

Leadership PACs, Inc.

*How Washington power players use leadership PACS to
buy access and influence*



issueone.org





Acknowledgments

This Issue One report was written by Manager of Research, Investigations and Policy Analysis Michael Beckel. Amisa Ratliff contributed to this report. Design by Evan Ottenfeld.

Methodology

Not all 535 members of Congress have leadership PACs, but most do. Some members of Congress even operate two affiliated leadership PACs, which share one contribution limit. For this report, Issue One identified 503 leadership PACs operated by 488 lawmakers who were sitting members of Congress as of September 28, 2018. Then, using data obtained from the Center for Responsive Politics in mid-October, Issue One analyzed the sources funding these committees during the 2017-2018 election cycle.

About Issue One

Issue One is a nonpartisan, nonprofit advocacy organization dedicated to political reform and government ethics in order to strengthen democracy and return government to the American people. Learn more at issueone.org.

Issue One
1401 K Street NW, Ste. 350
Washington, D.C. 20005
© 2018 Issue One

Media Contact

William Gray
wgray@issueone.org | (202) 204-8553

issueone.org | [f facebook.com/issueonereform](https://www.facebook.com/issueonereform) | [t @issueonereform](https://twitter.com/issueonereform)

Leadership PACs, Inc.

Introduction

There are more than 500 leadership PACs controlled by sitting members of Congress, and most of the money flowing into these groups is from Washington power players — not small-dollar givers.

Each year, tens of millions of dollars flow into these politicians' accounts, which are frequently decried as slush funds by critics on the left and the right. The system provides those who can afford it even more opportunities to gain face time with legislators.

Leadership PACs controlled by sitting members of Congress raised more than \$150 million between January 1, 2017, and September 30, 2018, according to data provided to Issue One by the Center for Responsive Politics.

Roughly 60 percent of this sum has come from political action committees (PACs) connected to companies, trade associations, labor unions and other groups that frequently have business before these lawmakers.

To wit: Just 35 PACs — led by Honeywell International Inc., United Parcel Service Inc. and AT&T Inc. — have contributed at least \$500,000 to leadership PACs operated by sitting members of Congress since January 2017. Of these 35 PACs, 20 have contributed to the leadership PACs of at least 100 sitting members of Congress.

Small-dollar donors giving \$200 or less, meanwhile, have accounted for less than five percent of leadership PACs' total receipts this election cycle, while about one-third of leadership PACs' funding has come from individual donors giving between \$200 and \$10,000 per PAC, many of whom have also given to the candidates' official campaign committees.

Largely hidden from public scrutiny, leadership PACs exemplify the Washington swamp. Most citizens have no idea that leadership PACs exist. Instead, the donor class treats these political groups as another means to gain access and influence while legally evading campaign contribution limits.

Under current law, money given to a leadership PAC comes on top of contributions to the same lawmaker's official campaign committee — effectively allowing those who can afford it the opportunity to nearly triple their contributions to House members and nearly septuple their contributions to senators.

This report documents how leadership PACs are a problem for both political parties in Washington. It also shows that there is growing bipartisan momentum to curb the abuses and misuses of these little-known committees.

Why are leadership PACs problematic?

Generally speaking, a leadership PAC is a political action committee established by a federal candidate or officeholder that is not this politician's authorized campaign committee. Funds given to leadership PACs cannot be used to pay for campaign expenses but can be used for a variety of other expenditures, including making contributions to like-minded politicians.

Using these committees to dole out cash to political allies (with the hope of currying favor with one's colleagues in Congress) was the primary reason leadership PACs were created in the late 1970s. But today, leadership PACs are frequently decried as slush funds by critics on the left and the right.

For instance, Colorado Republican Joel Hefley, a former chairman of the House Ethics Committee who once introduced a bill in Congress to ban leadership PACs, [told the *Wall Street Journal*](#) that “a lot of people use leadership PACs as a slush fund.”

Meanwhile, Trevor Potter, a former Republican chairman of the Federal Election Commission (FEC) who now serves as the president of the Campaign Legal Center, [told CBS's “60 Minutes”](#) that leadership PACs amount to “political slush funds” because the money they raise “can be used for literally anything.”

As Issue One and the Campaign Legal Center [detailed in a report earlier this year](#), a minority of leadership PAC spending — only 45 percent between January 2013 and mid-2018 — actually goes toward contributions to other candidates and political groups. Instead, lawmakers frequently use leadership PACs to pay for stays at luxury hotels, meals at prime restaurants and tickets for highly coveted events, often under the guise of fundraising activities.

Norm Ornstein, a scholar at the American Enterprise Institute, [has said](#) that Congress should “consider banning or sharply

restricting leadership PACs” as well as changing congressional ethics rules to prohibit lawmakers from soliciting or accepting “a contribution from a lobbyist with business before the body.”

Similarly, Brad Smith, a former Republican chairman of the FEC who now serves as the chairman of the Institute for Free Speech, supports the eradication of leadership PACs. Smith [told the investigative news organization ProPublica](#) that leadership PACs are “really kind of an incumbent racket.”

While Hefley is no longer a member of Congress — he's now a member of Issue One's [ReFormers Caucus](#) — other politicians have taken up the torch for leadership PAC reform.

