



## Corporate Political Spending and Reproductive Health Rights Support in the 2020 Election Cycle

Sept. 27, 2020

This memo discusses for the 2020 election cycle the political spending contributions of selected companies in the *Fortune* 250, to determine the extent of support for candidates and other political entities opposed to reproductive health rights. It updates an August memo on mid-year findings. A separate memo includes information on corporate trade association spending, which is rarely reported.

**Data:** The study universe includes 233 of the largest U.S. publicly traded companies, with spending in the categories noted below. Full information appears here on spending from Jan. 1, 2019 to mid-2020, up to the dates noted below:

- Candidates - mid-August.
- 527s - June 30
- PAC to PAC/Party - July 31
- State Party - July 29
- Super PACs –June 16

**Positions on reproductive health:** We assigned views on reproductive health rights for each of the candidates and politically active entities for which expenditure data are available. Documentation on file includes URLs about each entity's viewpoint, assessed as "pro," "anti," "mixed" or "?" for support of reproductive health rights. Some entities are nonpartisan by definition and do not express views on the subject and these are indicated as "n/a." The small number of entities we could not attribute are designated as "?".

**Types of spending:** The aim of this project is to compile a full political spending footprint for each company studied, which requires assessment of spending through multiple avenues, at the federal and state level. Companies give to the following:

- *527 political committees*, named after the portion of the tax code that defines their status,
- *Candidates*, via political action committees (PACs, which aggregate contributions from employees and others connected to a company) for federal races and via both PACs and directly from corporate funds for state races,
- *PAC contributions that in turn are given to other PACs*, which can be associated with specific candidates, groups of candidates or parties. State party committees support both federal and state candidates, but give much more to those seeking federal office.

**Table 1: Overview of Corporate Political Spending in the 2020 Election Cycle**

ALL CONTRIBUTIONS		Reproductive Rights Position					% Anti*	% of all spending
Level/Type	?	Anti	Mixed	n/a	Pro	Total		
<b>Federal</b>	<b>\$92,300</b>	<b>\$78,286,113</b>	<b>\$1,118,516</b>	<b>\$2,278,350</b>	<b>\$58,341,923</b>	<b>\$140,117,202</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>89%</b>
527		\$23,307,386		\$575,675	\$18,821,895	\$42,704,956	57%	27%
Candidate	\$5,800	\$27,199,852	\$542,600		\$22,199,503	\$49,947,755	55%	32%
PAC to PAC/Party	\$31,500	\$20,503,770	\$570,916	\$1,697,481	\$16,917,800	\$39,721,467	55%	25%
PAC State Party	\$5,000	\$1,080,105	\$5,000	\$2,750	\$402,725	\$1,495,580	72%	1%
SP	\$50,000	\$6,195,000		\$2,444		\$6,247,444	100%	4%
<b>State</b>	<b>\$302,038</b>	<b>\$9,681,996</b>	<b>\$164,150</b>	<b>\$336,615</b>	<b>\$7,446,119</b>	<b>\$17,930,918</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>11%</b>
Candidate	\$289,038	\$9,482,197	\$164,150	\$179,565	\$7,375,119	\$17,490,069	55%	11%
PAC to PAC/Party	\$13,000	\$104,100		\$157,050	\$11,500	\$285,650	94%	0%
PAC to State Party		\$95,699			\$59,500	\$155,199	63%	0%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>\$394,338</b>	<b>\$87,968,109</b>	<b>\$1,282,666</b>	<b>\$2,614,965</b>	<b>\$65,788,042</b>	<b>\$158,048,120</b>	<b>57%</b>	<b>89%</b>

\*anti/pro + anti

- *Super PACs*, which may receive unlimited contributions to spend supporting or opposing candidates, as long as such activity is not officially coordinated with the candidate.
- *Trade Associations* receive substantial levels of support, but information on this support is not available from independent, public sources. Self-reported data from companies sometimes appears in voluntary disclosures, but in almost every case it is updated only annually. The forthcoming memo will include new information on these expenditures.

### Overall Spending Footprint

The table below shows all available contributions for the study universe in the 2020 election cycle.

