income, as reported by the Center for Responsive Politics on May 31, 2000.

The Lobbyists and Companies Behind the Firms

Among the primary clients of the top 144 lobbying firms in the country are large corporations, trade associations, and industry front groups funded by large corporations whose narrow political agenda is often at odds with the public interest. Clients include big corporate polluters such as Exxon-Mobil, which supports drilling for oil and gas in the Arctic Refuge⁸ – one of the last wild places in the U.S. – and Southern Company, the nation’s largest utility air polluter.⁹ Also on the list of clients are money-lending institutions such as Sallie Mae and Bank of America. These corporations have supported efforts to repeal legislation that would help students pay back their college loans in a timely fashion.¹⁰ Visa, MasterCard and other credit card companies have paid lobbyists from top firms to help pass laws that make it harder to declare bankruptcy.¹¹ Anheuser-Busch and other liquor manufacturers that hire professional lobbyists have a vested interest in eliminating the federal tax on beer¹² and lowering the national drunk driving threshold, which MADD (Mothers Against Drunk Driving) claims could save 500 lives a year.¹³ The list goes on and on.

Profiled below are a few of the individual lobbyists who maximized their giving in the hard money system during the last election cycle:

Name	Lobbying Firm	Top Clients*	Total Hard \$ Given**	No. of Contributions
Smith, James E	Smith-Free Group	Bell Atlantic, Columbia/HCA Healthcare Corp, CSX Corp, Freddie Mac, MasterCard, MBNA, Northwest Mutual Life, USA Group Inc, Visa USA	\$68,541	85
Tate, Dan	Cassidy & Assoc	Boeing, Voicestream, Major League Baseball, Repeal PUHCA Now Coalition, Subaru America	\$56,750	133
Siebert, Thomas	Patton Boggs LLP	Supra Telecom \$ Information Systems	\$56,300	16
Abramoff, Jack	Preston, Gates et al	Pitney Bowes Inc, Future of Puerto Rico Inc, Court TV, Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians***	\$55,748	52
Berman, Michael	Duberstein Group	Fannie Mae, GM, Goldman Sachs, Pharmacia & Upjohn Inc, Transportation Institute	\$54,499	45
Boggs, Thomas	Downey Chandler Inc	AOL, British Energy, MCI WorldCom, Smokeless Tobacco Council, Sprint Corp	\$54,323	60
Jankowsky, Joel	Akin, Gump et al	AOL, MPAA, Mobil Oil, Exxon Mobil Corp, AT&T	\$53,847	36

Name	Lobbying Firm	Top Clients*	Total Hard \$ Given**	No. of Contributions
Keating, Tim	Timmons & Co	American Petroleum Institute, Anheuser-Busch, National Rifle Association, DaimlerChrysler	\$53,250	78
Carp, Bertram	Williams & Jensen	Continental Airlines, Fannie Mae, Gateway 2000, Qwest Communications, Time Warner	\$53,210	44
Madigan, Peter	Boland & Madigan Inc	Smokeless Tobacco Council, CMS Defense Systems, Charles Schwab, Ford, Fannie Mae, Lockheed Martin, PNC Bank Corp, Boeing, Bell Atlantic	\$50,650	41
Champlin, Steven	Duberstein Group	Fannie Mae, GM, Time Warner, United Airlines, American Gaming Association	\$50,450	64

* From Center for Responsive Politics.

**Refunded contributions not included in totals.

***The Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians paid Preston, Gates et al \$3 million¹⁴ to promote gambling interests, such as continuing to expand and allow legalized gambling on amateur events.¹⁵

The Impact of McCain-Feingold

On April 2, 2001 the U.S. Senate passed S. 27 or the McCain-Feingold campaign finance bill by a vote of 59-41. The bill bans soft money contributions to political parties and prevents corporate and labor interests from spending unlimited sums on electioneering issue ads. However, the final bill also includes a provision sponsored by Senators Thompson (Tenn.) and Feinstein (Cal.) that would increase certain hard money contribution limits. The amendment doubles the \$1,000 limits on individual contributions to candidates, doubles the \$5,000 per year state party contribution limits, raises the national party limits from \$20,000 to \$25,000, and increases the aggregate amount an individual can give per election cycle from \$50,000 to \$75,000. The bill also dramatically increases contribution limits for senatorial candidates running against wealthy challengers. The so-called “millionaire amendment” allows candidates facing “super spenders” to raise \$12,000 contributions from individuals and to receive unlimited party spending on their behalf – up to 110 percent of the amount spent by the wealthy candidate.

As shown in this study, lobbyists are large hard money donors and could potentially *increase* their political clout under McCain-Feingold. While lobbyists from top firms have the means necessary to make substantial contributions to a candidate and could take advantage of higher limits, the “typical worker” or “ordinary citizen” could not. This means that, under McCain-Feingold, a greater proportion of campaign funds will come from lobbyists and other wealthy donors, making small \$50 or \$100 contributions from average constituents even less meaningful than they are under the current system.

Of the \$13 million given to candidates by top lobbying firms in the last election cycle, contributions greater than or equal to the current legal maximum of \$1,000 accounted for \$7.5 million of the total. When multiple contributions to the same candidate were considered, the total money from maximum contributions jumps to \$8.6 million or 66 percent of all money donated to candidates. (See chart below)



If the McCain-Feingold bill had been law in the last election cycle, lobbyists *could* have doubled their maximum contributions to candidates, doubled their state party maximum contributions and increased their national party contributions by 25 percent. Top firms could have increased their

total employee contributions to candidates and parties by 58 percent in the last election cycle, from \$15 million to \$23.7 million. This \$8.7 million increase far outweighs the \$1.4 million in soft money that the bill would have removed.

Potential Increase in Contributions From Lobbyists Under McCain-Feingold

	<i>Total From Maximum Contributions in 99-00</i>	<i>Allowed Increase Under McCain-Feingold</i>
Maximum Individual Contributions to Candidates	\$ 8,570,603	\$ 8,570,603
From one \$1,000 Contributions	\$ 7,556,103	\$ 7,556,103
From two \$500 Contributions	\$ 981,500	\$ 981,500
From four \$250 Contributions	\$ 33,000	\$ 33,000
Maximum Party Contributions	\$ 255,000	\$ 150,000
To National Parties	\$ 140,000	\$ 35,000
To State Parties	\$ 115,000	\$ 115,000
Grand Total:	\$ 8,825,603	\$ 8,720,603

The following charts illustrate the likely effect of the McCain-Feingold bill on contributions from top lobbyists.



These charts assume that the McCain-Feingold bill would have removed all of the soft money given by lobbyists in the last election cycle. This is far from certain. While soft money donors would be prohibited from donating large sums directly to political parties – in excess of \$100,000 in hard money per presidential election cycle – they could still spend unlimited sums on independent expenditures, on direct mail or telephone “push polls” that attack a candidate’s reputation, or on issue ads that help set the agenda of a campaign. Lobbyists and former politicians such as Newt Gingrich and Bill Clinton could become the new fundraising kingpins in the post McCain-Feingold world. These political operatives might even take over the money-laundering role now played by political parties – except that unlimited sums would flow to independent groups instead of parties.