“The proliferation of leadership PACs reflects poorly on Congress as a whole. The American people's faith in Congress as an institution is eroded when moneyed interests can buy access and influence,” said former Amb. Tim Roemer, a former Democratic congressman

from Indiana who now serves as a co-chair of Issue One's ReFormers Caucus.

Added former Rep. Zach Wamp (R-TN), another co-chair of the ReFormers Caucus: “Inside-the-Beltway players contribute to these slush funds in hopes of currying favor with members of Congress. Now is the time for Congress to step up and create — in a bipartisan fashion — new rules for leadership PACs.”

Neither Roemer (who served in Congress for six terms) nor Wamp (who served in Congress for eight terms) operated a leadership PAC when they were in office.

Where leadership PAC money comes from

Issue One's new analysis shows that approximately \$3 of every \$5 raised by leadership PACs since January 2017 has come from PACs, many of which are connected to the largest companies, trade associations and labor unions in America.

“Leadership PACs are frequently decried as slush funds by critics on the left and the right.”

Top 15 PAC Donors to Leadership PACs of Current Members of Congress



Source: Center for Responsive Politics, reflecting contributions made between January 1, 2017, and September 30, 2018. Data obtained on October 24, 2018. See Appendix 2 for more details.

No. 1 among these PAC donors is Honeywell International Inc., whose corporate PAC has contributed about \$1.4 million so far this election cycle to 225 leadership PACs operated by 223 individual members of Congress. (Some members of Congress operate two affiliated leadership PACs, which share one contribution limit.)

No. 2 is United Parcel Service Inc.'s PAC, which has contributed about \$1.1 million to 164 leadership PACs operated by 163 members of Congress.

No. 3 is AT&T Inc.'s PAC, which has contributed about \$1.1 million to 163 leadership PACs operated by 162 members of Congress.

No. 4 is Northrop Grumman Corp.'s PAC, which has contributed about \$1.1 million to 155 leadership PACs operated by 154 members of Congress.

And No. 5 is the PAC of the National Association of Real Estate Investment Trusts, which has contributed about \$980,000 to 131 leadership PACs operated by 130 members of Congress.

At the same time, a handful of individual donors have also been giving large sums to leadership PACs. According to data provided to Issue One in mid-October by the Center for Responsive Politics, just eight individual donors have contributed at least \$100,000 so far this election cycle to leadership PACs controlled by sitting members of Congress — few enough that they would all fit into a large SUV.

In this way, leadership PACs amplify the power of the tiny sliver of Americans who are already part of the donor class — which the Center for Responsive Politics estimates is [less than one percent of all Americans](#).

Top among them: Sean Parker, the billionaire co-founder of the music-sharing website Napster who served as the first president of Facebook. Parker has contributed \$170,000 so far this election cycle to 34 leadership

PACs, with about two-thirds of that money benefiting Democrats and about one-third aiding Republicans.

Alexandra Parker, the singer and songwriter married to Sean Parker, has contributed an additional \$115,000 to 23 leadership PACs since January 2017, with about 55 percent of that sum aiding Democrats and about 45 percent going to Republicans.

The other individuals are:

- ▶ Jay Faison, the founder and CEO of [ClearPath](#), a nonprofit with a mission to “develop and advance conservative policies that accelerate clean energy innovation”;
- ▶ Albert Hegyi, the chairman, president and CEO of South Dakota-based [1st Financial Bank USA](#);
- ▶ Daniel Loeb, the billionaire hedge fund magnate who founded the firm [Third Point LLC](#);
- ▶ Jed Manocherian, a real estate investor who founded [Act for NIH](#), a nonprofit that advocates for biomedical research and increased funding for the National Institutes of Health (NIH);
- ▶ Michael Peterson, the chairman and CEO of the [Peter G. Peterson Foundation](#), which aims to increase awareness about the fiscal challenges facing the United States and what can be done to address them; and
- ▶ Roy Pfautch, the founder of Civic Service Inc., a public relations consulting and lobbying firm.

All the while, the top 20 industries alone accounted for roughly half of the \$150 million leadership PACs have raised so far this election cycle. Not surprisingly, these are the industries that are frequently seen as the most influential in Washington.

“Leadership PACs amplify the power of the tiny sliver of Americans who are already part of the donor class.”

Top 20 Industries Funding Leadership PACs of Current Members of Congress

1. Securities & Investment



Total contributed: **\$8.8 million**
Number of lawmakers whose leadership PACs benefited: **262**

2. Real Estate



Total contributed: **\$7.9 million**
Number of lawmakers whose leadership PACs benefited: **320**

3. Insurance



Total contributed: **\$6.4 million**
Number of lawmakers whose leadership PACs benefited: **257**

4. Pharmaceuticals



Total contributed: **\$5.3 million**
Number of lawmakers whose leadership PACs benefited: **199**

5. Health Professionals



Total contributed: **\$5.1 million**
Number of lawmakers whose leadership PACs benefited: **276**

6. Retired



Total contributed: **\$4.8 million**
Number of lawmakers whose leadership PACs benefited: **208**

7. Lawyers/Law Firms



Total contributed: **\$4.5 million**
Number of lawmakers whose leadership PACs benefited: **247**