**Federal:** The greatest amount goes to federal races (\$140.1 million), or 89 percent of the \$158 million that has been spent. The greatest amount has gone directly to political candidates (\$27.2 million), a little less to 527 committees (\$23.3 million) and \$20.5 million on PAC to PAC contributions (including state parties, which support both federal and state candidates). A total of \$6.3 million has gone to Super PACs. Federal spending was slightly more likely to favor candidates and entities that oppose reproductive health rights (58 percent “anti”), although Super PAC spending where reproductive health rights view were clearly defined all went to those opposed. State party spending on federal candidates clearly favored politicians unsupportive of reproductive health rights—\$1.1 million, or 72 percent of the category).

**State:** At the state level, companies gave nearly \$18 million (11 percent of the total), almost all to candidates. The overall spending breakdown for state candidates somewhat favored candidates opposing reproductive health rights (55 percent), but this spending varied significantly by region and in the South and Midwest heavily favored “anti” candidates, as explained below. Notably, PAC to PAC spending went heavily to candidates unsupportive of reproductive health (“RH”) rights (94 percent), while state party spending was somewhat less one-sided (63 percent to anti-RH entities). As explained below, corporate spending was much less anti-RH than PAC money.

**Overall numbers:** While we searched for contributions for all 233 companies in our study universe, only 163 of these companies contributed in some fashion at either the federal or state level. Overall, these

companies contributed more than \$158 million since the start of 2019 for 2020 races and nearly \$88 million (57 percent) went to candidates and other entities that do not support reproductive health rights since January 2019.

Additional discussion of spending types below excludes recipients where a position on reproductive health rights is not attributed.

### **Company Totals**

Table 2 shows the top corporate supporters of entities that do not support RH rights, and how much each disbursed through different spending methods. The table shows all that spent more than \$800 million on entities opposed to RH rights.

<b>Company</b>	<b>527s</b>	<b>Candidate</b>	<b>Type PAC to PAC/ Party</b>	<b>State Party</b>	<b>Super PAC</b>	<b>Anti- RH Total</b>
Chevron	\$1,630,000	\$963,800			\$3,425,000	\$6,018,800
Marathon Petroleum	\$1,475,000	\$848,548	\$355,000	\$12,500	\$500,000	\$3,191,048
Comcast	\$545,000	\$1,348,551	\$932,000	\$9,000		\$2,834,551
AT&T	\$150,000	\$1,717,837	\$825,000	\$23,500		\$2,716,337
Altria	\$945,919	\$703,441	\$341,000	\$37,500	\$360,000	\$2,387,860
Charter Comm'ns	\$672,500	\$857,238	\$718,500	\$20,000		\$2,268,238
Pfizer	\$1,150,000	\$561,350	\$441,500	\$41,000		\$2,193,850
Anthem	\$1,522,500	\$328,967	\$248,000	\$15,000		\$2,114,467
Exxon Mobil	\$1,350,000	\$698,800	\$10,000	\$10,000		\$2,068,800
Walmart	\$972,500	\$702,611	\$279,500			\$1,954,611
UPS	\$65,000	\$919,952	\$652,770	\$184,500		\$1,822,222
UnitedHealth Group	\$450,000	\$877,350	\$230,500	\$261,500		\$1,819,350
Honeywell Int'l	\$280,000	\$857,300	\$611,000	\$7,000		\$1,755,300
NextEra Energy	\$780,573	\$443,600	\$374,000	\$26,900	\$100,000	\$1,725,073
Lockheed Martin	\$150,000	\$841,500	\$614,000	\$7,500		\$1,613,000
General Motors	\$440,000	\$605,200	\$488,500	\$20,000		\$1,553,700
ConocoPhillips	\$135,000	\$155,550			\$1,250,000	\$1,540,550
Boeing	\$200,500	\$690,050	\$580,500	\$1,000		\$1,472,050
Northrop Grumman		\$677,750	\$768,500	\$12,000		\$1,458,250
Valero Energy		\$373,200	\$515,000	\$5,600	\$500,000	\$1,393,800
Raytheon	\$110,000	\$715,250	\$442,500	\$12,500		\$1,280,250
Coca-Cola	\$625,000	\$579,338	\$56,000			\$1,260,338
Duke Energy	\$275,000	\$678,850	\$139,500	\$63,780		\$1,157,130
Union Pacific	\$102,500	\$672,943	\$318,500	\$10,000		\$1,103,943
Eli Lilly	\$597,500	\$312,700	\$133,500	\$29,500		\$1,073,200
General Dynamics		\$541,000	\$500,900	\$8,500		\$1,050,400
Microsoft	\$385,374	\$392,000	\$221,500	\$17,500		\$1,016,374
Centene	\$883,191		\$45,000	\$38,500	\$25,000	\$991,691
Amazon.com	\$283,818	\$520,205	\$181,500			\$985,523
Merck	\$237,000	\$383,700	\$310,500	\$11,675		\$942,875
Delta Air Lines	\$155,000	\$494,100	\$272,500	\$7,500		\$929,100
AFLAC	\$160,000	\$443,450	\$299,500			\$902,950
DaVita	\$110,000	\$565,140	\$205,000			\$880,140
FedEx	\$10,000	\$474,150	\$323,000	\$41,600		\$848,750
Verizon	\$175,000	\$444,775	\$196,500	\$10,000		\$826,275
Abbott Labs	\$65,000	\$416,650	\$335,000			\$816,650
CIGNA	\$155,000	\$456,500	\$200,000	\$2,500		\$814,000

