

Under the Influence

Special Interest Money and
New York's Members of Congress



Acknowledgements

The primary authors of *Under the Influence* were Congress Watch Research Director Taylor Lincoln, Senior Researchers Alexander Cohen and John O'Donnell, Researcher Lara Chausow and Research Intern Marisa London. Congress Watch Director Laura MacCleery formulated and guided the project. Public Citizen information technology consultant Jason Stele designed the project's Web site and Benita Marcus offered essential assistance with graphics. The report would not have been possible without the generosity of the ARCA Foundation. The Center for Responsive Politics provided the summary data that was the basis for many of the tables in this publication. The Center for Public Integrity shared data from its project on congressional travel.

About Public Citizen

Public Citizen is a 100,000 member non-profit organization based in Washington, D.C. We represent consumer interests through lobbying, litigation, research and public education. Founded in 1971, Public Citizen fights for consumer rights in the marketplace, safe and affordable health care, campaign finance reform, fair trade, clean and safe energy sources, and corporate and government accountability. Public Citizen has five divisions and is active in every public forum: Congress, the courts, governmental agencies and the media. Congress Watch is one of the five divisions.

¹ David Magleby, Anthony Corrado, and Kelly Patterson, eds. FINANCING THE 2004 ELECTION (Washington DC: Brookings Institute, 2006), p. 75.

² Congressional Research Service Memorandum, Earmarks in Appropriations Acts: FY1994, FY1996, FY1998, FY2000, FY2002, FY2004, FY2005 (January 26, 2006).



Campaign Reform Act of 2002, which doubled the maximum allowable contribution to campaign committees.

PAC-Men and PAC-Women

This table details the amount of campaign contributions received from political action committees from the beginning of the 2000 election cycle in January 1999 through June 30, 2006. The results, based on data provided by the Center for Responsive Politics, are subdivided into two categories: business and labor. (A third PAC category, contributions provided by ideological groups, is not presented in this table.) In order to account for members having served for different lengths of time, a multiplier is used to create parity on a per-election-cycle basis. Each election of a member of the House counts as one election cycle. Each election for a member of the Senate counts as three election cycles. Per-cycle figures are adjusted to correct for an increase in campaign contributions with each passing cycle, including a marked jump that occurred following enactment of the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 2002, which doubled the maximum allowable contribution to campaign committees.

On Tour: Contributions from Individuals Who Live Out of State

This table details the amount of campaign contributions over \$200 received by members of Congress from individuals who do not live in the state that they represent. Note: Calculations in this table do not include contributions from PACs or contributions from individuals who gave \$200 or less (the cutoff point for disclosure of itemized contributions to the Federal Election Commission). The table covers contributions made from the start of the 2000 election cycle in January 1999 through June 30, 2006. The data were provided by the Center for Responsive Politics. To account for members having served for different lengths of time, a multiplier is used to create parity on a per-election cycle basis. Each election of a member of the House counts as one election cycle. Each election of a member of the Senate counts as three election cycles. Per-cycle figures are adjusted to correct for an increase in campaign contributions with each passing cycle, including a marked jump that occurred following enactment of the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 2002, which doubled the maximum allowable contribution to campaign committees.

Fat Cats or Passing the Hat? Contributions of \$200 or Less

This table enumerates campaign contributions of \$200 or less given by individuals, from the start of the 2000 election cycle in January 1999 to June 30, 2006. Federal election rules do not require itemized reporting of such contributions, which is why it was chosen as a cutoff point to separate small donors from others. The table is based on data provided by the Center for Responsive Politics. In order to account for members having served for different lengths of time, a multiplier is used to create parity on a per election cycle basis. Each election of a member of the House counts as one election cycle. Each election of a member of the Senate counts as three election cycles. Data are further adjusted to account for increases in campaign contributions that occurred since 2000, including a marked jump that occurred in the 2004 election cycle following enactment of the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 2002, which doubled the maximum allowable contribution to campaign committees.