Conclusions

Both Senators McCain and Feingold have stated that the purpose of their bill is to reduce the influence of special interests in politics, yet the round of amendments approved by the Senate in April do just the opposite. Increasing the hard money contribution limits will allow powerful interests even *greater* control over the election process, offsetting any progress made by banning soft money. As this report has shown, top lobbying firms in Washington, D.C. and their clients would be among the chief beneficiaries of higher contribution limits.

While contributions from lobbyists make up only a small percentage of the total money in politics, a similar story can be told of contributions from corporate executives, political consultants, and many other special interests. Even those large soft money donors who currently give very little hard money could find ways to adapt to the McCain-Feingold bill. Much if not all of the soft money banned by the bill could be re-channeled into the hard money system or used for political activities not covered by the legislation.

Comprehensive reform must include provisions to dramatically lower contribution limits to a level that would make even small \$20 contributions meaningful. As long as politicians continue to win office by soliciting contributions from the one in a thousand Americans who can afford to give \$1,000, we will have a government that represents a small minority, not a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. Raising the existing limit would set back the citizens' reform movement for decades to come.

History has shown us that Congress may seriously consider reforming our campaign finance system only once every twenty years. If this is to be the year, we should get it right. The next opportunity may be decades away.

Methodology

Only contributions greater than \$200 were considered in the analysis, as the Federal Election Commission (FEC) does not require disclosure of contributions under \$200.

All individual contributions during the 1999-2000 election cycle were downloaded from the FEC in May 2001. Contributions are from January 1, 1999 to December 31, 2000. Refunded contributions were not considered.

Top lobbying firms, rank, and receipts from 1998 and 1999 were found on the Center for Responsive Politics website: www.opensecrets.org

Individuals who listed a top lobbying firm in the "occupation" field of the FEC database were compiled into a list, including obvious misspellings of a firm name. Additional contributions from these individuals also were considered if the name, city, state, and zip code were identical. Because many individuals did not list an occupation and others made contributions from multiple addresses, the total amount of money donated by lobbyists is likely much greater than calculated in this analysis.

Contributions from employees of top lobbying firms were coded based on employer. Contributions from individuals who listed more than one firm as an employer were counted under both firms. Duplicate listings were subtracted from all totals.

Contributions were separated into hard money, soft money, and donations to joint fundraising committees, based on the committee type and designation assigned by the FEC. The hard money recipients were similarly separated by committee type as designated by the FEC.

Maximum \$1,000 contributions from employees were found by summing all contributions of \$1,000 to a House, Senate, or Presidential candidate. Multiple \$500 or \$250 contributions that collectively totaled \$1,000 were considered as maximum contributions if the donor name and recipient name were identical.

The potential increase in hard money donated under McCain-Feingold was calculated by doubling all maximum contributions to individuals, doubling maximum contributions to state parties, and increasing maximum national party contributions by 25 percent.

¹ Akin Gump and PricewaterhouseCooper may not literally operate out of offices located on K Street.

² Influence Inc. *The Bottom Line on Washington Lobbying*, Center for Responsive Politics, 2000 Edition. Available online at: <http://www.opensecrets.org/pubs/lobby00/lobby.asp>

³ The Federal Election Commission does not require disclosure of contributions less than \$200.

⁴ Assumes that all maximum \$1,000 donors would adjust their contributions to the new maximum allowed by McCain-Feingold.

⁵ Statistics can be found online at: http://www.fec.gov/finance_reports.html

⁶ Calculation is based on numbers released by the FEC on May 15, 2000. Actual percentage is 22.

⁷ Influence Inc. *The Bottom Line on Washington Lobbying*, Center for Responsive Politics, 2000 Edition. Available online at: <http://www.opensecrets.org/pubs/lobby00/lobby.asp>

⁸ *The Dirty Four: The Case Against Letting BP Amoco, ExxonMobil, Chevron, and Phillips Petroleum Drill in the Arctic Refuge*, U.S. Public Interest Research Group, March 22, 2001.

⁹ *Southern Company: Abuse of Power*, U.S. PIRG, May 2001.

¹⁰ U.S. PIRG, <http://www.pirg.org/highered/lenderlawsuit.htm>

¹¹ Consumer Federation of America, <http://www.consumerfed.org/backpage/bankruptcy.html>

¹² Mothers Against Drunk Driving, http://jtdirect.madd.org/plugin.jhtml?siteID=MADD&p=2&Tab=News&Object_ID=267954

¹³ Center for Responsive Politics, http://www.opensecrets.org/alerts/v5/alertv5_49.asp

¹⁴ Influence Inc. *The Bottom Line on Washington Lobbying*, Center for Responsive Politics, 2000 Edition. Available online at: <http://www.opensecrets.org/pubs/lobby00/lobby.asp>.

¹⁵ Center for Responsive Politics, http://www.opensecrets.org/alerts/v6/alertv6_17.asp

Appendix A: Contributions by Lobbying Firm

Lobbying Firm	Total Given	Hard \$	Soft \$	Joint \$	%Hard
Accord Group	\$20,950	\$20,950	\$0	\$0	100%
Advocacy Group	\$110,507	\$108,157	\$1,350	\$1,000	98%
Akin, Gump et al	\$1,121,625	\$1,088,375	\$7,750	\$25,500	97%
Alcalde & Fay	\$49,791	\$47,291	\$0	\$2,500	95%
Alpine Group	\$118,050	\$88,050	\$30,000	\$0	75%
American Continental Group	\$96,327	\$88,948	\$2,379	\$5,000	92%
American Defense International	\$48,325	\$47,325	\$0	\$1,000	98%
Ann Eppard Assoc	\$32,724	\$32,724	\$0	\$0	100%
Arent, Fox et al	\$171,825	\$171,825	\$0	\$0	100%
Arnold & Porter	\$280,211	\$274,711	\$500	\$5,000	98%
Arter & Hadden	\$265,265	\$154,815	\$107,950	\$2,500	58%
Baker & Hostetler	\$263,492	\$263,492	\$0	\$0	100%
Baker, Donelson et al	\$99,333	\$99,333	\$0	\$0	100%
Balch & Bingham	\$142,706	\$141,106	\$600	\$1,000	99%
Ball Janik	\$12,950	\$12,950	\$0	\$0	100%
Barbour, Griffith & Rogers	\$147,123	\$138,323	\$3,800	\$5,000	94%
Barents Group	\$750	\$750	\$0	\$0	100%
Bergner, Bockorny et al	\$92,219	\$92,219	\$0	\$0	100%
Black, Kelly et al	\$404,646	\$153,221	\$250,425	\$1,000	38%
Boland & Madigan Inc	\$189,558	\$183,958	\$600	\$5,000	97%
Bracewell & Patterson	\$94,785	\$86,285	\$0	\$8,500	91%
Bracy Williams & Co	\$32,050	\$31,050	\$0	\$1,000	97%
Brownstein, Hyatt et al	\$589,621	\$319,741	\$251,380	\$18,500	54%
Bryan Cave LLP	\$226,271	\$156,421	\$1,500	\$68,350	69%
Butera & Andrews	\$52,672	\$52,672	\$0	\$0	100%
Campbell-Crane & Assoc	\$61,508	\$61,508	\$0	\$0	100%
Canfield & Assoc	\$66,300	\$61,300	\$0	\$5,000	92%
Capitol Assoc	\$88,385	\$88,385	\$0	\$0	100%
Carmen Group Inc	\$45,874	\$45,874	\$0	\$0	100%
Cartwright & Riley	\$28,000	\$28,000	\$0	\$0	100%
Cassidy & Assoc	\$665,219	\$542,037	\$116,182	\$7,000	81%
Cavarocchi Ruscio Dennis Assoc	\$43,089	\$43,089	\$0	\$0	100%
Chambers, Conlon & Hartwell	\$55,476	\$54,976	\$0	\$500	99%
Clark & Weinstock	\$176,841	\$172,841	\$1,000	\$3,000	98%
Collier, Shannon et al	\$197,300	\$197,050	\$0	\$250	100%
Collins & Co	\$30,175	\$30,175	\$0	\$0	100%
Copeland, Lowery & Jacquez	\$122,264	\$119,264	\$0	\$3,000	98%
Covington & Burling	\$138,250	\$131,500	\$4,000	\$2,750	95%
Da Vinci Group	\$4,250	\$4,250	\$0	\$0	100%
Davidson & Co	\$80,200	\$78,200	\$0	\$2,000	98%
Davis & Harman	\$88,733	\$77,883	\$10,850	\$0	88%
Denny Miller Assoc Inc	\$94,350	\$93,350	\$0	\$1,000	99%
Dewey Ballantine	\$92,450	\$91,450	\$1,000	\$0	99%
Dickstein, Shapiro & Morin	\$185,665	\$184,665	\$0	\$1,000	99%
Dow, Lohnes & Albertson	\$118,941	\$118,941	\$0	\$0	100%
Downey Chandler Inc	\$119,135	\$103,368	\$11,267	\$4,500	87%
Downey McGrath Group	\$112,997	\$102,997	\$10,000	\$0	91%
Duberstein Group	\$270,954	\$252,604	\$12,350	\$6,000	93%