## 527s

Companies gave a total of \$34.5 million to 527s, listed below, with the biggest portions to governors' associations, which in turn supported candidates in their respective parties. About 56 percent of contributions to 527 groups went to groups opposed to reproductive health rights.

**Table 3: 527 Spending**

Recipient	Reproductive Health Position		Total
	Anti	Pro	
Republican Governors Association	\$14,332,890		\$14,332,890
Democratic Governors Association		\$12,113,559	\$12,113,559
Republican State Leadership Committee - RSLC	\$5,508,691		\$5,508,691
Democratic Attorneys General Association		\$3,345,910	\$3,345,910
Democratic Legislative Campaign Committee		\$3,034,521	\$3,034,521
Republican Attorneys Generals Association	\$2,445,805		\$2,445,805
Gopac	\$1,020,000		\$1,020,000
Democratic Municipal Officials		\$122,500	\$122,500
Gay And Lesbian Victory Fund (Non-Fed)		\$75,554	\$75,554
Progressive Change Campaign Committee Non-Federal		\$60,000	\$60,000
National Conference Democratic Mayors		\$40,000	\$40,000
Emerge America		\$14,851	\$14,851
Democratic Lieutenant Governors Association		\$12,500	\$12,500
emerge Oregon		\$2,5010	\$2,500
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$23,307,386</b>	<b>\$18,821,895</b>	<b>\$42,129,281</b>

The Republican Governors' Association received the most funding from companies—\$14.3 million, but corporate money also went to three other anti-RH rights entities: the Republican State Leadership Committee (\$5.5 million), the Republican Attorney Generals Association (RAGA) (\$2.4 million) and Gopac (\$1 million). RAGA is an important funder of reproductive health rights legal challenges and its top funders are listed in Table 4.

**Table 4: Republican Attorneys General Association Funders**

Company	Contributions	Company	Contributions	Company	Contributions
Anthem	\$260,000	CIGNA	\$50,000	Amgen	\$25,000
Altria	\$203,254	UnitedHealth Group	\$50,000	Tenet Healthcare	\$25,000
Walmart	\$130,000	Fluor	\$50,000	Oracle	\$25,000
Exxon Mobil	\$125,000	Wells Fargo	\$50,000	PepsiCo	\$25,000
Lowe's	\$125,000	Johnson & Johnson	\$50,000	JPMorgan Chase	\$15,500
Centene	\$125,000	Eli Lilly	\$50,000	Yelp	\$15,000
Chevron	\$125,000	Facebook	\$50,000	Sprint	\$15,000
Visa	\$100,000	Southern	\$47,500	CarMax	\$15,000
Coca-Cola	\$100,000	Charter Comm'ns	\$40,000	eBay	\$15,000
CVS Health	\$54,177	Mastercard	\$35,000	Lyft	\$15,000
Uber	\$50,000	Best Buy	\$30,000	Microsoft	\$10,374
Amazon.com	\$50,000	Cardinal Health	\$25,000	FedEx	\$10,000
CenturyLink	\$50,000	Verizon	\$25,000	Comcast	\$10,000
Capital One Financial	\$50,000	T-Mobile	\$25,000	<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>\$2,445,805</b>
Nucor	\$50,000	Bank of America	\$25,000		
		AEP	\$25,000		

## Candidates

### Federal

Direct support for federal candidates, all through PACs as required by law, totaled \$27.2 million as of September 30, 2020—but it varied regionally, with the greatest amount (\$17.8 million) spent on candidates in the South, where 72 percent of those supported were anti-RH. The second heaviest regional spending in the Midwest (\$12.4 million) also went mostly to anti-RH candidates (63 percent). Spending from corporate PACs on candidates in other regions mostly went to candidates supporting RH health rights. Very few corporate PACs spent directly on Presidential candidates (less than \$5,000).