Who Really Represents New York? An Index of Special Interest Influence

This report takes a hard and close look at the sources of campaign funding for all of New York's incumbent federal office holders.

Scandals involving prominent members of Congress and lobbyists, including the admissions of guilt by **Reps. Randy "Duke" Cunningham** of California and **Bob Ney** of Ohio, and lobbyist Jack Abramoff have rocked the nation and angered citizens. But, when members of Congress faced a historic opportunity to enact meaningful lobbying and ethics reforms, they chose instead to cut and run.

Some states have responded to scandals by reforming their election systems, opting for public funding. What is good for state legislators would also be good for members of Congress. On the federal level, powerful interests and lobbyists spend millions of dollars to gain access to elected officials, and are rewarded with billions of taxpayer dollars in return. The potential leaders of tomorrow who refuse to play this game or do not have access to millions cannot get a start in federal politics today.

The costs of this pay-to-play system are high. Issues that concern ordinary citizens get left behind: skyrocketing gas prices fail to spur a plan for energy independence; a soaring federal budget deficit produces yet more spending without any end in sight; members of Congress get a raise while the minimum wage stagnates. Most tellingly, voters get a do-nothing Congress that will not enact meaningful lobbying or ethics reform despite criminal indictments of its own members.

This report breaks out campaign contributions to New York's federal lawmakers, detailing for each incumbent the:

- Amount of contributions from lobbyists;
- Value of privately funded travel accepted by the incumbent;
- Amount of contributions from out-of-state donors;
- Percentage of contributions from donors who give \$200 or less, a measure of grassroots financial support as opposed to special interest support; and
- Amount of contributions from political action committees (PACs).

Certain categories of data were adjusted, as indicated, to account for the periods of time members served and overall increases in contributions since the 2000 election cycle. Some of the findings highlighted below reflect these adjusted figures.

This report unearths the following facts about New York's congressional delegation:

- Nearly half of the members of the delegation rely on PACs for at least 40 percent of their contributions, including a half-dozen House members whose take from PACs tops 50 percent – **Reps. Edolphus Towns, Nydia Velazquez, Gregory Meeks, Michael McNulty, Jose E. Serrano and John McHugh**.
- Eight members of the delegation get more than 35 percent of their contributions from individuals from out of state, including **Sen. Hillary Rodham Clinton** at 55.4 percent and McHugh at an astounding 75.1 percent.

- Most members of the delegation rely on small donors for less than half of contributions from individuals. These include **Reps. Jerrold Nadler, Charles Rangel, Tom Reynolds, Gary Ackerman and Carolyn Maloney** and Serrano, who each get 30 percent or less of their contributions from small donors. Only five of the 31 members of the delegation get more than half of their contributions from individuals from small donors: **Reps. Brian Higgins, Carolyn McCarthy, Louise Slaughter, Maurice Hinchey, Randy Kuhl** and Maloney.
- Topping the list of K Street favorites are Clinton (\$203,600 per election cycle), **Sen. Charles Schumer** (\$101,994 per cycle). Rangel (\$107,285 per cycle) and Reynolds (\$76,975 per cycle) top members of New York’s House delegation in reliance on contributions from K Street.

The problem of money and its influence in elections is fundamental and must be addressed with a fundamental change: the public funding of Congressional elections.

Public funding puts voters back at the center of elections. Candidates collect an established number of small contributions, such as \$5, from supporters. These donations qualify them for public campaign funds, if they agree to accept no additional private money and abide by strict spending limits. When candidates face privately funded opponents who outspend them or independent expenditures on behalf of their opposition, they can qualify for additional funding, up to a limit.

The benefits of public funding for congressional candidates are substantial:

- More and different voices on Capitol Hill would be heard;
- There would be less pressure on lawmakers to cater to donors;
- Candidates would spend less time raising money and more time serving the public and speaking with constituents; and
- Public confidence in the integrity of elections and elected officials would increase.