8. Electric Utilities



Total contributed: **\$3.6 million**
Number of lawmakers whose leadership PACs benefited: **226**

9. Accountants



Total contributed: **\$3.5 million**
Number of lawmakers whose leadership PACs benefited: **227**

10. Telecom Services



Total contributed: **\$3.5 million**
Number of lawmakers whose leadership PACs benefited: **213**

11. Lobbyists



Total contributed: **\$3.4 million**
Number of lawmakers whose leadership PACs benefited: **231**

12. Manufacturing/Distributing



Total contributed: **\$3.3 million**
Number of lawmakers whose leadership PACs benefited: **277**

13. Commercial Banks



Total contributed: **\$3.1 million**
Number of lawmakers whose leadership PACs benefited: **186**

14. Air Transport



Total contributed: **\$2.6 million**
Number of lawmakers whose leadership PACs benefited: **223**

15. Defense Aerospace



Total contributed: **\$2.6 million**
Number of lawmakers whose leadership PACs benefited: **212**

16. Oil & Gas



Total contributed: **\$2.5 million**
Number of lawmakers whose leadership PACs benefited: **168**

17. Railroads



Total contributed: **\$2.5 million**
Number of lawmakers whose leadership PACs benefited: **157**

18. Retail Sales



Total contributed: **\$2.5 million**
Number of lawmakers whose leadership PACs benefited: **216**

19. Health Services/HMOs



Total contributed: **\$2.5 million**
Number of lawmakers whose leadership PACs benefited: **171**

20. Automotive



Total contributed: **\$2.3 million**
Number of lawmakers whose leadership PACs benefited: **199**

The top five industries funding leadership PACs this election cycle are:

- ▶ the securities and investment industry (\$8.8 million combined to 268 leadership PACs operated by 262 members of Congress);
- ▶ the real estate industry (\$7.9 million combined to 328 leadership PACs operated by 320 members of Congress);
- ▶ the insurance industry (\$6.4 million combined to 264 leadership PACs operated by 257 members of Congress);
- ▶ the pharmaceutical industry (\$5.3 million combined to 202 leadership PACs operated by 199 members of Congress); and
- ▶ the health professionals industry (\$5.1 million combined to 278 leadership PACs operated by 276 members of Congress).

Other high-profile industries on the top 20 list of the largest leadership PAC funders include:

- ▶ lawyers and law firms (\$4.5 million combined to 252 leadership PACs operated by 247 members of Congress);
- ▶ the telecom industry (\$3.5 million combined to 214 leadership PACs operated by 213 members of Congress);
- ▶ lobbyists (\$3.4 million combined to 235 leadership PACs operated by 231 members of Congress);
- ▶ the commercial banking industry (\$3.1 million combined to 190 leadership PACs operated by 186 members of Congress); and
- ▶ the defense aerospace industry (\$2.6 million combined to 214 leadership PACs operated by 212 members of Congress).

A lawful way to evade contribution limits

Campaign contribution limits exist to guard against corruption and the appearance of corruption. Yet under the current rules,

contributions to leadership PACs from individual donors and PAC donors alike come on top of the money that they can donate directly to the same lawmaker's official campaign committee.

For instance, members of the U.S. House of Representatives — who stand for re-election every two years — may only accept up to \$5,400 from an individual donor for their official campaign committees. (Specifically, this \$5,400 is \$2,700 for the primary election and \$2,700 for the general election.) Yet they may, under current rules, accept another \$10,000 over two years from that same individual for their leadership PAC.

And senators — who stand for re-election every six years — may only accept up to \$5,400 from an individual donor for their official campaign committee. (Again, this \$5,400 is \$2,700 for the primary election and \$2,700 for the general election.) Yet they may, under current rules, accept another \$30,000 over six years from that same individual for their leadership PAC.

Similarly, a PAC representing a company, trade association, labor union or ideological group may only contribute up to \$10,000 to either a House or Senate candidate — up to \$5,000 for that candidate's primary election campaign and up to \$5,000 for the general election campaign. Yet that same PAC could donate an additional \$10,000 over two years to that same House candidate's leadership PAC or an additional \$30,000 over six years to that same Senate candidate's leadership PAC.

In this way, leadership PACs are a lawful way to get around campaign contribution limits — effectively allowing individuals the opportunity to nearly triple their contributions to House members and nearly septuple their contributions to senators, and allowing PACs the opportunity to double their contributions to House members and quadruple their contributions to senators.

The history of leadership PACs

In 1978, Rep. Henry Waxman (D-CA) and a group of his supporters approached the

FEC with a novel request: Could Waxman participate in the operation of a PAC that was separate from his own campaign committee?

Waxman's intention for this PAC was to support his colleagues' campaigns as he made a bid for a House subcommittee chairmanship. The FEC said that he could, and it affirmed that funds raised by this PAC would not count toward the contribution limits for donors to Waxman's own official campaign committee.

Forty years later, leadership PACs are not just for aspiring congressional leaders.

Today, nearly every member of Congress, in both parties, has at least one. A handful of members of Congress have two, and some politicians form them even before they are elected to federal office.

