

THE STATES AND DISTRICTS HIT HARDEST BY THE 1993 TAX INCREASE

(Updating *Backgrounder* No. 942, "Why Higher Tax Rates on Income Will Slow Growth, Cost Jobs," May 25, 1993.)

The Treasury Department this August produced a report detailing, by state and congressional district, how many taxpayers would be directly affected by the higher income tax rates included in President Clinton's record tax increase.¹ When asked to make public a copy of the report, however, the Department refused.

A Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request, which legally obligates the government to respond within twenty days, appeared to have little effect on the Administration. Only after two months of demands by a dozen congressional offices did the Administration comply with the anti-secrecy law and release a copy of the report. A cursory glance at the report's contents suggests why the Administration was so unwilling to part with this information. The report chronicles precisely which districts and states will pay a larger-than-average share of the higher income taxes. Had this report, dated August 4, been made public, lawmakers would have been more aware of the impact of the Administration's tax plan, and it may not have been enacted. The measure passed the House by just two votes on August 5, and passed the Senate on Vice President Gore's tie-breaking vote on August 6.

It turns out that some legislators voted for the tax bill even though their districts were over ten times more adversely affected than the median district.² As the following table illustrates, 21 districts will lose more than \$1 billion each because of the tax bill.³ Notwithstanding the heavy financial burden imposed on these districts by the Clinton tax hike, nine of the 21 Representatives voted for the legislation (see table 1).

-
- 1 The Clinton budget approved by Congress created a new 36 percent top tax rate. This new rate took effect at \$115,000 for single taxpayers, \$127,500 for heads of households, and \$140,000 for joint returns. The legislation also created an additional 39.6 percent tax bracket for all incomes over \$250,000. (The effect of Clinton's 10 percent surtax on income over \$250,000 is the same as imposing a 39.6 percent tax rate, since 10 percent of 36 percent is 3.6 percent.) These new rates were applied retroactively to January 1, 1993. In addition, the tax plan included a provision lifting the cap (\$135,000 in 1993) on the amount of income subject to the 2.9 percent Medicare payroll tax. This change effectively eliminated any economic distinction between the Medicare payroll tax and ordinary income taxes, with the exception that Medicare payroll taxes are not levied against investment income and royalties.
 - 2 The median district, the 19th district of Pennsylvania, had 2,146 taxpayers affected by Clinton's tax hike, costing the district more than \$220 million. Because it is the median, 217 districts will be more adversely affected and 217 districts less adversely affected than the Pennsylvania district.
 - 3 These figures were calculated by taking from the Administration's report the total number of taxpayers affected by the higher income tax rates, then dividing that number into the total amount of revenue the bill is projected to raise from higher income tax rates and increased payroll taxes. Two caveats apply: 1) If the "rich" people in one district are, on average, richer than the "rich"

Several states also were harmed disproportionately by the increased taxes on income. While the relative effect is not as severe as among congressional districts, residents in nine states will pay at least 50 percent more than the national median in new income and payroll taxes. Fourteen of the eighteen Senators representing these nine hardest-hit states voted for the tax plan (see table 2).

Not only are these states disproportionately harmed by the Clinton tax hike, many of them already were struggling with large state-imposed tax increases.⁴ Legislatures in California, Connecticut, and New Jersey imposed large income tax increases on their taxpayers in recent years. These mistaken policies no doubt have contributed to the sluggish growth and relatively high unemployment those states have experienced. Several of these high-unemployment states, struggling to revive their economies, are particularly hard hit by the Clinton tax hike. California, with an unemployment rate nearly three percentage points above the national average, will see more than \$22 billion in new tax revenues taken from investors and consumers and sent to Washington.⁵

ADMINISTRATION POLICY DRIVEN BY INCOME REDISTRIBUTION

The Treasury report initially was prepared to help the Administration sell its tax

Table 1

THE BILLION DOLLAR CLUB: Districts Hit Hardest By Clinton's "Soak-The-Rich" Taxes