A public funding system for elections is also cost-effective. Congressional candidates spent about \$1.3 billion in the last two-year election cycle – a miniscule amount when compared to the \$2.3 *trillion* federal budget.¹ If this cost were divided among all 215 million adults in the United States, it would equal the price of a cup of gourmet coffee – a mere \$3 per year per eligible voter. These costs pale in comparison to the government’s estimate of \$47.4 billion each year that Congress hands out through direct earmarks to wealthy donors, special interests and big business, costing each citizen of voting age \$220 a year.²

Most important, public funding is fair. Both Republicans and Democrats are successfully using the system in several states. Arizona’s incumbent Governor Janet Napolitano is now running her second campaign using the Clean Elections program. In Maine, the Republican gubernatorial nominee, Chandler Woodcock, opted into that state’s Clean Elections system. The state legislature in Connecticut passed a Clean Elections bill in December 2005. Arizona and Maine have used statewide and legislative clean elections since 2000, and North Carolina started public funding for judicial races in 2004. Many lawmakers say the system frees them to vote their conscience without having to worry about their next campaign dollar.

Methodology for Determining Data in Tables

Explanation of Adjustments to the Totals.

Unadjusted numbers would not provide an apples-to-apples comparison of the amount of money contributed to members who were in office for different numbers of years over the time period studied. Contribution amounts in the tables in this study were therefore adjusted, as we note in each table, to allow a comparison of members who served less than the full time period of the study (2000 to 2006) with those who were officeholders for the full period.

Certain figures were also adjusted, as noted in each chart in which this occurs, to account for the increase in contributions that occurred in 2004 following enactment of the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 2002, which doubled the maximum allowable contribution to campaign committees. This second adjustment was similarly needed to ensure fairness in comparing contributions to some senators who last ran for office in 2002 (before the contribution limits were doubled) to contributions to members who ran in 2004, after the doubling of the contribution limits occurred.

Teeing Off: Acceptance of Privately Funded Travel and Related Expenses.

These data, obtained from the Center for Public Integrity (CPI), enumerate the amount of privately-funded travel and related expenditures reported by each current member of each state’s congressional delegation from January 2000 through June 2005. To account for members having varying numbers of years of service since January 2000, a column – *Privately Funded Travel (with years of service multiplier)* – was created. It extrapolates the value of each member’s travel to 5.5 years, the length of the study.

CPI noted the sheer number of “misfiled, misreported and mystifying travel disclosures” in its original analysis of congressional travel. Documents filed by members are often illegible or incomplete, and some may have been lost. The result is a level of imprecision in figures derived from the documents, which is why this chart provides travel amounts only in increments of \$10,000. On top of the exhaustive review conducted by CPI, we also independently reviewed the travel forms of the members in our study and compared the totals against CPI’s database. In cases where the reported figures were uncertain, the lowest apparent total was assigned. The figures therefore should be viewed as a guidepost to the amount of travel members accepted, rather than as absolute indicators.

K Street Cash: Contributions from Lobbyists

This table details the amount of campaign contributions received by current members of the state’s congressional delegation from lobbyists and their families from the start of the 2000 election cycle through the end of 2005. The table includes only contributions made to incumbents, meaning that if a current member was elected for the first time during the period studied, contributions made during his or her initial campaign are not included. The information is based on data obtained from the Center for Responsive Politics. To account for members having served for different lengths of time, data are provided on a per election cycle basis. Each election of a member of the House counts as one election cycle. Each election of a member of the Senate counts as three election cycles. Per-cycle figures are adjusted to correct for an increase in campaign contributions with each passing cycle, including a marked jump that occurred following enactment of the Bipartisan