In fact, roughly 90 percent of lawmakers currently serving in the U.S. House of Representatives have a leadership PAC, and just three sitting senators do *not* have one, according to an Issue One analysis of filings with the Federal Election Commission and data from the Center for Responsive Politics.

Incentivizing crony capitalism?

It is concerning enough that officeholders use their leadership PAC funds to buy their way up the leadership ladder by giving to congressional colleagues. And it is also troubling that it is now commonplace for most leadership PACs to get nearly all of their funds from PACs connected to companies, trade associations, labor unions and other groups which have business before these powerful lawmakers.

For this report, Issue One identified 503 leadership PACs operated by lawmakers who were sitting members of Congress as of September 28, 2018. Then, using data obtained from the Center for Responsive Politics in mid-October, Issue One analyzed the sources funding these committees during the 2017-2018 election cycle.

More than half of the 503 leadership PACs analyzed by Issue One have collected at least two-thirds of their funds this election cycle from PACs.

Moreover, roughly one of every five leadership PACs has collected at least 90 percent of its funds this election cycle from PACs.

And approximately 30 have collected fully 100 percent of their funds this election cycle from PACs.

Among those lawmakers whose leadership PACs were fully funded by PAC cash as of

September 30, 2018, the two Republicans and two Democrats whose PACs raised the most money are:

Rep. Sam Graves (R-MO), the chairman of the House Transportation Committee's subcommittee focused on highways and transit issues.

Graves' leadership PAC — known as the Show-Me PAC — raised \$205,500 through the end of September. Many of its donors are groups with business before Graves' subcommittee, including the trucking industry, the railroad industry and transportation unions. For instance, the PACs of the American Trucking Associations, CSX Corp. and Norfolk Southern Corp. have each contributed the legal maximum of \$10,000 to Graves' leadership PAC.

Rep. David Scott (D-GA), the ranking Democratic member on the House Agriculture Committee's subcommittee focused on commodity exchanges, energy and credit issues.

Scott's leadership PAC — known as Brave PAC — raised \$111,000 through the end of September. Many of its donors are groups with business before this subcommittee, including commercial banks, the insurance industry and the securities and investment industry. Among them: the PACs of the American Peanut Shellers Association and National Cattlemen's Beef Association, as well as PACs operated by financial institutions including JPMorgan

“Today, nearly every member of Congress, in both parties, has at least one leadership PAC.”

Chase & Co., Regions Financial Corp. and UBS Americas Inc.

Rep. Mario Diaz-Balart (R-FL), a member of the powerful House Appropriations Committee who chairs the subcommittee focused on transportation, housing and urban development appropriations and who also sits on the subcommittee focused on defense appropriations.

Diaz-Balart's leadership PAC — known as Maintaining All Republicans In Office (MARIO) PAC — raised \$97,000 through the end of September. Many of its donors are groups with business before the appropriations committee, including the railroad industry, transportation unions and defense contractors. Among them: the PACs of BNSF Railway Co., CSX Corp., the Air Line Pilots Association, Northrop Grumman Corp. and General Atomics.

Rep. Dutch Ruppersberger (D-MD), another member of the powerful House Appropriations Committee who sits on the subcommittees focused on defense appropriations and homeland security appropriations.

“Congressional action to rein in leadership PACs is long overdue.”

Ruppersberger's leadership PAC — known as Democrats United To Change and Hope (DUTCH) PAC — raised \$96,000 through the end of September. Many of its donors are groups with business before these subcommittees, including defense contractors. For instance, the PACs of Northrop Grumman Corp. and Raytheon Co. have each contributed the legal maximum of \$10,000 to Ruppersberger's leadership PAC.

Powerful politicians rake in big money

While nearly every member of Congress operates a leadership PAC, some pull in far more money than others. Not surprisingly, congressional leaders — as well as those with aspirations for leadership roles or higher office — are often prolific fundraisers, using every tool at their disposal to raise as much money as possible.

Issue One's analysis found that the top 50 leadership PACs account for roughly half of the \$150 million raised by leadership PACs so far this election cycle.

And the top 10 leadership PACs alone — including those controlled by House Speaker Paul Ryan (R-WI), House Freedom Caucus founding chairman Jim Jordan (R-OH) and House Minority Whip Steny Hoyer (D-MD) — account for about 20 percent of all leadership PAC receipts.

Why do powerful legislators top this list? Precisely because they are powerful legislators. They are the congressional leaders and committee chairs with whom industries want to have positive working relationships and to whom it is difficult to say no to when they ask for money.

But it is also important to remember that hundreds of other members of Congress who are not in leadership roles also have leadership PACs that tap donors for extra cash. Issue One's analysis showed that the typical leadership PAC raised about \$120,000 between January 2017 and September 2018.

So why are donors giving to the leadership PACs of legislative leaders as well as those controlled by rank-and-file members?

Conservative author Peter Schweizer, president of the Government Accountability Institute, argues in his book “Extortion: How Politicians Extract Your Money, Buy Votes, and Line Their Own Pockets” that members of Congress frequently “leverage their positions to shake the money tree for themselves and their political allies.”