Lobbying Firm	Total Given	Hard \$	Soft \$	Joint \$	%Hard
Dutko Group	\$220,507	\$219,507	\$1,000	\$0	100%
Dyer, Ellis & Joseph	\$41,450	\$41,450	\$0	\$0	100%
E. Del Smith & Co	\$55,925	\$55,925	\$0	\$0	100%
EOP Group Inc	\$40,285	\$37,835	\$2,450	\$0	94%
Ernst & Young	\$2,006,586	\$1,975,769	\$20,317	\$10,500	98%
Ervin Technical Assoc	\$20,462	\$20,462	\$0	\$0	100%
Ferguson Group	\$74,440	\$74,440	\$0	\$0	100%
Fierce & Isakowitz	\$50,723	\$50,723	\$0	\$0	100%
Furman Group Inc	\$19,250	\$19,250	\$0	\$0	100%
Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher	\$250,728	\$248,478	\$0	\$2,250	99%
Goodwin, Procter & Hoar	\$36,600	\$36,100	\$500	\$0	99%
Greenberg, Traurig et al	\$354,495	\$331,495	\$0	\$23,000	94%
Griffin, Johnson et al	\$154,517	\$142,517	\$0	\$12,000	92%
Hall Green & Assoc	\$110,900	\$105,900	\$5,000	\$0	95%
Hecht, Spencer & Assoc	\$44,102	\$44,102	\$0	\$0	100%
Hogan & Hartson	\$313,398	\$312,398	\$0	\$1,000	100%
Holland & Knight	\$424,486	\$417,029	\$457	\$7,000	98%
Hooper, Owen et al	\$197,491	\$196,491	\$0	\$1,000	99%
Hopkins & Sutter	\$176,440	\$161,940	\$3,500	\$11,000	92%
Infotech Strategies	\$5,750	\$5,750	\$0	\$0	100%
Jack Ferguson Assoc	\$37,670	\$37,670	\$0	\$0	100%
Janus-Meritt Strategies	\$54,556	\$54,556	\$0	\$0	100%
Jefferson Government Relations	\$24,265	\$24,265	\$0	\$0	100%
Jefferson Group	\$89,600	\$54,600	\$25,000	\$10,000	61%
Johnston & Assoc	\$69,503	\$67,003	\$0	\$2,500	96%
Kessler & Assoc	\$97,173	\$97,173	\$0	\$0	100%
Law Offices of John T O'Rourke	\$22,750	\$22,750	\$0	\$0	100%
Legislative Strategies Group	\$113,367	\$112,367	\$0	\$1,000	99%
Lent & Scrivner	\$52,787	\$48,787	\$2,500	\$1,500	92%
Livingston Group	\$1,650	\$1,650	\$0	\$0	100%
Liz Robbins & Assoc	\$29,500	\$23,500	\$0	\$6,000	80%
Long, Aldridge & Norman	\$115,860	\$115,610	\$0	\$250	100%
Manatt, Phelps & Phillips	\$181,140	\$175,640	\$0	\$5,500	97%
MARC Assoc	\$32,350	\$32,350	\$0	\$0	100%
Marcus G Faust PC	\$17,000	\$17,000	\$0	\$0	100%
Mayer, Brown & Platt	\$438,950	\$434,450	\$3,000	\$1,500	99%
McClure, Gerard, & Neuenschwander Inc	\$34,257	\$29,257	\$0	\$5,000	85%
McDermott, O'Neill & Assoc	\$64,400	\$63,400	\$0	\$1,000	98%
McDermott, Will & Emery	\$367,225	\$355,325	\$250	\$19,250	97%
McGlotten & Jarvis	\$26,200	\$23,200	\$0	\$3,000	89%
McGuire, Woods et al	\$143,938	\$143,438	\$0	\$500	100%
McLeod, Watkinson & Miller	\$5,350	\$5,350	\$0	\$0	100%
Miller & Chevalier	\$118,450	\$107,700	\$10,250	\$500	91%
Mintz, Levin et al	\$119,043	\$112,793	\$1,250	\$5,000	95%
Morrison & Foerster	\$112,156	\$101,656	\$500	\$10,000	91%
Murray, Scheer et al	\$92,689	\$92,689	\$0	\$0	100%
MWW Group Inc	\$68,200	\$68,200	\$0	\$0	100%
National Environmental Strategies	\$15,700	\$15,700	\$0	\$0	100%
O'Brien Calio	\$169,515	\$108,665	\$58,850	\$2,000	64%