Member	\$ from PACs, 2000 Cycle to Present	Pct. of Total \$ from PACs	\$ from Business PACs Per Cycle (adjusted)*	\$ from Labor PACs Per Cycle (adjusted)	\$ from PACs Per Cycle (adjusted)
Velazquez					
Rep. Gregory Meeks	\$1,244,104	51.9	\$219,025	\$83,959	\$309,348
Rep. Gary Ackerman	\$1,012,405	33.1	\$119,815	\$122,458	\$256,479
Rep. Anthony Weiner	\$941,024	28.3	\$107,372	\$118,904	\$241,552
Rep. Jerrold Nadler	\$949,176	30.7	\$107,259	\$117,143	\$239,387
Rep. Maurice Hinchey	\$910,356	33.6	\$87,292	\$125,663	\$233,490
Rep. John McHugh	\$911,907	61.9	\$131,821	\$93,539	\$225,852
Rep. Louise Slaughter	\$888,920	41.1	\$84,282	\$117,345	\$223,129
Rep. Michael McNulty	\$841,763	50.5	\$111,907	\$98,467	\$215,741
Rep. Major Owens	\$635,151	44.0	\$45,990	\$152,404	\$215,380
Rep. Jose Serrano	\$566,285	58.9	\$49,792	\$86,799	\$143,160

Source: The Center for Responsive Politics. Figures are drawn from information for the period from January 1, 1999 through June 30, 2006 and are based on data released electronically by the FEC on August 7, 2006.

*See Methodology for explanation of adjustment method.

Public funding for elections is a practical, proven solution that puts voters in control of elections. It is also the focus of growing public and congressional attention. In Congress, **Reps. John Tierney** (D-Mass.) and **Raul Grijalva** (D-Ariz.) are leading sponsors of H.R. 3099, the Clean Money, Clean Elections Act, which would provide full public funding for House candidates. **Reps. Joseph Crowley, Hinchey, Michael McNulty** and **Nadler** of New York are co-sponsors of this important bill. A similar bill is expected for introduction in the Senate soon.

You can join this exciting movement for public funding of elections and learn more at www.cleanupwashington.org.

Meet Your Member
Basic Facts about New York's Senators and Representatives

Member	District	Party	Term	Next Election	Percentage of Vote Received in Last General Election
Sen. Hillary Rodham Clinton	n/a	D	1st	2006	55
Sen. Charles Schumer	n/a	D	2nd	2010	71
Rep. Timothy Bishop	1	D	2nd	2006	56
Rep. Steve Israel	2	D	3rd	2006	67
Rep. Pete King	3	R	7th	2006	63
Rep. Carolyn McCarthy	4	D	5th	2006	63
Rep. Gary Ackerman	5	D	12th	2006	71
Rep. Gregory Meeks	6	D	5th	2006	Uncontested
Rep. Joseph Crowley	7	D	4th	2006	80
Rep. Jerrold Nadler	8	D	7th	2006	80
Rep. Anthony Weiner	9	D	4th	2006	70
Rep. Edolphus Towns	10	D	12th	2006	91
Rep. Major Owens	11	D	12th	Retiring	Uncontested
Rep. Nydia Velazquez	12	D	7th	2006	85
Rep. Vito Fossella	13	R	5th	2006	59
Rep. Carolyn Maloney	14	D	7th	2006	81
Rep. Charles Rangel	15	D	18th	2006	90
Rep. Jose Serrano	16	D	9th	2006	95
Rep. Eliot Engel	17	D	9th	2006	76
Rep. Nita Lowey	18	D	9th	2006	69
Rep. Sue Kelly	19	R	6th	2006	67
Rep. John Sweeney	20	R	4th	2006	66
Rep. Michael McNulty	21	D	9th	2006	70
Rep. Maurice Hinchey	22	D	7th	2006	67
Rep. John McHugh	23	R	7th	2006	71
Rep. Sherwood Boehlert	24	R	12th	Retiring	57
Rep. James Walsh	25	R	9th	2006	91
Rep. Tom Reynolds	26	R	4th	2006	56
Rep. Brian Higgins	27	D	1st	2006	51
Rep. Louise Slaughter	28	D	10th	2006	72
Rep. Randy Kuhl	29	R	1st	2006	51

* See Methodology for explanation of adjustment method.