Robert Herbold, a former Microsoft executive, told Schweizer that “you're crazy if you don't play along” with lawmakers' solicitation requests because “they will go after you.” Ray Plank, the founder and former chairman of oil and gas company Apache Corporation, reflected to Schweizer that these solicitations are more akin to “what you expect from the mafia.”

Others have echoed that sentiment. An unnamed lobbyist for a Fortune 500 company [told](#) the *National Journal* that if you decline to make political contributions, “you’re taking a risk of legislative retribution.” And a Committee for Economic Development survey of business leaders [found](#) that many made political donations because they feared “adverse legislative consequences” for themselves or their industries if they rejected solicitation requests.

Leadership PACs thus provide another means through which lawmakers can cajole those with business before their committees for financial support. At the same time, leadership PACs also provide those who can afford it another avenue to curry access and influence with members of Congress.

Time to take on the slush funds

In 1976, the U.S. Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of campaign contribution limits in a case called *Buckley v. Valeo* because of the importance of “the prevention of corruption and the appearance of corruption spawned by the real or imagined coercive influence of large financial contributions on candidates’ positions and on their actions.”

As the public sees more and more reports of the abuses of leadership PACs, it only enhances people’s perception of government corruption. The good news is that there is a growing bipartisan appetite to curb the abuses and misuses of leadership PACs.

Here are some of the options that lawmakers could consider:

- ▶ Congress could ban leadership PACs altogether.
- ▶ Congress could greatly reduce the number of leadership PACs — for instance, restricting them to a limited number of congressional leaders, which some, such as the [Bipartisan Policy Center](#), have called for.
- ▶ Congress could specify that contributions to leadership PACs and

official campaign committees should share one, aggregated contribution limit, not two separate ones. This reform would ensure that leadership PACs are not used as a means to evade contribution limits.

▶ Congress could pass a new law to restrict the money flowing to leadership PACs from lobbyists as well as companies, labor unions and other groups that hire lobbyists. Such a reform would reduce the amount of money from Washington interests flowing into leadership PACs.

- For instance, lobbyists and organizations that hire lobbyists could be prohibited from bundling contributions to lawmakers’ leadership PACs.
- Alternatively or additionally, new legislation could establish a “cooling off” period between lobbying and fundraising. That is, if you lobby a member of Congress’ office, you would not be able contribute to that lawmaker’s leadership PAC for a set period of time, and if you contribute to the leadership PAC of a member of Congress, you could not lobby that lawmaker for a set period of time.

While some lawmakers may pressure those with business before their committees to financially support them, it is clear that contributions to leadership PACs are ways for Washington power players to ingratiate themselves to members of Congress.

In an era when nearly every member of Congress operates a leadership PAC — and some politicians form them prior to even being elected to Congress — it is clear that politicians in both parties know that leadership PACs are cash cows to collect money from Washington power players. It is also clear that congressional action to rein in leadership PACs is long overdue. •

Appendix 1

Top 50 Industries Funding Leadership PACs Controlled by Sitting Members of Congress

Rank	Industry	Total Contributed	Number of Leadership PAC Beneficiaries	Number of Lawmakers Whose Leadership PACs Benefited	Percent Given to Democrats	Percent Given to Republicans
1	Securities & Investment	\$8,783,560	268	262	39%	60%
2	Real Estate	\$7,946,068	328	320	38%	62%
3	Insurance	\$6,358,498	264	257	36%	64%
4	Pharmaceuticals/Health Products	\$5,329,399	202	199	31%	69%
5	Health Professionals	\$5,134,649	278	276	37%	63%
6	Retired	\$4,842,281	214	208	47%	53%
7	Lawyers/Law Firms	\$4,480,212	252	247	69%	30%
8	Electric Utilities	\$3,629,151	227	226	30%	69%
9	Accountants	\$3,513,275	230	227	38%	62%
10	Telecom Services	\$3,480,191	214	213	38%	62%
11	Lobbyists	\$3,402,535	235	231	30%	70%
12	Misc Manufacturing & Distributing	\$3,281,623	282	277	33%	67%
13	Commercial Banks	\$3,147,562	190	186	28%	72%
14	Air Transport	\$2,605,524	226	223	25%	75%
15	Defense Aerospace	\$2,561,214	214	212	34%	65%
16	Oil & Gas	\$2,526,553	170	168	5%	95%
17	Railroads	\$2,520,802	158	157	37%	63%
18	Retail Sales	\$2,483,324	220	216	27%	73%
19	Health Services/HMOs	\$2,456,817	174	171	37%	63%
20	Automotive	\$2,330,818	202	199	27%	73%
21	Hospitals/Nursing Homes	\$2,142,873	164	163	40%	60%
22	Electronics Manufacturing & Equipment	\$2,090,505	181	178	44%	55%
23	Casinos/Gambling	\$2,032,833	146	145	49%	51%
24	Defense Electronics	\$1,956,374	183	182	36%	64%
25	Building Trade Unions	\$1,936,202	153	153	81%	18%
26	TV/Movies/Music	\$1,858,130	165	162	58%	41%
27	Misc Finance	\$1,741,303	166	164	38%	61%
28	Beer, Wine & Liquor	\$1,738,818	167	167	39%	61%
29	Transportation Unions	\$1,697,077	213	211	63%	37%
30	Telephone Utilities	\$1,610,299	199	198	29%	71%
31	Business Services	\$1,442,449	160	157	46%	53%
32	Public Sector Unions	\$1,332,505	116	116	81%	19%
33	Finance/Credit Companies	\$1,289,017	139	138	28%	72%
34	Internet	\$1,260,903	142	139	54%	46%
35	Industrial Unions	\$1,198,131	153	153	98%	1%
36	Non-Profit Institutions	\$1,174,257	123	121	69%	31%
37	Leadership PACs	\$1,081,463	132	129	12%	88%
38	Crop Production & Basic Processing	\$1,078,774	118	117	29%	71%
39	Chemical & Related Manufacturing	\$939,928	112	112	22%	78%
40	Lodging/Tourism	\$934,785	110	108	31%	69%
41	Food & Beverage	\$848,840	117	115	19%	81%
42	Education	\$838,099	111	107	73%	25%
43	General Contractors	\$837,212	100	100	16%	84%
44	Construction Services	\$792,269	109	107	33%	67%
45	Tobacco	\$778,370	87	86	16%	84%
46	Building Materials & Equipment	\$735,273	91	90	10%	90%
47	Misc Defense	\$692,141	84	84	33%	67%
48	Agricultural Services/Products	\$645,815	82	82	30%	70%
49	Misc Energy	\$638,103	86	86	31%	69%
50	Misc Business	\$603,433	102	100	26%	74%