Table 5: Federal Candidate Support by Region				
Region	Anti	Pro	Total	% anti
South	\$12,756,585	\$5,015,152	\$17,771,737	72%
Midwest	\$7,844,740	\$4,536,412	\$12,381,152	63%
West	\$4,590,877	\$6,251,881	\$10,842,758	42%
Mid-Atlantic	\$959,350	\$3,422,613	\$4,381,963	22%
Northeast	\$1,045,500	\$2,971,325	\$4,016,825	26%
President	\$2,800	\$2,120	\$4,920	57%
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$27,199,852</b>	<b>\$22,199,503</b>	<b>\$49,399,355</b>	<b>55%</b>

**Anti-RH candidates:** Company PAC money totaling \$12.8 million went to federal anti-RH candidates in the South. Contribution totals by state and politician appear below. The database identifies the top corporate supporters for these candidates.

Table 6: Anti-RH Federal Candidates Supported by Corporate PACs in the South

Region/Candidate	Contributions	Region/Candidate	Contributions
<b>Texas</b>		<b>Weber, Randy</b>	
<b>Brady, Kevin</b>		US House District TX 014	\$38,500
US House District TX 008	\$461,000	<b>Wright, Ron</b>	
<b>Cornyn, John</b>		US House District TX 006	\$37,500
US Senate District TX Sw-Class II	\$444,000	<b>Roy, Chip</b>	
<b>Cuellar, Enrique (Henry)</b>		US House District TX 021	\$31,500
US House District TX 028	\$255,800	<b>Van Duyne, Elizabeth Ann (Beth)</b>	
<b>Arrington, Jodey</b>		US House District TX 024	\$28,000
US House District TX 019	\$209,500	<b>Cloud, Michael</b>	
<b>Mccaul, Michael</b>		US House District TX 027	\$21,000
US House District TX 010	\$180,500	<b>Pfluger II, August Lee</b>	
<b>Granger, Kay</b>		US House District TX 011	\$17,500
US House District TX 012	\$167,500	<b>Sessions, Pete</b>	
<b>Burgess, Michael</b>		US House District TX 017	\$16,000
US House District TX 026	\$148,000	<b>Hunt, Wesley</b>	
<b>Gooden, Lance</b>		US House District TX 007	\$7,000
US House District TX 005	\$141,800	<b>Gonzales II, Ernest Anthony (Tony)</b>	
<b>Crenshaw, Dan</b>		US House District TX 023	\$6,500
US House District TX 002	\$141,500	<b>Gohmert Jr, Louis B (Louie)</b>	
<b>Taylor, Nicholas Van Campen (Van)</b>		US House District TX 001	\$2,000
US House District TX 003	\$110,500	<b>North Carolina</b>	
<b>Williams, Roger</b>		<b>Tillis, Thomas R (Thom)</b>	
US House District TX 025	\$94,500	US Senate District NC Sw-Class II	\$483,000
<b>Carter, John</b>		<b>Mchenry, Patrick Timothy</b>	
US House District TX 031	\$90,500	US House District NC 010	\$347,250
<b>Babin, Brian</b>		<b>Hudson Jr, Richard Lane</b>	
US House District TX 036	\$81,000	US House District NC 008	\$270,000
<b>Ratcliffe, John L</b>		<b>Holding, George Edward Bell</b>	
US House District TX 004	\$78,500	US House District NC 002	\$173,000