Contributions By Firm

Lobbying Firm	Total Given	Hard \$	Soft \$	Joint \$	%Hard
O'Connor & Hannan	\$159,050	\$143,450	\$11,600	\$4,000	90%
Olsson, Frank & Weeda	\$73,822	\$73,822	\$0	\$0	100%
O'Neill, Athy & Casey	\$66,850	\$63,850	\$0	\$3,000	96%
Oppenheimer, Wolff & Donnelly	\$25,625	\$24,625	\$0	\$1,000	96%
Palumbo & Cerrell Inc	\$14,050	\$14,050	\$0	\$0	100%
Parry & Romani Assoc	\$68,990	\$66,490	\$0	\$2,500	96%
Patton Boggs LLP	\$580,634	\$537,850	\$36,284	\$6,500	93%
Paul Magliocchetti Assoc	\$382,393	\$382,393	\$0	\$0	100%
Podesta.com	\$126,793	\$122,293	\$2,000	\$2,500	96%
Policy Impact Communications	\$21,580	\$21,580	\$0	\$0	100%
Powell, Goldstein et al	\$117,533	\$116,033	\$0	\$1,500	99%
Powers, Pyles et al	\$61,100	\$60,850	\$0	\$250	100%
Preston, Gates et al	\$308,065	\$300,815	\$2,500	\$4,750	98%
PricewaterhouseCoopers	\$1,492,923	\$1,479,281	\$7,392	\$6,250	99%
Public Strategies Washington Inc	\$197,357	\$170,357	\$25,000	\$2,000	86%
R Duffy Wall & Assoc	\$133,005	\$133,005	\$0	\$0	100%
Reed, Smith et al	\$242,537	\$237,287	\$3,500	\$1,750	98%
Robertson, Monagle & Eastaugh	\$28,200	\$28,200	\$0	\$0	100%
Robison International	\$51,700	\$51,700	\$0	\$0	100%
Ryan, Phillips et al	\$128,150	\$127,650	\$500	\$0	100%
Sagamore Assoc	\$35,650	\$35,650	\$0	\$0	100%
Shaw, Pittman et al	\$407,020	\$395,380	\$10,640	\$1,000	97%
Smith-Free Group	\$192,705	\$190,320	\$1,385	\$1,000	99%
Steelman Health Strategies	\$53,000	\$47,000	\$0	\$6,000	89%
Stuntz & Davis	\$16,500	\$16,500	\$0	\$0	100%
Sunrise Research Corp	\$3,750	\$3,750	\$0	\$0	100%
Swidler & Berlin	\$271,264	\$269,264	\$0	\$2,000	99%
Thelen, Reid & Priest	\$236,190	\$233,090	\$3,100	\$0	99%
Thomas D. Campbell & Assoc	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$0	\$0	100%
Timmons & Co	\$259,594	\$231,894	\$10,700	\$17,000	89%
Tongour & Scott	\$40,898	\$40,898	\$0	\$0	100%
Troutman Sanders	\$101,940	\$96,040	\$5,900	\$0	94%
Ungaretti & Harris	\$79,732	\$49,732	\$30,000	\$0	62%
Van Scoyoc Assoc	\$218,001	\$217,001	\$0	\$1,000	100%
Verner, Lipfert et al	\$739,064	\$719,514	\$3,550	\$16,000	97%
Vinson & Elkins	\$525,577	\$519,327	\$0	\$6,250	99%
Washington Counsel	\$190,432	\$188,432	\$0	\$2,000	99%
Washington Group	\$143,253	\$136,253	\$0	\$7,000	95%
Weber McGinn	\$52,700	\$51,700	\$0	\$1,000	98%
Weil, Gotshal & Manges	\$240,264	\$225,314	\$0	\$14,950	94%
Wexler Group	\$206,058	\$199,858	\$0	\$6,200	97%
Williams & Jensen	\$347,302	\$310,914	\$32,388	\$4,000	90%
Willkie, Farr & Gallagher	\$132,212	\$129,212	\$0	\$3,000	98%
Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering	\$381,505	\$155,655	\$216,350	\$9,500	41%
Winburn, Jenkins & Wheat	\$22,500	\$22,500	\$0	\$0	100%
Winston & Strawn	\$283,310	\$274,910	\$4,650	\$3,750	97%
Wunder, Knight et al	\$49,500	\$48,500	\$0	\$1,000	98%
<i>Duplicate Listing</i>	<i>(\$372,792)</i>	<i>(\$360,542)</i>	<i>(\$1,500)</i>	<i>(\$10,750)</i>	<i>N/A</i>
	\$24,002,397	\$22,187,351	\$1,365,646	\$457,000	92.4%

Contributions By Firm

Appendix B: Contributions by Legislator

Note: Top recipients in each state are listed in bold type.

Candidate Name	Party	State	District	Amount Received
YOUNG, DONALD	REP	AK	0	\$29,450
ADERHOLT, ROBERT BROWN	REP	AL	4	\$24,105
RILEY, BOB	REP	AL	3	\$14,295
CALLAHAN, HERBERT L	REP	AL	1	\$14,000
BACHUS, SPENCER T III	REP	AL	6	\$12,250
CRAMER, ROBERT E "BUD"	DEM	AL	5	\$9,750
HILLIARD, EARL FREDERICK	DEM	AL	7	\$8,250
EVERETT, TERRY	REP	AL	2	\$4,500
ROSS, MICHAEL AVERY	DEM	AR	4	\$14,450
BERRY, MARION	DEM	AR	1	\$6,500
HUTCHINSON, ASA	REP	AR	3	\$3,500
SNYDER, VICTOR FREDERICK	DEM	AR	2	\$2,750
KYL, JON L	REP	AZ	0	\$44,321
PASTOR, EDWARD L	DEM	AZ	2	\$25,000
KOLBE, JAMES T	REP	AZ	5	\$19,336
HAYWORTH, J D	REP	AZ	6	\$9,750
SHADEGG, JOHN BARDEN	REP	AZ	4	\$4,250
STUMP, BOB	REP	AZ	3	\$3,900
FLAKE, JEFFRY LANE	REP	AZ	1	\$1,500
FEINSTEIN, DIANNE	DEM	CA	0	\$106,900
HARMAN, JANE	DEM	CA	36	\$48,118
LEWIS, JERRY	REP	CA	40	\$46,700
WAXMAN, HENRY A	DEM	CA	29	\$34,000
TAUSCHER, ELLEN O	DEM	CA	10	\$30,840
DOOLEY, CALVIN M	DEM	CA	20	\$30,200
SCHIFF, ADAM	DEM	CA	27	\$26,850
THOMAS, WILLIAM M	REP	CA	21	\$21,312
ESHOO, ANNA G	DEM	CA	14	\$20,667
MATSUI, ROBERT	DEM	CA	5	\$19,071
BERMAN, HOWARD L	DEM	CA	26	\$17,000
SANCHEZ, LORETTA	DEM	CA	46	\$16,400
CUNNINGHAM, RANDY "DUKE"	REP	CA	51	\$15,750
MCKEON, HOWARD "BUCK"	REP	CA	25	\$15,250
GALLEGLY, ELTON	REP	CA	23	\$15,100
PELOSI, NANCY	DEM	CA	8	\$14,250
ROHRBACHER, DANA	REP	CA	45	\$12,300
BECERRA, XAVIER	DEM	CA	30	\$11,750
HUNTER, DUNCAN CONGRESSMAN	REP	CA	52	\$11,500
CAPPS, LOIS G	DEM	CA	22	\$10,700
CALVERT, KENNETH STANTON	REP	CA	43	\$10,566
CONDIT, GARY A	DEM	CA	18	\$10,550
DOOLITTLE, JOHN T	REP	CA	4	\$9,750
MILLER, GEORGE	DEM	CA	7	\$9,000
THOMPSON, C MICHAEL	DEM	CA	1	\$8,640
ROYCE, EDWARD R	REP	CA	39	\$8,250
COX, CHRISTOPHER	REP	CA	47	\$7,950
HONDA, MICHAEL MAKOTO	DEM	CA	15	\$7,250
FARR, SAM	DEM	CA	17	\$7,000
BACA, JOE	DEM	CA	42	\$7,000
LOFGREN, ZOE	DEM	CA	16	\$6,750
FILNER, BOB	DEM	CA	50	\$6,500
SHERMAN, BRAD	DEM	CA	24	\$6,250
HERGER, WALTER WILLIAM (WALLY) JR	REP	CA	2	\$6,175
STARK, FORTNEY PETE	DEM	CA	13	\$6,000
LANTOS, TOM	DEM	CA	12	\$5,750