Source: Center for Responsive Politics, reflecting contributions made between January 1, 2017, and September 30, 2018. Data obtained on October 24, 2018.

Appendix 2

Top 100 PAC Donors to Leadership PACs Controlled by Sitting Members of Congress

Rank	Political Action Committee (PAC) Name	Total Contributions	Number of Leadership PAC Beneficiaries	Number of Lawmakers Whose Leadership PACs Benefited	Percent Given to Democrats	Percent Given to Republicans
1	Honeywell International	\$1,439,000	225	223	37%	63%
2	United Parcel Service	\$1,133,784	164	163	22%	78%
3	AT&T Inc	\$1,060,000	163	162	27%	73%
4	Northrop Grumman	\$1,056,000	155	154	34%	65%
5	National Assn of Real Estate Investment Trusts	\$984,500	131	130	37%	63%
6	Comcast Corp	\$967,000	154	154	37%	63%
7	Deloitte LLP	\$941,500	131	130	35%	65%
8	International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers	\$932,000	149	149	99%	1%
9	National Multi Housing Council	\$922,000	142	141	45%	55%
10	Home Depot	\$871,500	137	137	26%	74%
11	Lockheed Martin	\$820,000	126	125	33%	66%
12	Raytheon Co	\$788,000	125	125	30%	70%
13	National Air Traffic Controllers Assn	\$770,000	185	183	60%	40%
14	National Assn of Realtors	\$763,500	145	144	44%	56%
15	Union Pacific Corp	\$688,000	92	92	33%	67%
16	BNSF Railway	\$680,700	119	119	39%	61%
17	PricewaterhouseCoopers	\$662,000	103	102	33%	67%
18	General Dynamics	\$635,500	104	103	44%	54%
19	Sheet Metal, Air, Rail & Transportation Union	\$634,000	87	87	95%	5%
20	Charter Communications	\$614,500	96	96	30%	70%
21	American Bankers Assn	\$603,500	91	90	24%	76%
22	NCTA The Internet & Television Assn	\$578,500	99	98	35%	65%
23	General Motors	\$568,500	107	105	43%	57%
24	General Electric	\$563,500	131	130	38%	62%
25	Wine & Spirits Wholesalers of America	\$556,296	93	93	36%	63%
26	National Assn of Broadcasters	\$549,500	90	90	42%	58%
27	KPMG LLP	\$547,000	89	89	51%	49%
27	New York Life Insurance	\$547,000	87	87	53%	46%
29	American Institute of CPAs	\$541,000	95	94	26%	73%
30	Koch Industries	\$540,000	84	83	1%	99%
30	UBS Americas	\$540,000	79	78	53%	47%
32	CSX Corp	\$532,500	71	71	38%	62%
33	FedEx Express	\$529,500	100	100	27%	73%
34	Mortgage Bankers Assn	\$526,000	87	86	39%	61%
35	Ernst & Young	\$523,500	82	81	49%	51%
36	Credit Union National Assn	\$498,500	81	81	48%	51%
37	Investment Co Institute	\$495,500	76	76	47%	53%
38	Altria Group	\$491,000	73	73	22%	78%
39	Air Line Pilots Assn	\$487,000	78	78	56%	44%
40	Google Inc	\$477,500	70	69	51%	48%
41	American College of Emergency Physicians	\$455,500	86	86	42%	58%
42	Norfolk Southern	\$451,000	59	59	42%	58%
43	Microsoft Corp	\$445,000	79	78	39%	61%
44	Pfizer Inc	\$444,000	73	73	41%	59%
45	AFLAC Inc	\$441,500	87	86	35%	65%
46	National Rural Electric Cooperative Assn	\$434,000	57	57	44%	56%
47	Laborers Union	\$427,500	61	61	63%	36%
48	Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance	\$413,000	90	90	39%	61%
49	American Dental Assn	\$407,000	83	82	26%	74%
50	National Beer Wholesalers Assn	\$405,000	77	77	39%	61%