Region/Candidate	Contributions	Region/Candidate	Contributions
<b>Rouzer, David Cheston</b>		<b>Steube, Greg</b>	
US House District NC 007	\$127,500	US House District FL 017	\$62,000
<b>Budd, Theodore Paul (Ted)</b>		<b>Spano, ViNCent Ross</b>	
US House District NC 013	\$109,000	US House District FL 015	\$39,000
<b>Foxx, Virginia</b>		<b>Posey, Bill</b>	
US House District NC 005	\$87,000	US House District FL 008	\$37,000
<b>Walker, Bradley Mark</b>		<b>Dunn, Neal Patrick</b>	
US House District NC 006	\$56,000	US House District FL 002	\$30,000
<b>Meadows, Mark Randal</b>		<b>Webster, Daniel</b>	
US House District NC 011	\$37,500	US House District FL 011	\$16,000
<b>Bishop, James Daniel (Dan)</b>		<b>Gaetz II, Matthew L (Matt)</b>	
US House District NC 009	\$19,000	US House District FL 001	\$10,000
<b>Murphy, Gregory FraNCis (Greg)</b>		<b>Yoho, Theodore Scott (Ted)</b>	
US House District NC 003	\$8,000	US House District FL 003	\$3,000
<b>Perry, Joan Templeton</b>		<b>Eagle, Dane</b>	
US House District NC 003	\$5,000	US House District FL 019	\$2,000
<b>Georgia</b>		<b>Kentucky</b>	
<b>Perdue, David A</b>		<b>Mcconnell, Mitch</b>	
US Senate District GA Sw-Class II	\$396,800	US Senate District KY Sw-Class II	\$422,800
<b>Ferguson Iv, Anderson (Drew)</b>		<b>Barr, Garland (Andy)</b>	
US House District GA 003	\$298,500	US House District KY 006	\$231,000
<b>Collins, Douglas A (Doug)</b>		<b>Guthrie, Steven Brett</b>	
US House District GA 009	\$210,152	US House District KY 002	\$200,850
<b>Carter, Earl Leroy (Buddy)</b>		<b>Rogers, Harold (Hal)</b>	
US House District GA 001	\$193,884	US House District KY 005	\$65,500
<b>Graves Jr, John Thomas (Tom)</b>		<b>Comer Jr, James R</b>	
US House District GA 014	\$144,000	US House District KY 001	\$50,000
<b>Loeffler, Kelly L</b>		<b>Massie, Thomas Harold</b>	
US Senate District GA Sw-Class Ili	\$104,500	US House District KY 004	\$20,500
<b>Scott, James Austin (Austin)</b>		<b>South Carolina</b>	
US House District GA 008	\$89,500	<b>Graham, Lindsey Olin</b>	
<b>Loudermilk, Barry D</b>		US Senate District SC Sw-Class II	\$283,000
US House District GA 011	\$81,000	<b>Rice Jr, Tom</b>	
<b>Allen, Richard W (Rick)</b>		US House District SC 007	\$182,300
US House District GA 012	\$62,500	<b>Duncan, Jeff</b>	
<b>Hice, Jody Brownlow</b>		US House District SC 003	\$114,500
US House District GA 010	\$36,000	<b>Timmons Iv, William R</b>	
<b>Unterman, Renee S</b>		US House District SC 004	\$105,500
US House District GA 007	\$5,000	<b>Wilson, Addison Graves (Joe)</b>	
<b>Cowan, John</b>		US House District SC 002	\$92,500
US House District GA 014	\$1,000	<b>Norman Jr, Ralph W</b>	
<b>Florida</b>		US House District SC 005	\$34,500
<b>Buchanan, Vern</b>		<b>Rice Jr, Hugh Thompson (Tom)</b>	
US House District FL 016	\$232,000	US House District SC 007	\$9,500
<b>Diaz-Balart, Mario</b>		<b>Louisiana</b>	
US House District FL 025	\$145,000	<b>Scalise, Stephen J (Steve)</b>	
<b>Bilirakis, Gus Michael</b>		US House District LA 001	\$291,700
US House District FL 012	\$122,500	<b>Cassidy, William (Bill)</b>	
<b>Mast, Brian</b>		US Senate District LA Sw-Class II	\$179,700
US House District FL 018	\$112,500	<b>Graves, Garret</b>	
<b>Waltz, Michael</b>		US House District LA 006	\$152,500
US House District FL 006	\$102,000	<b>Johnson, James Michael (Mike)</b>	
<b>Rutherford, John</b>		US House District LA 004	\$85,500
US House District FL 004	\$96,500	<b>Higgins, Clay</b>	
		US House District LA 003	\$26,000