† Percentage represents contributions from individuals who gave \$200 or less divided by all contributions from individuals.

PAC-Men and PAC-Women

Contributions from Political Action Committees (PACs)

Members of Congress are elected to represent constituents, but often receive contributions from special interest organizations known as PACs. PACs may give up to \$5,000 per candidate per election and typically target elections in which their donations will have the biggest impact.

Member	\$ from PACs, 2000 Cycle to Present	Pct. of Total \$ from PACs	\$ from Business PACs Per Cycle (adjusted)*	\$ from Labor PACs Per Cycle (adjusted)	\$ from PACs Per Cycle (adjusted)
Sen. Charles Schumer	\$1,722,950	6.2	\$444,063	\$86,438	\$563,477
Sen. Hillary Rodham Clinton	\$2,745,319	3.2	\$250,487	\$172,364	\$461,557
Rep. Tom Reynolds	\$5,001,343	37.6	\$1,140,830	\$55,447	\$1,216,980
Rep. Charles Rangel	\$4,657,679	41.8	\$902,194	\$260,920	\$1,184,329
Rep. Sherwood Boehlert	\$1,746,977	47.7	\$361,508	\$182,665	\$583,274
Rep. Joseph Crowley	\$2,230,025	47.2	\$318,264	\$190,763	\$549,567
Rep. Sue Kelly	\$2,146,411	43.6	\$443,986	\$74,342	\$536,538
Rep. Edolphus Towns	\$2,016,732	52.7	\$416,319	\$89,628	\$515,061
Rep. John Sweeney	\$1,891,664	33.3	\$351,233	\$111,137	\$474,452
Rep. Vito Fossella	\$1,739,602	39.9	\$418,074	\$16,514	\$437,514
Rep. Carolyn McCarthy	\$1,711,365	24.8	\$185,057	\$216,742	\$431,954
Rep. Steve Israel	\$1,644,256	30.5	\$211,173	\$169,004	\$411,049
Rep. Eliot Engel	\$1,616,643	42.3	\$216,801	\$152,896	\$408,758
Rep. James Walsh	\$1,507,266	45.3	\$319,510	\$54,890	\$379,174
Rep. Brian Higgins	\$807,791	33.4	\$87,759	\$247,054	\$376,510
Rep. Carolyn Maloney	\$1,433,265	37.1	\$236,999	\$108,163	\$363,571
Rep. Randy Kuhl	\$772,096	38.6	\$272,583	\$70,055	\$359,758
Rep. Timothy Bishop	\$1,137,662	27.6	\$92,409	\$221,506	\$355,711
Rep. Nita Lowey	\$1,306,139	20.5	\$147,201	\$150,872	\$330,400
Rep. Pete King	\$1,244,786	41.9	\$206,863	\$108,987	\$317,611
Rep. Nydia	\$1,249,413	57.4	\$216,517	\$89,426	\$313,237

Fat Cats or Passing the Hat? Contributions of \$200 or Less

When candidates are collecting dollars, it is easier to go to a relatively small number of wealthy donors who can write \$2,000 checks than to gather many, many more small contributions from a large number of people. Candidates with many small donations likely reached out to a more economically and socially diverse group of citizens.

Federal election law does not require itemized reporting of donations of \$200 or less. Members of Congress who receive more money from small donors, especially in proportion to their overall contributions, probably are turning more to their whole constituencies to raise money instead of to a few well-heeled supporters.