District	Member	Affected Taxpayers	(\$ billions) ¹	Median ²
NY-14	Carolyn Maloney	28,898	\$2.971	1347%
CA-29	Henry Waxman	22,714	\$2.335	1058%
IL-10	John Porter	19,114	\$1.965	891%
CT-4	Christopher Shays	16,086	\$1.654	750%
NY-8	Jerrold Nadler	14,469	\$1.488	674%
FL-22	E. Clay Shaw	14,022	\$1.442	653%
NY-18	Nita Lowey	13,401	\$1.378	624%
MD-8	Constance Morella	13,006	\$1.337	606%
CA-24	Anthony Beilenson	12,749	\$1.311	594%
MI-11	Joseph Knollenberg	12,537	\$1.289	584%
NY-5	Gary Ackerman	12,218	\$1.256	569%
NJ-11	Dean Gallo	12,209	\$1.255	569%
NJ-5	Marge Roukema	11,495	\$1.182	536%
PA-13	Marjorie Mezvinsky	11,379	\$1.170	530%
TX-7	Bill Archer	11,323	\$1.164	528%
NJ-12	Dick Zimmer	11,263	\$1.158	525%
CA-47	Chris Cox	10,957	\$1.126	511%
NY-3	Peter King	10,880	\$1.119	507%
CA-14	Anna Eshoo	10,758	\$1.106	501%
TX-3	Sam Johnson	10,712	\$1.101	499%
CA-36	Jane Harman	10,558	\$1.085	492%

Members in bold voted for the Clinton tax increase.

1. District's revenue loss over five years.

2. District burden as percentage of median.

Source: Treasury Department

people in another district, that relative difference could be enough to shift national rankings. Given the size of the affected population, however, such shifts are unlikely; 2) Because the payroll tax affects almost the same population as the income tax rate increase (The higher income tax rates begin at \$115,000 for single, \$127,500 for head-of-household, and \$140,000 for joint returns, while the payroll tax increase begins at \$135,000), each district's revenue total has been increased to reflect the amount of money expected to be raised from that levy. If, for some reason, a particular district has a disproportionate number of taxpayers falling into an income level that does not overlap (single taxpayers, for instance, earning between \$115,000 and \$135,000), the national rankings could shift. As with the first caveat, however, there is no reason to expect that this would be significant. These calculations do not include, however, other income-related provisions, such as the increase in estate taxes, the corporate income tax, the deductibility cap on executive pay, and the increased tax on Social Security benefits. All of these provisions were aimed at rich people. But in the absence of strong evidence that the burden of these tax increases is distributed similarly to the income tax hikes, these taxes (and others) were not included in the district and state totals.

- 4 The 1990 budget deal, with its increase in tax rates, doubtlessly had the same negative effect on well-to-do states and districts. While not as severe as the 1993 tax increase, the 1990 tax increase nonetheless imposed economic hardship on the nation.
- 5 As noted, this does not include the revenue coming from other tax increases such as increased taxes on Social Security benefits, corporations, motor fuels, and many other goods and services, thus adding to California's (and other states') burden.

plan to lawmakers. In addition to calculating how many taxpayers in each state and district were affected by higher income tax rates, the report also provided a figure showing how many lower-paid taxpayers are expected to benefit from the tax bill because of the expansion of the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC). The EITC is a special tax credit for low-income working households. Since it is refundable, government funds are provided to eligible households paying no income tax. (Indeed, nearly 92 percent of the EITC's \$20.8 billion expansion represents new federal spending.) The White House apparently felt that some legislators could be persuaded to vote for the tax increase if they were shown that the number of voters in their district receiving new or expanded EITC benefits exceeded the number of taxpayers subjected to higher tax rates.

Table 2

**NINE BIGGEST LOSERS
FROM CLINTON TAX BILL**

State	Unemployment Rate (September 1993)	State Revenue Loss (\$billions)	Revenue Loss Per Capita	As Pct. of National Median	How Delegation Voted
Connecticut	6.2%	\$4.0	\$1,175	277%	Lieberman-Y Dodd-Y
New Jersey	7.7%	\$7.4	\$918	216%	Bradley-Y Lautenberg-N
New York	7.1%	\$15.3	\$836	197%	Moynihan-Y D'Amato-N
Massachusetts	7.2%	\$4.5	\$718	169%	Kennedy-Y Kerry-Y
California	9.4%	\$22.5	\$703	166%	Boxer-Y Feinstein-Y
Illinois	8.5%	\$8.1	\$691	163%	Simon-Y Mosely-Braun-Y
Maryland	6.3%	\$3.3	\$660	156%	Sarbanes-Y Mikulski-Y
Nevada	7.2%	\$0.9	\$656	155%	Reid-Y Bryan-N
Florida	6.4%	\$9.0	\$644	152%	Graham-Y Mack-N
NATIONAL:	6.7%				

Source: Treasury Department

With the higher income tax rates projected to affect 1.4 million taxpayers directly,⁶ and EITC expansion expected to reach 15 million households, the Administration's political calculus was apparent. For every "rich" taxpayer facing a tax increase, there would be more than ten households receiving special tax relief or government funds.⁷ The Administration did not make clear, however, that the magnitude of the income tax increase—the biggest jump in tax rates since Herbert Hoover agreed to higher rates in 1930—meant every state and virtually every congressional district was adversely affected by the tax bill.