Candidate Name	Party	State	District	Amount Received
ROYBAL-ALLARD, LUCILLE	DEM	CA	33	\$5,750
DIXON, JULIAN C	DEM	CA	32	\$5,500
HORN, STEVE	REP	CA	38	\$5,250
RADANOVICH, GEORGE	REP	CA	19	\$5,225
MILLER, GARY G	REP	CA	41	\$4,750
LEE, BARBARA	DEM	CA	9	\$4,150
OSE, DOUG	REP	CA	3	\$4,050
NAPOLITANO, GRACE	DEM	CA	34	\$4,000
DREIER, DAVID	REP	CA	28	\$3,750
BONO, MARY	REP	CA	44	\$3,550
POMBO, RICHARD	REP	CA	11	\$3,000
WOOLSEY, LYNN C	DEM	CA	6	\$2,600
WATERS, MAXINE	DEM	CA	35	\$2,500
SOLIS, HILDA	DEM	CA	31	\$2,250
ISSA, DARRELL E	REP	CA	48	\$2,250
DAVIS, SUSAN A	DEM	CA	49	\$1,500
MILLENDER-MCDONALD, JUANITA	DEM	CA	37	\$500
MCINNIS, SCOTT	REP	CO	3	\$22,200
UDALL, MARK	DEM	CO	2	\$21,793
DEGETTE, DIANA	DEM	CO	1	\$21,700
TANCREDO, THOMAS GERARD	REP	CO	6	\$10,754
HEFLEY, JOEL	REP	CO	5	\$3,711
LIEBERMAN, JOSEPH I	DEM	CT	0	\$68,254
JOHNSON, NANCY L	REP	CT	6	\$22,700
DELAURO, ROSA L	DEM	CT	3	\$11,800
MALONEY, JAMES H	DEM	CT	5	\$7,589
LARSON, JOHN B	DEM	CT	1	\$7,000
SHAYS, CHRISTOPHER	REP	CT	4	\$1,500
SIMMONS, ROB	REP	CT	2	\$500
CARPER, THOMAS R	DEM	DE	0	\$60,653
CASTLE, MICHAEL N	REP	DE	0	\$10,250
NELSON, BILL	DEM	FL	0	\$90,724
SHAW, E CLAY JR	REP	FL	22	\$38,100
FOLEY, MARK ADAM	REP	FL	16	\$19,877
YOUNG, C W BILL	REP	FL	10	\$12,957
PUTNAM, ADAM HUGHES	REP	FL	12	\$10,500
THURMAN, KAREN L	DEM	FL	5	\$10,415
BOYD, F ALLEN JR	DEM	FL	2	\$9,000
DEUTSCH, PETER R	DEM	FL	20	\$8,400
DAVIS, JIM	DEM	FL	11	\$8,350
MEEK, CARRIE P	DEM	FL	17	\$8,250
MICA, JOHN L	REP	FL	7	\$6,500
BILIRAKIS, MICHAEL	REP	FL	9	\$5,750
STEARNS, CLIFFORD B	REP	FL	6	\$5,500
CRENSHAW, ANDER	REP	FL	4	\$4,250
DIAZ-BALART, LINCOLN	REP	FL	21	\$4,100
SCARBOROUGH, CHARLES JOSEPH	REP	FL	1	\$4,000
BROWN, CORRINE	DEM	FL	3	\$3,500
KELLER, RICHARD ANTHONY	REP	FL	8	\$3,000
WELDON, DAVID J	REP	FL	15	\$2,900
WEXLER, ROBERT	DEM	FL	19	\$2,450
HASTINGS, ALCEE L	DEM	FL	23	\$2,300
MILLER, DAN	REP	FL	13	\$1,500
GOSS, PORTER JOHNSTON	REP	FL	14	\$750
MILLER, ZELL BRYAN	DEM	GA	0	\$60,865
ISAKSON, JOHN HARDY	REP	GA	6	\$13,000
CHAMBLISS, SAXBY	REP	GA	8	\$10,507
LEWIS, JOHN	DEM	GA	5	\$9,650

Contributions by Legislator

Candidate Name	Party	State	District	Amount Received
COLLINS, MICHAEL A	REP	GA	3	\$6,500
NORWOOD, CHARLES WHITLOW	REP	GA	10	\$5,100
LINDER, JOHN	REP	GA	11	\$4,750
BISHOP, SANFORD D JR	DEM	GA	2	\$3,400
BARR, BOB	REP	GA	7	\$2,200
KINGSTON, JOHN H (JACK)	REP	GA	1	\$1,450
DEAL, NATHAN	REP	GA	9	\$1,000
MCKINNEY, CYNTHIA	DEM	GA	4	\$250
AKAKA, DANIEL KAHIKINA	DEM	HI	0	\$6,750
ABERCROMBIE, NEIL	DEM	HI	1	\$3,250
MINK, PATSY TAKEMOTO	DEM	HI	2	\$250
NUSSLE, JAMES ALLEN	REP	IA	2	\$8,331
LATHAM, TOM	REP	IA	5	\$4,225
BOSWELL, LEONARD L	DEM	IA	3	\$3,500
GANSKE, JOHN GREG	REP	IA	4	\$2,750
SIMPSON, MICHAEL K	REP	ID	2	\$4,500
OTTER, CLEMENT LEROY	REP	ID	1	\$4,425
KIRK, MARK STEVEN	REP	IL	10	\$26,350
HYDE, HENRY J	REP	IL	6	\$25,549
LAHOOD, RAY	REP	IL	18	\$22,425
HASTERT, J DENNIS	REP	IL	14	\$19,550
WELLER, GERALD	REP	IL	11	\$18,834
JACKSON, JESSE LOUIS JR	DEM	IL	2	\$12,550
LIPINSKI, WILLIAM O	DEM	IL	3	\$10,050
SCHAKOWSKY, JANICE D	DEM	IL	9	\$9,950
RUSH, BOBBY LEE	DEM	IL	1	\$5,750
BLAGOJEVICH, ROD R	DEM	IL	5	\$5,000
JOHNSON, TIMOTHY V	REP	IL	15	\$4,750
CRANE, PHILIP MILLER	REP	IL	8	\$4,251
PHELPS, DAVID D	DEM	IL	19	\$3,300
SHIMKUS, JOHN M	REP	IL	20	\$2,500
MANZULLO, DONALD A	REP	IL	16	\$2,000
EVANS, LANE A	DEM	IL	17	\$2,000
DAVIS, DANNY K	DEM	IL	7	\$2,000
COSTELLO, JERRY F	DEM	IL	12	\$1,750
BIGGERT, JUDY	REP	IL	13	\$1,500
GUTIERREZ, LUIS V	DEM	IL	4	\$1,000
LUGAR, RICHARD G	REP	IN	0	\$41,645
VISCLOSKEY, PETER J	DEM	IN	1	\$20,454
ROEMER, TIM	DEM	IN	3	\$14,522
BURTON, DANNY L	REP	IN	6	\$13,250
HILL, BARON P	DEM	IN	9	\$7,900
BUYER, STEVE	REP	IN	5	\$6,057
CARSON, JULIA	DEM	IN	10	\$4,300
HOSTETTLER, JOHN N	REP	IN	8	\$3,850
KERNS, BRIAN	REP	IN	7	\$2,000
SOUDER, MARK E	REP	IN	4	\$1,000
PENCE, MICHAEL RICHARD	REP	IN	2	\$750
MORAN, JERRY	REP	KS	1	\$41,750
MOORE, DENNIS	DEM	KS	3	\$11,850
TAHRT, TODD	REP	KS	4	\$2,000
RYUN, JIM R	REP	KS	2	\$500
FLETCHER, ERNEST LEE	REP	KY	6	\$40,227
NORTHUP, ANNE MEAGHER	REP	KY	3	\$16,879
WHITFIELD, EDWARD	REP	KY	1	\$12,500
ROGERS, HAROLD D	REP	KY	5	\$8,750
LEWIS, RON	REP	KY	2	\$3,000
TAUZIN, W J "BILLY"	REP	LA	3	\$26,996