Region/Candidate	Contributions		
<b>Abraham Jr, Ralph Lee</b>			
US House District LA 005	\$9,500		
<b>Oklahoma</b>			
<b>Inhofe, James M (Jim)</b>			
US Senate District OK Sw-Class II	\$184,000		
<b>Mullin, Markwayne</b>			
US House District OK 002	\$177,500		
<b>Cole, Tom</b>			
US House District OK 004	\$124,000		
<b>Lucas, Frank D</b>			
US House District OK 003	\$111,500		
<b>Hern, Kevin Ray</b>			
US House District OK 001	\$75,500		
<b>Bice, Stephanie</b>			
US House District OL 005	\$5,000		
<b>Arkansas</b>			
<b>Cotton, Thomas (Tom)</b>			
US Senate District AR Sw-Class II	\$177,000		
<b>Hill, James FreNCh (FreNCh)</b>			
US House District AR 002	\$165,750		
<b>Womack, Steve</b>			
US House District AR 003	\$117,000		
<b>Westerman, Bruce E</b>			
US House District AR 004	\$103,000		
<b>Crawford, Eric Alan (Rick)</b>			
US House District AR 001	\$76,400		
<b>West Virginia</b>			
<b>Capito, Shelley Moore</b>			
US Senate District WV Sw-Class II	\$270,500		
<b>Miller, Carol D</b>			
US House District WV 003	\$59,500		
<b>Mckinley, David B</b>			
US House District WV 001	\$54,500		
<b>Mooney, Alex</b>			
US House District WV 002	\$49,500		
<b>Virginia</b>			
<b>Riggleman III, Denver Lee</b>			
US House District VA 005	\$163,900		
<b>Griffith, H Morgan</b>			
US House District VA 009	\$93,000		
<b>Wittman, Robert J</b>			
US House District VA 001	\$90,500		
<b>Cline, Ben L</b>			
US House District VA 006	\$43,000		
<b>Alabama</b>			
<b>Byrne, Bradley R</b>			
US Senate District AL Sw-Class II	\$82,000		
<b>Aderholt, Robert B</b>			
US House District AL 004	\$79,000		
<b>Rogers, Mike</b>			
US House District AL 003	\$77,000		
<b>Palmer, Gary</b>			
US House District AL 006	\$35,000		
<b>Brooks, Mo</b>			
US House District AL 005	\$34,000		
<b>Sessions, Jeff</b>			
US Senate District AL Sw-Class II	\$19,500		
<b>Pringle, Chris</b>			
US House District AL 001	\$6,000		
<b>Carl Jr, Jerry Lee</b>			
US House District AL 001	\$6,000		
<b>Coleman, Jeff</b>			
US House District AL 002	\$2,500		
<b>Hightower, Bill</b>			
US House District AL 001	\$2,000		
<b>Merrill, John H</b>			
US Senate District AL Sw-Class II	\$1,000		
<b>Tennessee</b>			
<b>Kustoff, David</b>			
US House District TN 008	\$86,500		
<b>Hagerty Iv, William F (Bill)</b>			
US Senate District TN Sw-Class II	\$83,500		
<b>Fleischmann, Chuck</b>			
US House District TN 003	\$51,000		
<b>Rose, John W</b>			
US House District TN 006	\$45,000		
<b>Burchett, Tim</b>			
US House District TN 002	\$13,500		
<b>Desjarlais, Scott</b>			
US House District TN 004	\$10,500		
<b>Green, Mark E</b>			
US House District TN 007	\$8,000		
<b>Mississippi</b>			
<b>Hyde-Smith, Cindy</b>			
US Senate District MS Sw-Class II	\$83,000		
<b>Kelly, John Trent</b>			
US House District MS 001	\$64,499		
<b>Palazzo, Steven Mccarty</b>			
US House District MS 004	\$56,500		
<b>Guest, Michael Patrick</b>			
US House District MS 003	\$47,500		
<b>Grand Total</b>			<b>\$12,756,585</b>

## State

While 56 percent of the \$16.9 million in state candidate spending overall went to candidates opposed to abortion rights, via both corporate and PAC contributions, regional variations and differences between corporate and PAC spending are striking. Where the most stringent anti-abortion laws have been passed, companies and their PACs favored candidates that do not support reproductive health rights. Even more striking, however, is a bifurcation between corporate contributions (from the company treasury) and PAC money (the latter of which comes from executives). Corporate treasury money is spready evenly among pro- and anti- candidates (with the exception of the South), even with a slight pro-RH rights bent (only 47% “anti”). But two-thirds of PAC money (from corporate executives) is anti-RH—not only in the expected regions of the South (79%) and Midwest (71%), but also in the more moderate Mid-Atlantic (56% anti).