Member	Contributions from Small Donors 2000 Cycle to Present	Contributions from Small Donors Per Cycle (adjusted)*	Percentage of Contributions from Small Donors [†]
Sen. Charles Schumer	\$9,857,270	\$2,876,902	30.6
Sen. Hillary Rodham Clinton	\$35,744,220	\$5,867,953	41.8
Rep. Jerrold Nadler	\$471,477	\$105,994	19.7
Rep. Carolyn Maloney	\$676,423	\$151,858	23.2
Rep. Charles Rangel	\$1,550,998	\$353,852	23.5
Rep. Gary Ackerman	\$655,682	\$152,104	28.6
Rep. Tom Reynolds	\$2,511,618	\$586,620	29.8
Rep. Jose Serrano	\$125,320	\$29,149	29.9
Rep. Nita Lowey	\$1,845,445	\$422,853	32.1
Rep. Sherwood Boehlert	\$745,377	\$219,713	32.2
Rep. Steve Israel	\$1,452,279	\$329,766	32.4
Rep. Nydia Velazquez	\$374,194	\$84,227	34.1
Rep. Eliot Engel	\$863,676	\$204,610	36.1
Rep. John Sweeney	\$1,444,043	\$335,398	36.1
Rep. Joseph Crowley	\$962,994	\$222,191	36.2
Rep. Vito Fossella	\$1,022,496	\$243,147	36.4
Rep. John McHugh	\$209,394	\$47,928	37.8
Rep. Major Owens	\$257,574	\$82,912	39.4
Rep. Gregory Meeks	\$532,456	\$126,381	39.6
Rep. Sue Kelly	\$1,157,660	\$273,607	41.0
Rep. Anthony Weiner	\$734,575	\$171,085	42.8
Rep. Timothy Bishop	\$1,559,394	\$473,292	43.6
Rep. Edolphus Towns	\$783,120	\$189,568	43.6
Rep. Michael McNulty	\$325,986	\$80,617	44.8
Rep. Pete King	\$886,903	\$214,048	47.8
Rep. James Walsh	\$967,305	\$229,555	47.9
Rep. Brian Higgins	\$972,801	\$434,226	51.4
Rep. Louise Slaughter	\$608,845	\$150,791	52.5
Rep. Randy Kuhl	\$702,489	\$314,287	54.6
Rep. Maurice Hinchey	\$1,080,046	\$262,191	55.7
Rep. Carolyn McCarthy	\$3,499,789	\$874,804	66.8

Source: The Center for Responsive Politics. Figures are drawn from information for the period from January 1, 1999 through June 30, 2006 and are based on data released electronically by the FEC on August 7, 2006.

K Street Cash Contributions from Lobbyists

Lobbyists are paid big bucks to convince members of Congress to vote a certain way. They do this through meetings in which they lay out their point of view. They also sometimes provide members of Congress with expensive meals, golf trips and campaign contributions to ensure access.

In addition to the direct contributions detailed below, the “bundling” of so-called hard money contributions from individuals by lobbyists substantially enabled the rapid increase in political expenditures in recent years, which are not reflected in the chart. This chart is only the tip of the iceberg in documenting lobbyists’ influence through fundraising.

Member	Total Contributions from Lobbyists, 2000 to 2005	Contributions from Lobbyists Per Cycle (adjusted)*
Sen. Hillary Rodham Clinton	\$615,700	\$203,600
Sen. Charles Schumer	\$254,996	\$101,949
Rep. Charles Rangel	\$397,652	\$107,285
Rep. Tom Reynolds	\$340,818	\$76,975
Rep. John Sweeney	\$219,500	\$54,875
Rep. Sherwood Boehlert	\$164,618	\$52,038
Rep. James Walsh	\$191,041	\$48,510
Rep. John McHugh	\$76,151	\$18,833
Rep. Nita Lowey	\$68,541	\$17,529
Rep. Joseph Crowley	\$69,801	\$17,187
Rep. Randy Kuhl	\$15,250	\$16,928
Rep. Edolphus Towns	\$63,195	\$16,674
Rep. Vito Fossella	\$67,754	\$16,448
Rep. Pete King	\$58,350	\$15,558
Rep. Carolyn McCarthy	\$61,300	\$15,533
Rep. Eliot Engel	\$56,000	\$14,716
Rep. Timothy Bishop	\$33,250	\$13,294
Rep. Nydia Velazquez	\$46,900	\$12,463
Rep. Brian Higgins	\$11,086	\$12,305
Rep. Steve Israel	\$38,220	\$11,860
Rep. Carolyn Maloney	\$41,150	\$11,240
Rep. Louise Slaughter	\$38,707	\$10,864
Rep. Gregory Meeks	\$42,250	\$10,773
Rep. Sue Kelly	\$40,700	\$9,981
Rep. Gary Ackerman	\$26,900	\$7,285
Rep. Jerrold Nadler	\$21,750	\$5,531
Rep. Michael McNulty	\$17,250	\$4,780
Rep. Maurice Hinchey	\$14,861	\$3,852
Rep. Anthony Weiner	\$10,750	\$2,688
Rep. Jose Serrano	\$10,250	\$2,563
Rep. Major Owens	\$7,150	\$2,089