Contributions by Legislator

Candidate Name	Party	State	District	Amount Received
JOHN, CHRIS	DEM	LA	7	\$19,105
BAKER, RICHARD HUGH	REP	LA	6	\$16,750
VITTER, DAVID B	REP	LA	1	\$8,783
JEFFERSON, WILLIAM JENNINGS	DEM	LA	2	\$8,000
MCCRERY, JAMES O III	REP	LA	4	\$5,383
COOKSEY, JOHN CHARLES	REP	LA	5	\$2,750
KENNEDY, EDWARD MOORE SENATOR	DEM	MA	0	\$157,900
MARKEY, EDWARD JOHN	DEM	MA	7	\$48,588
MOAKLEY, JOHN JOSEPH	DEM	MA	9	\$33,600
MEEHAN, MARTIN T	DEM	MA	5	\$32,100
NEAL, RICHARD E	DEM	MA	2	\$20,692
MCGOVERN, JAMES P	DEM	MA	3	\$11,531
OLVER, JOHN	DEM	MA	1	\$9,000
CAPUANO, MICHAEL E	DEM	MA	8	\$9,000
TIERNEY, JOHN F	DEM	MA	6	\$8,750
DELAHUNT, WILLIAM D	DEM	MA	10	\$7,750
FRANK, BARNEY	DEM	MA	4	\$3,550
SARBANES, PAUL S	DEM	MD	0	\$49,790
HOYER, STENY HAMILTON	DEM	MD	5	\$28,099
MORELLA, CONSTANCE A	REP	MD	8	\$18,850
EHRlich, ROBERT LEROY JR	REP	MD	2	\$15,275
CARDIN, BENJAMIN L	DEM	MD	3	\$8,000
WYNN, ALBERT R	DEM	MD	4	\$6,250
CUMMINGS, ELIJAH E	DEM	MD	7	\$4,000
GILCHREST, WAYNE T	REP	MD	1	\$700
SNOWE, OLYMPIA J	REP	ME	0	\$33,129
BALDACCI, JOHN ELIAS	DEM	ME	2	\$8,499
ALLEN, THOMAS H	DEM	ME	1	\$4,500
STABENOW, DEBBIE	DEM	MI	0	\$54,100
BONIOR, DAVID E	DEM	MI	10	\$27,550
LEVIN, SANDER M	DEM	MI	12	\$23,250
DINGELL, JOHN D	DEM	MI	16	\$22,250
STUPAK, BART T	DEM	MI	1	\$12,250
CONYERS, JOHN JR	DEM	MI	14	\$8,800
CAMP, DAVID LEE	REP	MI	4	\$8,733
KILPATRICK, CAROLYN CHEEKS	DEM	MI	15	\$8,600
ROGERS, MICHAEL J	REP	MI	8	\$7,000
KNOLLENBERG, JOSEPH K	REP	MI	11	\$4,750
UPTON, FREDERICK STEPHEN	REP	MI	6	\$3,070
HOEKSTRA, PETER	REP	MI	2	\$2,250
BARCIA, JAMES A	DEM	MI	5	\$1,750
EHLERS, VERNON J	REP	MI	3	\$1,500
KILDEE, DALE E	DEM	MI	9	\$500
OBERSTAR, JAMES L	DEM	MN	8	\$21,378
LUTHER, BILL	DEM	MN	6	\$9,350
RAMSTAD, JAMES M	REP	MN	3	\$9,150
SABO, MARTIN OLAV	DEM	MN	5	\$6,000
KENNEDY, MARK RAYMOND	REP	MN	2	\$2,250
DAYTON, MARK	DFL	MN	0	\$2,000
MCCOLLUM, BETTY	DFL	MN	4	\$1,250
GUTKNECHT, GILBERT WILLIAM JR	REP	MN	1	\$250
PETERSON, COLLIN C	DFL	MN	7	\$250
CARNAHAN, MEL	DEM	MO	0	\$91,030
GEPHARDT, RICHARD ANDREW	DEM	MO	3	\$39,450
BLUNT, ROY	REP	MO	7	\$17,528
SKELTON, IKE	DEM	MO	4	\$14,750
CLAY, WILLIAM LACY JR	DEM	MO	1	\$8,750
MCCARTHY, KAREN	DEM	MO	5	\$6,500