Table 7: State Candidate Support							
Region	Corporate		PAC		Total	% anti-RH rights	
	Anti	Pro	Anti	Pro		Corporate	PAC
West	\$2,193,400	\$3,580,514	\$697,513	\$1,167,152	\$7,638,579	38%	37%
South	\$1,333,605	\$390,862	\$3,188,362	\$823,300	\$5,736,129	77%	79%
Midwest	\$574,300	\$644,278	\$1,184,592	\$481,363	\$2,884,533	47%	71%
Mid-Atlantic	\$42,200	\$39,700	\$224,600	\$173,100	\$479,600	52%	56%
Northeast	\$36,825	\$43,900	\$6,800	\$30,950	\$118,475	46%	18%
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$4,180,330</b>	<b>\$4,699,254</b>	<b>\$5,301,867</b>	<b>\$2,675,865</b>	<b>\$16,857,316</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>66%</b>

While spending on state candidates is slanted in favor of anti-RH rights politicians in the South, individual candidates generally do not receive an overwhelming amount of money. Table 8 below shows how much top anti-RH rights recipients received from the companies in the study. Politicians in Texas received the most, followed by Georgia and Florida.

**Table 8: Top Supported Anti-RH Rights State Candidates in the South**

State/Candidate/District	Amount
<b>TX</b>	
NELSON, JANE	
SENATE DISTRICT 012	\$70,000
LUCIO JR, EDDIE	
SENATE DISTRICT 027	\$59,676
PADDIE, CHRIS	
HOUSE DISTRICT 009	\$58,750
PRICE IV, WALTER (FOUR)	
HOUSE DISTRICT 087	\$53,000
<b>GA</b>	
RALSTON, DAVID	
HOUSE DISTRICT 007	\$53,550
<b>FL</b>	
RENNER, PAUL	
HOUSE DISTRICT 024	\$17,600
<b>NC</b>	
BERGER SR, PHILIP EDWARD	
SENATE DISTRICT 030	\$76,950
MOORE, TIMOTHY KEITH (TIM)	
HOUSE DISTRICT 111	\$68,250
<b>OK</b>	
TREAT, GREG	
SENATE DISTRICT 047	\$25,050
<b>SC</b>	
LUCAS, JAMES H (JAY)	
HOUSE DISTRICT 065	\$16,000
<b>AR</b>	
HENDREN, JAMES PAUL (JIM)	
SENATE DISTRICT 002	\$9,450
<b>KY</b>	
STIVERS, ROBERT	
SENATE DISTRICT 025	\$9,750
<b>AL</b>	
CAVANAUGH, TWINKLE A	
PUBLIC SVC COMM. PRESIDENT	\$6,000
<b>MS</b>	
MANGOLD, VINCE	
HOUSE DISTRICT 053	\$350
<b>Grand Total (all “anti” candidates)</b>	<b>\$4,521,967</b>



Spending in favor of “anti” candidates by individual companies in the South and Midwest varied among the largest contributors. The table below shows companies that spent more than \$100,000 in each region, with the “anti” breakdown noted. More of the big spenders in the South were supporters of “anti” candidates than in the Midwest.