Source: The Center for Responsive Politics. Figures are drawn from information for the period from January 1, 1999 through December 31, 2005.

*See Methodology for explanation of adjustment method.

Teeing Off

Acceptance of Privately Funded Travel and Related Expenses

Being a member of Congress is supposed to be a job, not a vacation. Yet lawmakers accept free trips all over the world. While some of the trips are legitimate fact-finding missions, others include golf outings and spa visits. Often traveling with Members are representatives of the special interests that funded the travel. Sometimes these companions are lobbyists, who can use charter flights and breaks between holes on the golf course to lobby members of Congress.

Member	Total Privately Funded Travel*	Years of Service [†]	Privately Funded Travel (with years-of-service multiplier) [‡]
Sen. Hillary Rodham Clinton	\$60,001 to \$70,000	4.5	\$70,001 to \$80,000
Sen. Charles Schumer	\$20,001 to \$30,000	5.5	\$20,001 to \$30,000
Rep. Maurice Hinchey	\$140,001 to \$150,000	5.5	\$140,001 to \$150,000
Rep. Gregory Meeks	\$130,001 to \$140,000	5.5	\$130,001 to \$140,000
Rep. Joseph Crowley	\$90,001 to \$100,000	5.5	\$90,001 to \$100,000
Rep. Eliot Engel	\$80,001 to \$90,000	5.5	\$80,001 to \$90,000
Rep. Steve Israel	\$40,001 to \$50,000	4.5	\$60,001 to \$70,000
Rep. Nita Lowey	\$60,001 to \$70,000	5.5	\$60,001 to \$70,000
Rep. Tom Reynolds	\$40,001 to \$50,000	5.5	\$40,001 to \$50,000
Rep. Gary Ackerman	\$30,001 to \$40,000	5.5	\$30,001 to \$40,000
Rep. Sue Kelly	\$30,001 to \$40,000	5.5	\$30,001 to \$40,000
Rep. Jerrold Nadler	\$30,001 to \$40,000	5.5	\$30,001 to \$40,000
Rep. Major Owens	\$30,001 to \$40,000	5.5	\$30,001 to \$40,000
Rep. Anthony Weiner	\$30,001 to \$40,000	5.5	\$30,001 to \$40,000
Rep. Carolyn Maloney	\$20,001 to \$30,000	5.5	\$20,001 to \$30,000
Rep. Vito Fossella	\$10,001 to \$20,000	5.5	\$10,001 to \$20,000
Rep. Brian Higgins	\$1 to \$10,000	0.5	\$10,001 to \$20,000
Rep. Pete King	\$10,001 to \$20,000	5.5	\$10,001 to \$20,000
Rep. Carolyn McCarthy	\$10,001 to \$20,000	5.5	\$10,001 to \$20,000
Rep. John McHugh	\$10,001 to \$20,000	5.5	\$10,001 to \$20,000
Rep. Charles Rangel	\$10,001 to \$20,000	5.5	\$10,001 to \$20,000
Rep. John Sweeney	\$10,001 to \$20,000	5.5	\$10,001 to \$20,000
Rep. Sherwood Boehlert	\$1 to \$10,000	5.5	\$1 to \$10,000
Rep. Michael McNulty	\$1 to \$10,000	5.5	\$1 to \$10,000
Rep. Louise Slaughter	\$1 to \$10,000	5.5	\$1 to \$10,000
Rep. Edolphus Towns	\$1 to \$10,000	5.5	\$1 to \$10,000
Rep. Nydia Velazquez	\$1 to \$10,000	5.5	\$1 to \$10,000
Rep. Timothy Bishop	\$0	2.5	\$0
Rep. Randy Kuhl	\$0	0.5	\$0
Rep. Jose Serrano	\$0	5.5	\$0
Rep. James Walsh	\$0	5.5	\$0