Contributions by Legislator

Candidate Name	Party	State	District	Amount Received
HULSHOF, KENNY CHARLES	REP	MO	9	\$4,500
EMERSON, JO ANN	REP	MO	8	\$2,800
AKIN, W TODD	REP	MO	2	\$2,550
GRAVES, SAMUEL B JR (SAM)	REP	MO	6	\$1,500
LOTT, C TRENT	REP	MS	0	\$33,500
PICKERING, CHARLES W "CHIP" JR	REP	MS	3	\$20,522
WICKER, ROGER F	REP	MS	1	\$10,750
THOMPSON, BENNIE G	DEM	MS	2	\$2,500
SHOWS, CLIFFORD RONALD	DEM	MS	4	\$2,500
TAYLOR, GENE	DEM	MS	5	\$1,750
BURNS, CONRAD	REP	MT	0	\$96,539
REHBERG, DENNIS R	REP	MT	0	\$10,751
JONES, WALTER BEAMAN JR	REP	NC	3	\$13,500
PRICE, DAVID EUGENE	DEM	NC	4	\$13,244
BURR, RICHARD M	REP	NC	5	\$13,049
COBLE, JOHN HOWARD	REP	NC	6	\$8,919
HAYES, ROBERT CANNON	REP	NC	8	\$8,582
MYRICK, SUE	REP	NC	9	\$6,000
TAYLOR, CHARLES H	REP	NC	11	\$4,500
WATT, MELVIN LUTHER	DEM	NC	12	\$3,300
ETHERIDGE, BOB	DEM	NC	2	\$2,005
MCINTYRE, MIKE	DEM	NC	7	\$1,500
CLAYTON, EVA MCPHERSON	DEM	NC	1	\$700
BALLENGER, THOMAS CASS	REP	NC	10	\$250
CONRAD, KENT	DEM	ND	0	\$78,520
POMEROY, EARL RALPH	DEM	ND	0	\$10,050
NELSON, E BENJAMIN	DEM	NE	0	\$36,250
TERRY, LEE R	REP	NE	2	\$9,750
BEREUTER, DOUGLAS K	REP	NE	1	\$6,161
OSBORNE, TOM	REP	NE	3	\$900
SUNUNU, JOHN E	REP	NH	1	\$5,250
BASS, CHARLES F	REP	NH	2	\$3,500
FRELINGHUYSEN, RODNEY P	REP	NJ	11	\$34,590
CORZINE, JON STEVENS	DEM	NJ	0	\$25,200
SAXTON, H JAMES	REP	NJ	3	\$20,275
MENENDEZ, ROBERT	DEM	NJ	13	\$16,723
HOLT, RUSH DEW	DEM	NJ	12	\$13,650
FERGUSON, MIKE	REP	NJ	7	\$12,723
ROTHMAN, STEVEN R	DEM	NJ	9	\$11,000
ANDREWS, ROBERT E	DEM	NJ	1	\$8,800
ROUKEMA, MARGE	REP	NJ	5	\$7,650
PALLONE, FRANK JR	DEM	NJ	6	\$4,000
PASCRELL, WILLIAM J JR	DEM	NJ	8	\$3,000
PAYNE, DONALD M	DEM	NJ	10	\$2,150
LOBIONDO, FRANK A	REP	NJ	2	\$1,475
BINGAMAN, JEFF	DEM	NM	0	\$77,700
WILSON, HEATHER A	REP	NM	1	\$13,500
SKEEN, JOE	REP	NM	2	\$12,250
UDALL, TOM	DEM	NM	3	\$10,250
ENSIGN, JOHN ERIC	REP	NV	0	\$63,701
BERKLEY, SHELLEY	DEM	NV	1	\$9,800
GIBBONS, JAMES A	REP	NV	2	\$3,250
CLINTON, HILLARY RODHAM	DEM	NY	0	\$328,150
RANGEL, CHARLES B	DEM	NY	15	\$84,805
NADLER, JERROLD LEWIS	DEM	NY	8	\$25,500
WALSH, JAMES T	REP	NY	25	\$24,148
GILMAN, BENJAMIN A CONGRESSMAN	REP	NY	20	\$22,250
LAFALCE, JOHN J	DEM	NY	29	\$19,000

Contributions by Legislator

Candidate Name	Party	State	District	Amount Received
QUINN, JACK	REP	NY	30	\$15,050
LOWEY, NITA M	DEM	NY	18	\$14,991
BOEHLERT, SHERWOOD	REP	NY	23	\$14,680
MCCARTHY, CAROLYN	DEM	NY	4	\$13,500
KING, PETER T	REP	NY	3	\$10,150
HOUGHTON, AMORY JR	REP	NY	31	\$9,250
SWEENEY, JOHN E	REP	NY	22	\$9,232
ENGEL, ELIOT L	DEM	NY	17	\$9,200
REYNOLDS, THOMAS M	REP	NY	27	\$9,095
MALONEY, CAROLYN B	DEM	NY	14	\$9,000
ACKERMAN, GARY L	DEM	NY	5	\$7,500
SLAUGHTER, LOUISE M	DEM	NY	28	\$6,750
GRUCCI, FELIX J JR	REP	NY	1	\$6,250
MCNULTY, MICHAEL R	DEM	NY	21	\$5,950
TOWNS, EDOLPHUS	DEM	NY	10	\$5,750
FOSSELLA, VITO J JR	REP	NY	13	\$5,000
MCHUGH, JOHN M	REP	NY	24	\$4,750
CROWLEY, JOSEPH	DEM	NY	7	\$3,725
HINCHEY, MAURICE D	DEM	NY	26	\$3,200
ISRAEL, STEVE	DEM	NY	2	\$2,750
KELLY, SUE W	REP	NY	19	\$2,500
MEEKS, GREGORY W	DEM	NY	6	\$1,950
SERRANO, JOSE E	DEM	NY	16	\$1,000
VELAZQUEZ, NYDIA M	DEM	NY	12	\$750
OWENS, MAJOR ROBERT ODELL	DEM	NY	11	\$450
DEWINE, MIKE	REP	OH	0	\$60,409
PORTMAN, ROBERT J	REP	OH	2	\$26,150
TIBERI, PATRICK J	REP	OH	12	\$21,700
BROWN, SHERROD	DEM	OH	13	\$13,891
CHABOT, STEVEN J	REP	OH	1	\$12,750
HOBSON, DAVID LEE	REP	OH	7	\$12,544
OXLEY, MICHAEL G	REP	OH	4	\$10,250
SAWYER, TOM	DEM	OH	14	\$8,750
PRYCE, DEBORAH D	REP	OH	15	\$5,000
LATOURETTE, STEVEN C	REP	OH	19	\$5,000
NEY, ROBERT W	REP	OH	18	\$4,250
REGULA, RALPH S	REP	OH	16	\$4,153
BOEHNER, JOHN A	REP	OH	8	\$3,800
STRICKLAND, TED	DEM	OH	6	\$3,250
GILLMOR, PAUL E	REP	OH	5	\$2,750
KAPTUR, MARCY (MARCIA) C	DEM	OH	9	\$1,500
KUCINICH, DENNIS J	DEM	OH	10	\$750
JONES, STEPHANIE TUBBS	DEM	OH	11	\$400
HALL, TONY P	DEM	OH	3	\$250
ISTOOK, ERNEST J JR	REP	OK	5	\$14,250
CARSON, BRAD	DEM	OK	2	\$10,250
WATTS, JULIUS CEASER (J C) JR	REP	OK	4	\$7,750
LARGENT, STEPHEN MICHAEL	REP	OK	1	\$5,000
LUCAS, FRANK D	REP	OK	6	\$3,545
WATKINS, WESLEY WADE	DEM	OK	3	\$3,250
BLUMENAUER, EARL	DEM	OR	3	\$9,875
WU, DAVID	DEM	OR	1	\$8,750
HOOLEY, DARLENE	DEM	OR	5	\$7,500
WALDEN, GREGORY PAUL	REP	OR	2	\$4,150
DEFAZIO, PETER	DEM	OR	4	\$1,250
SANTORUM, RICHARD J	REP	PA	0	\$68,600
MURTHA, JOHN P	DEM	PA	12	\$32,500
SHUSTER, BUD	REP	PA	9	\$27,550