51	Council of Insurance Agents & Brokers	\$389,000	72	71	55%	45%
52	National Assn of Home Builders	\$372,500	50	50	24%	76%
53	American Hotel & Lodging Assn	\$369,500	62	61	27%	72%
54	Walmart Inc	\$366,500	98	97	29%	70%
55	UnitedHealth Group	\$359,500	60	59	34%	66%
56	National Assn of Convenience Stores	\$358,500	51	51	17%	83%
57	Automotive Free International Trade PAC	\$355,000	42	41	4%	96%
58	Blue Cross & Blue Shield Assn	\$351,500	75	74	31%	69%
59	Merck & Co	\$349,500	59	59	25%	75%
60	Humana Inc	\$344,000	63	63	41%	59%
61	More Conservatives PAC	\$341,500	55	55	0%	100%
62	Goldman Sachs	\$340,000	56	56	51%	49%
63	American Assn of Orthopaedic Surgeons	\$338,400	76	76	26%	74%
64	Abbott Laboratories	\$338,100	54	54	29%	71%
65	Amgen Inc	\$336,000	63	63	36%	64%
66	Independent Insurance Agents & Brokers of Am	\$335,000	68	67	25%	75%
67	Independent Community Bankers of America	\$328,500	69	68	27%	73%
68	Capital Group Companies	\$325,500	49	49	41%	59%
69	Amazon	\$314,500	72	72	39%	61%
70	Verizon Communications	\$309,500	65	65	31%	69%
71	American Society of Anesthesiologists	\$309,250	58	58	46%	54%
72	Operating Engineers Union	\$307,500	38	38	71%	29%
73	American Assn for Justice	\$302,000	41	41	97%	2%
74	MetLife Inc	\$295,000	50	50	39%	61%
75	American Hospital Assn	\$282,750	62	62	49%	51%
76	Aetna Inc	\$281,500	41	41	37%	63%
77	International Assn of Fire Fighters	\$281,000	41	41	77%	23%
78	Prudential Financial	\$280,000	53	53	45%	55%
79	Delta Air Lines	\$277,000	43	43	31%	69%
80	Capital One Financial	\$274,500	52	52	17%	83%
81	Ford Motor Co	\$273,500	47	47	33%	67%
82	American Academy of Dermatology Assn	\$273,000	55	55	42%	58%
82	T-Mobile USA	\$273,000	69	69	44%	55%
84	Anthem Inc	\$267,000	47	47	35%	65%
85	NextEra Energy	\$265,500	49	49	20%	80%
86	American College of Radiology	\$263,500	52	52	20%	80%
87	California Dairies Inc	\$259,000	39	39	11%	89%
88	American Crystal Sugar	\$251,000	44	44	63%	37%
88	American Seniors Housing Assn	\$251,000	48	48	39%	61%
90	National Assn of Letter Carriers	\$250,000	42	42	80%	20%
91	BASF Corp	\$243,375	45	45	31%	69%
92	PG&E Corp	\$242,000	46	46	53%	47%
93	Huntington Ingalls Industries	\$240,500	50	50	50%	50%
94	Majority Cmte PAC	\$240,000	31	31	0%	100%
95	National Auto Dealers Assn	\$238,500	58	57	18%	82%
96	American Health Care Assn	\$235,500	51	51	62%	38%
97	BAE Systems	\$233,000	40	40	47%	53%
97	CME Group	\$233,000	45	45	44%	56%
99	US Oncology	\$230,500	56	56	36%	64%
100	USAA	\$228,500	37	37	21%	79%

Source: Center for Responsive Politics, reflecting contributions made between January 1, 2017, and September 30, 2018. Data obtained on October 24, 2018.

Appendix 3

Top 50 Leadership PACs by Total Receipts (January 2017 - September 2018)