Source: The Center for Public Integrity.

* Due to the imprecise reporting of privately funded travel, increments of \$10,000 are used.

[†] The range of the available data is from January 1, 2000 to June 30, 2005.

[‡] The figure incorporates the years of service factor and extrapolates each member's travel as if he or she had served all 5.5 years.

On Tour

Contributions from Individuals Who Live Out of State

Members of Congress are elected to represent constituents, yet many candidates for office receive contributions from people who do not live in their states or districts. Large amounts of out-of-state contributors may indicate that candidates are gearing up for a national election, that they are beholden to special interests located outside their state or district, or both.

Member	Total Contributions from Out-of-State, 2000 Cycle to Present*	Percentage of Contributions from Out-of-State	Contributions from Out-of-State Per Cycle (adjusted) [†]
Sen. Hillary Rodham Clinton	\$27,545,130	55.4	\$4,677,090
Sen. Charles Schumer	\$6,390,355	28.6	\$2,126,325
Rep. Charles Rangel	\$2,407,790	47.7	\$608,422
Rep. Tom Reynolds	\$2,116,436	35.8	\$520,839
Rep. Eliot Engel	\$652,859	42.7	\$164,123
Rep. Nita Lowey	\$555,191	14.2	\$140,010
Rep. John Sweeney	\$548,059	21.5	\$136,594
Rep. Carolyn McCarthy	\$530,863	30.6	\$135,843
Rep. Joseph Crowley	\$527,028	31.0	\$126,933
Rep. Sherwood Boehlert	\$356,388	22.7	\$117,857
Rep. Timothy Bishop	\$354,251	17.6	\$115,484
Rep. Carolyn Maloney	\$419,533	18.7	\$105,892
Rep. Gary Ackerman	\$406,450	24.9	\$104,476
Rep. Vito Fossella	\$400,886	22.5	\$101,126
Rep. Edolphus Towns	\$376,295	37.1	\$95,714
Rep. James Walsh	\$368,673	35.0	\$90,410
Rep. Nydia Velazquez	\$302,000	41.8	\$74,409
Rep. Jerrold Nadler	\$287,350	15.0	\$73,198
Rep. Steve Israel	\$274,100	9.0	\$69,581
Rep. Sue Kelly	\$263,670	15.8	\$65,895
Rep. John M McHugh	\$258,801	75.1	\$64,141
Rep. Gregory W Meeks	\$241,288	29.7	\$59,814
Rep. Pete King	\$225,840	23.4	\$56,927
Rep. Brian Higgins	\$102,834	11.2	\$46,499
Rep. Anthony Weiner	\$153,942	15.7	\$43,735
Rep. Randy Kuhl	\$85,850	14.7	\$39,931
Rep. Major Owens	\$101,150	25.6	\$34,447
Rep. Maurice Hinchey	\$104,736	12.2	\$26,638
Rep. Jose Serrano	\$93,500	31.7	\$23,505
Rep. Louise Slaughter	\$87,232	15.8	\$22,517
Rep. Michael McNulty	\$82,435	20.6	\$21,656

Source: The Center for Responsive Politics. Figures are drawn from information for the period from January 1, 1999 through June 30, 2006 and are based on data released electronically by the FEC on August 7, 2006.

*Contributions include only those from individuals who gave more than \$200.

[†] See Methodology for explanation of adjustment method.