Table 9: Top “Anti” State Candidates Spenders				
Region/Company	Reproductive Health Position		Total	% Anti
	Pro	Anti		
South				
AT&T	\$122,950	\$423,262	\$546,212	77%
Duke Energy	\$86,100	\$317,600	\$403,700	79%
UnitedHealth Group	\$61,000	\$221,700	\$282,700	78%
Walmart	\$36,500	\$176,011	\$212,511	83%
Union Pacific	\$44,500	\$162,000	\$206,500	78%
HCA Healthcare	\$46,200	\$154,900	\$201,100	77%
Comcast	\$50,200	\$138,500	\$188,700	73%
NextEra Energy	\$25,250	\$161,000	\$186,250	86%
Charter Communications	\$30,900	\$149,800	\$180,700	83%
Marathon Petroleum	\$12,500	\$160,398	\$172,898	93%
American Electric Power	\$21,000	\$150,350	\$171,350	88%
CVS Health	\$38,250	\$127,000	\$165,250	77%
Coca-Cola	\$37,650	\$121,200	\$158,850	76%
Walt Disney	\$49,000	\$97,100	\$146,100	66%
Merck	\$34,850	\$107,550	\$142,400	76%
Pfizer	\$38,850	\$93,700	\$132,550	71%
United Parcel Service	\$26,000	\$105,750	\$131,750	80%
Altria	\$30,150	\$96,100	\$126,250	76%
Exelon	\$32,500	\$81,500	\$114,000	71%
General Motors	\$16,250	\$97,400	\$113,650	86%
CIGNA	\$20,800	\$81,350	\$102,150	80%
Allstate	\$14,500	\$87,500	\$102,000	86%
Midwest				
AT&T	\$136,600	\$169,800	\$306,400	55%
Comcast	\$120,000	\$103,250	\$223,250	46%
Eli Lilly	\$63,213	\$57,000	\$120,213	47%
Duke Energy	\$9,226	\$106,750	\$115,976	92%
Charter Communications	\$26,550	\$88,638	\$115,188	77%
American Electric Power	\$7,500	\$98,650	\$106,150	93%
UnitedHealth Group	\$24,850	\$80,000	\$104,850	76%

## PAC to PAC Spending

When it comes to PAC to PAC spending, by far and away the biggest recipients of company contributions are the National Republican Senatorial Committee and the National Republican Congressional Committee. Their largest corporate supporters are listed on Table 10. Table 11 shows the next largest group of corporate recipients by “anti” committee total and the affiliated politician, if any. (*Tables, next page.*)

**Table 10: Top PAC Recipients and Company Supporters**

<b>NATIONAL REPUBLICAN SENATORIAL COMMITTEE (NRSC)</b>	<b>\$3,082,500</b>
AT&T	\$120,000
Valero Energy	\$120,000
Boeing	\$120,000
Northrop Grumman	\$110,000
Pfizer	\$105,000
Charter Communications	\$100,000
NextEra Energy	\$90,000
Marathon Petroleum	\$90,000
Honeywell International	\$75,000
Bank of New York Mellon	\$70,000
General Motors	\$60,000
Walmart	\$60,000
<b>NATIONAL REPUBLICAN CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE (NRCC)</b>	<b>\$2,730,500</b>
General Dynamics	\$142,500
Boeing	\$120,000
Valero Energy	\$115,000
Northrop Grumman	\$110,000
Pfizer	\$80,500
Honeywell International	\$75,000
Bank of New York Mellon	\$70,000
NextEra Energy	\$70,000
Emerson Electric	\$70,000
Marathon Petroleum	\$60,000
Wells Fargo	\$60,000
Walmart	\$60,000

**Table 11: Top “Anti” PAC Recipients**

<b>PAC Name/Affiliate Politician(s)</b>	<b>Affiliated Politician(s)</b>	<b>Total</b>
National Republican Senatorial Committee (NRSC)		\$3,082,500
National Republican Congressional Committee (NRCC)		\$2,730,500
Republican National Committee		\$465,000
Bluegrass Committee	Mitch McConnell	\$411,000
Heartland Values Pac	John Thune	\$394,000
Majority Committee Pac - MC PAC	Kevin McCarthy	\$390,000
Mccarthy Victory Fund	Kevin McCarthy	\$366,500
Promoting Our Republican Team (PORT PAC)	Rob Portman	\$320,500
Rely On Your Beliefs (ROYB) Fund	Roy Blunt	\$308,800
Tomorrow Is Meaningful (TIM PAC)	Tim Scott	\$285,000
Eye Of The Tiger PAC	Steve Scalise	\$271,000
Scalise Leadership Fund	Steve Scalise	\$268,200
Tuesday Group PAC	Susan Brooks, John Katko, Fred Upton	\$262,000
Project West PAC	Cory Gardner	\$245,500
Common Values PAC	John A Barrasso	\$236,000
Republican Main Street Partnership PAC		\$235,000
Together Holding Our Majority (THOMPAC)	Frank Pallone Jr.	\$224,500
Value In Electing Women Political Action Committee (VIEWPAC)		\$212,500
Alamo PAC	John Cornyn	\$210,500
More Conservatives Pac (MCPAC)	Patrick Henry	\$209,500