Contributions by Legislator

Candidate Name	Party	State	District	Amount Received
ENGLISH, PHIL	REP	PA	21	\$20,709
HART, MELISSA A	REP	PA	4	\$16,950
SHERWOOD, DONALD L	REP	PA	10	\$15,234
BORSKI, ROBERT A	DEM	PA	3	\$11,000
GREENWOOD, JAMES C	REP	PA	8	\$9,760
TOOMEY, PATRICK J	REP	PA	15	\$8,500
KANJORSKI, PAUL E	DEM	PA	11	\$6,250
PETERSON, JOHN E	REP	PA	5	\$5,999
HOEFFEL, JOSEPH M	DEM	PA	13	\$4,500
FATTAH, CHAKA	DEM	PA	2	\$4,250
BRADY, ROBERT A	DEM	PA	1	\$4,250
HOLDEN, T TIMOTHY	DEM	PA	6	\$3,750
WELDON, W CURTIS	REP	PA	7	\$3,500
PITTS, JOSEPH R	REP	PA	16	\$2,894
COYNE, WILLIAM J	DEM	PA	14	\$2,441
GEKAS, GEORGE W	REP	PA	17	\$2,250
DOYLE, MIKE	DEM	PA	18	\$1,500
KENNEDY, PATRICK J	DEM	RI	1	\$37,100
CHAFEE, LINCOLN D	REP	RI	0	\$35,374
LANGEVIN, JAMES R	DEM	RI	2	\$1,500
SPRATT, JOHN MCKEE JR	DEM	SC	5	\$19,750
CLYBURN, JAMES E (JIM)	DEM	SC	6	\$12,400
GRAHAM, LINDSEY O	REP	SC	3	\$9,150
SPENCE, FLOYD DAVIDSON	REP	SC	2	\$4,250
BROWN, HENRY E JR	REP	SC	1	\$3,358
THUNE, JOHN R	REP	SD	0	\$7,791
FRIST, WILLIAM H	REP	TN	0	\$63,361
HILLEARY, WILLIAM V	REP	TN	4	\$16,700
FORD, HAROLD JR	DEM	TN	9	\$12,806
BRYANT, EDWARD G	REP	TN	7	\$11,601
GORDON, BARTON JENNINGS	DEM	TN	6	\$10,077
DUNCAN, JOHN JAMES JR	REP	TN	2	\$7,750
TANNER, JOHN S	DEM	TN	8	\$6,738
CLEMENT, BOB	DEM	TN	5	\$4,750
WAMP, ZACH	REP	TN	3	\$3,243
JENKINS, WILLIAM L	REP	TN	1	\$1,833
HUTCHISON, KAY BAILEY	REP	TX	0	\$56,457
FROST, MARTIN	DEM	TX	24	\$33,600
BENTSEN, KENNETH E JR	DEM	TX	25	\$29,111
DELAY, THOMAS DALE	REP	TX	22	\$22,000
JOHNSON, SAM	REP	TX	3	\$17,098
BONILLA, HENRY	REP	TX	23	\$14,000
SESSIONS, PETE	REP	TX	5	\$13,725
STENHOLM, CHARLES W	DEM	TX	17	\$12,328
LAMPSON, NICHOLAS	DEM	TX	9	\$11,950
SANDLIN, MAX	DEM	TX	1	\$11,480
COMBEST, LARRY ED	REP	TX	19	\$11,400
EDWARDS, CHET	DEM	TX	11	\$8,800
HALL, RALPH M	DEM	TX	4	\$7,250
CULBERSON, JOHN A	REP	TX	7	\$7,000
DOGGETT, LLOYD	DEM	TX	10	\$7,000
TURNER, JIM	DEM	TX	2	\$6,750
GONZALEZ, CHARLES A	DEM	TX	20	\$6,000
BRADY, KEVIN PATRICK	REP	TX	8	\$5,850
GRANGER, KAY	REP	TX	12	\$5,400
ARMEY, RICHARD KEITH	REP	TX	26	\$5,350
GREEN, RAYMOND EUGENE "GENE"	DEM	TX	29	\$4,750
ORTIZ, SOLOMON P	DEM	TX	27	\$4,750

Contributions by Legislator

Candidate Name	Party	State	District	Amount Received
BARTON, JOE LINUS	REP	TX	6	\$4,550
JOHNSON, EDDIE BERNICE	DEM	TX	30	\$2,750
REYES, SILVESTRE	DEM	TX	16	\$2,550
PAUL, RONALD E	REP	TX	14	\$2,000
LEE, SHEILA JACKSON	DEM	TX	18	\$2,000
SMITH, LAMAR SEELIGSON	REP	TX	21	\$1,725
RODRIGUEZ, CIRO D	DEM	TX	28	\$1,500
THORNBERRY, MAC	REP	TX	13	\$1,000
HINOJOSA, RUBEN E	DEM	TX	15	\$500
HATCH, ORRIN G	REP	UT	0	\$67,481
CANNON, CHRISTOPHER B	REP	UT	3	\$9,600
HANSEN, JAMES V	REP	UT	1	\$4,509
MATHESON, JAMES DAVID	DEM	UT	2	\$4,450
ALLEN, GEORGE	REP	VA	0	\$205,546
DAVIS, THOMAS M	REP	VA	11	\$50,334
MORAN, JAMES P JR	DEM	VA	8	\$41,750
CANTOR, ERIC IVAN	REP	VA	7	\$24,187
BOUCHER, FREDERICK C "RICK"	DEM	VA	9	\$16,060
SCHROCK, EDWARD L	REP	VA	2	\$6,000
GOODLATTE, ROBERT W	REP	VA	6	\$5,750
WOLF, FRANK RUDOLPH	REP	VA	10	\$5,250
SCOTT, ROBERT C	DEM	VA	3	\$2,000
SISISKY, NORMAN	DEM	VA	4	\$1,750
DAVIS, JO ANN S	REP	VA	1	\$1,344
GOODE, VIRGIL H JR	IND	VA	5	\$1,000
JEFFORDS, JAMES M	REP	VT	0	\$28,523
DICKS, NORM D	DEM	WA	6	\$39,050
INSLEE, JAY ROBERT	DEM	WA	1	\$20,110
SMITH, D ADAM	DEM	WA	9	\$17,082
CANTWELL, MARIA	DEM	WA	0	\$16,400
LARSEN, RICHARD RAY	DEM	WA	2	\$15,700
DUNN, JENNIFER B	REP	WA	8	\$15,082
NETHERCUTT, GEORGE R JR	REP	WA	5	\$14,450
BAIRD, BRIAN	DEM	WA	3	\$12,422
MCDERMOTT, JAMES A	DEM	WA	7	\$6,250
HASTINGS, DOC	REP	WA	4	\$6,000
OBEY, DAVID R	DEM	WI	7	\$26,600
PETRI, THOMAS E	REP	WI	6	\$14,421
KLECZKA, GERALD D	DEM	WI	4	\$9,900
RYAN, PAUL D	REP	WI	1	\$6,699
SENSENBRENNER, FRANK JAMES JR	REP	WI	9	\$6,500
BARRETT, THOMAS M	DEM	WI	5	\$4,464
BALDWIN, TAMMY	DEM	WI	2	\$4,000
KIND, RONALD JAMES	DEM	WI	3	\$3,000
GREEN, MARK ANDREW	REP	WI	8	\$2,700
BYRD, ROBERT C	DEM	WV	0	\$17,000
CAPITO, SHELLEY MOORE	REP	WV	2	\$9,407
RAHALL, NICK JOE II	DEM	WV	3	\$8,050
MOLLOHAN, ALAN BOWLBY	DEM	WV	1	\$5,100
THOMAS, CRAIG	REP	WY	0	\$8,100
CUBIN, BARBARA L	REP	WY	0	\$6,379