Rank	Leadership PAC Name	Affiliated Member of Congress	Total Raised
1	Prosperity Action	Rep. Paul Ryan (R-WI)	\$5,259,596
2	House Freedom Fund	Rep. Jim Jordan (R-OH)	\$5,253,137
3	AMERIPAC: The Fund for a Greater America	Rep. Steny Hoyer (D-MD)	\$4,380,721
4	Majority Committee PAC	Rep. Kevin McCarthy (R-CA)	\$3,993,959
5	Fearless for the People PAC	Sen. Kamala Harris (D-CA)	\$2,329,208
6	Serve America PAC	Rep. Seth Moulton (D-MA)	\$2,017,081
7	Alamo PAC	Sen. John Cornyn (R-TX)	\$1,991,613
8	Jobs, Freedom & Security PAC	Sen. Ted Cruz (R-TX)	\$1,940,463
9	Heartland Values PAC	Sen. John Thune (R-SD)	\$1,778,148
10	Eye of the Tiger PAC	Rep. Steve Scalise (R-LA)	\$1,665,616
11	New Pioneers PAC	Rep. Greg Walden (R-OR)	\$1,521,621
12	More Conservatives PAC	Rep. Patrick McHenry (R-NC)	\$1,490,233
13	Reinventing a New Direction (RAND) PAC	Sen. Rand Paul (R-KY)	\$1,469,562
14	Defend America PAC	Sen. Richard Shelby (R-AL)	\$1,462,695
15	Bluegrass Committee	Sen. Mitch McConnell (R-KY)	\$1,445,020
16	Impact	Sen. Charles Schumer (D-NY)	\$1,376,245
17	Making America Prosperous PAC	Rep. Kevin Brady (R-TX)	\$1,358,799
18	Common Ground PAC	Sen. Tim Kaine (D-VA)	\$1,352,747
19	Tenn PAC	Sen. Lamar Alexander (R-TN)	\$1,286,505
20	Opportunity & Renewal PAC	Sen. Jeff Merkley (D-OR)	\$1,224,301
21	Building Relationships in Diverse Geographic Environments (BRIDGE) PAC	Rep. James Clyburn (D-SC)	\$1,216,664
22	PAC to the Future	Rep. Nancy Pelosi (D-CA)	\$1,169,929
23	Rely on Your Beliefs Fund	Sen. Roy Blunt (R-MO)	\$1,161,483
24	Jobs, Opportunities & Education (JOE) PAC	Rep. Joseph Crowley (D-NY)	\$1,105,278
25	Forward Together PAC	Sen. Mark Warner (D-VA)	\$1,102,419
26	Support To Ensure Victory Everywhere (STEVE) PAC	Rep. Steve Stivers (R-OH)	\$1,098,688
27	Tomorrow Is Meaningful (TIM) PAC	Sen. Tim Scott (R-SC)	\$1,086,811
28	Project West PAC	Sen. Cory Gardner (R-CO)	\$1,077,133
29	Promoting Our Republican Team PAC	Sen. Rob Portman (R-OH)	\$1,039,323
30	Purpose PAC	Sen. Cory Booker (D-NJ)	\$1,034,401
31	Republican Majority Fund	Sen. Tom Cotton (R-AR)	\$1,007,899
32	Jobs, Opportunity & New Ideas (JONI) PAC	Sen. Joni Ernst (R-IA)	\$1,002,771
33	Citizens for Prosperity in America Today PAC	Sen. Pat Toomey (R-PA)	\$939,561
34	One Georgia PAC	Sen. David Perdue (R-GA)	\$926,868
35	Common Values PAC	Sen. John Barrasso (R-WY)	\$896,489
36	CMR PAC	Rep. Cathy McMorris Rodgers (R-WA)	\$884,230
37	Prairie PAC	Sen. Dick Durbin (D-IL)	\$884,011
38	21st Century Majority Fund	Sen. Johnny Isakson (R-GA)	\$853,038
39	Great Lakes PAC	Sen. Debbie Stabenow (D-MI)	\$817,930
40	Dakota Prairie PAC	Sen. Heidi Heitkamp (D-ND)	\$812,500
41	M-PAC	Sen. Patty Murray (D-WA)	\$802,300
42	Freedom Fund	Sen. Mike Crapo (R-ID)	\$796,930
43	All for Our Country Leadership PAC	Sen. Catherine Cortez Masto (D-NV)	\$793,039
44	Green Mountain PAC	Sen. Patrick Leahy (D-VT)	\$775,175
45	Off the Sidelines PAC	Sen. Kirsten Gillibrand (D-NY)	\$765,985
46	Common Sense Colorado	Sen. Michael Bennet (D-CO)	\$764,993
47	HellerHighWater PAC	Sen. Dean Heller (R-NV)	\$757,445
48	America Works Federal PAC	Sen. Sherrod Brown (D-OH)	\$757,266
49	Treasure State PAC	Sen. Jon Tester (D-MT)	\$750,533
50	Next Century Fund	Sen. Richard Burr (R-NC)	\$745,354

Source: Issue One analysis of data from the Center for Responsive Politics and Federal Election Commission.

Appendix 4

The Top 10 Leadership PACs Fully Funded by PAC Cash

Leadership PAC Name	Affiliated Member of Congress	Total Raised
Show-Me PAC	Rep. Sam Graves (R-MO)	\$205,500
Brave PAC	Rep. David Scott (D-GA)	\$111,000
Maintaining All Republicans In Office (MARIO) PAC	Rep. Mario Diaz-Balart (R-FL)	\$97,000
Democrats United To Change and Hope (DUTCH) PAC	Rep. Dutch Ruppersberger (D-MD)	\$96,000
Greater Opportunities for Leadership Development (GOLD) PAC	Rep. Sanford Bishop (D-GA)	\$72,500
Husky PAC	Rep. Joe Courtney (D-CT)	\$70,000
Gene PAC	Rep. Gene Green (D-TX)	\$68,500
Promise PAC	Rep. Marcia L Fudge (D-OH)	\$66,500
Maple PAC	Rep. Peter Welch (D-VT)	\$60,000
Taxpayers Incensed By Government Excess and Regulation PAC	Rep. Dennis Ross (R-FL)	\$50,150
Source: Issue One analysis of data from the Center for Responsive Politics and Federal Election Commission.		
Note: Total receipts represents all money raised by this PAC between January 1, 2017, and September 30, 2018.		