For instance, even though there are 10.7 households benefitting from higher welfare payments for every taxpayer punished by higher tax rates, the average EITC beneficiary receives an additional \$1,387 over the next five years. While this is a substantial sum of money, it is dwarfed by the average tax increase of \$81,980 imposed by the higher income tax rates. And if the increase in the Medicare payroll tax is included,⁸ the average well-to-do taxpayer will see his tax bill climb by nearly \$103,000 over the next five years.

⁶ "Taxpayers" refers to the number of tax returns filed with taxable income affected by the new rates. Included in the 1.4 million figure are single, head of household, and joint returns.

⁷ As welfare programs go, the EITC is considerably less destructive than most since benefits are tied to having a job. Most welfare programs, of course, do not require recipients to engage in any productive economic activity.

⁸ The Clinton tax bill also removed the cap, previously \$135,000, on the amount of income upon which Medicare payroll taxes are levied. This change largely makes the 2.9 percent Medicare payroll tax indistinguishable from the income tax.

Thus, even though the average state and district has more than ten times as many beneficiaries of income redistribution as it has taxpayers footing the bill, the average affected taxpayer is paying out more than 74 times as much in higher taxes as EITC recipients receive in increased tax relief and welfare benefits. All told, Clinton's "soak-the-rich" tax increases are estimated to raise approximately \$144 billion, more than seven times the amount (\$20.8 billion) flowing to EITC recipients. Congress will use most, if not all, of the remaining money for other spending programs. And these calculations do not include the remaining \$118 billion of increased revenue in the Clinton tax bill, a significant portion of which, such as the gasoline tax, will be paid by lower- and middle-class taxpayers.

CONCLUSION

The economic, political, fiscal, and philosophical arguments against excessive taxation of income have been well known for decades. Indeed, almost all industrialized nations and many developing nations have realized these important lessons and have moved to reduce their tax rates to maintain their competitiveness and strengthen their economies. The United States, in many ways, triggered this world-wide tax revolution by reducing its tax rates in the early and mid-1980s. Unfortunately, the Bush and Clinton Administrations have reversed most of these gains.

Daniel J. Mitchell
McKenna Senior Fellow in Political Economy

THE 50 HARDEST HIT DISTRICTS

Rank	Members of Congress: Those italicized and bolded voted in favor of tax hike (all Democrats). Those voting no were Republicans except where noted.	District	Number of Taxpayers In District Affected by Income Tax Hike	Combined Increase in Income Tax and Medicare Tax Burden by District	Impact of Tax Increase Compared to National Median Average
1	<i>Carolyn Maloney</i>	N.Y.-14	28,898	\$2,970,982,621	1347%
2	<i>Henry Waxman</i>	Cal-29	22,714	\$2,335,210,023	1058%
3	John Porter	Ill-10	19,114	\$1,965,096,609	891%
4	Christopher Shays	Conn-4	16,086	\$1,653,790,105	750%
5	<i>Jerrold Nadler</i>	N.Y.-8	14,469	\$1,487,547,496	674%
6	E. Clay Shaw	Fla-22	14,022	\$1,441,591,747	653%
7	<i>Nita Lowey</i>	N.Y.-18	13,401	\$1,377,747,183	624%
8	Constance Morella	Md-8	13,006	\$1,337,137,517	606%
9	<i>Anthony Bellinson</i>	Cal-24	12,749	\$1,310,715,532	594%
10	Joseph Knollenberg	Mich-11	12,537	\$1,288,919,964	584%
11	<i>Gary Ackerman</i>	N.Y.-5	12,218	\$1,256,123,803	569%
12	Dean Gallo	N.J.-11	12,209	\$1,255,198,520	569%
13	Marge Roukema	N.J.-5	11,495	\$1,181,792,693	536%
14	<i>Margolies-Mezvinsky</i>	Pa-13	11,379	\$1,169,866,816	530%
15	Bill Archer	Tex-7	11,323	\$1,164,109,496	528%
16	Dick Zimmer	N.J.-12	11,263	\$1,157,940,939	525%
17	Chris Cox	Cal-47	10,957	\$1,126,481,299	511%
18	Peter King	N.Y.-3	10,880	\$1,118,564,984	507%
19	<i>Anna Eshoo</i>	Cal-14	10,758	\$1,106,022,252	501%
20	Sam Johnson	Tex-3	10,712	\$1,101,293,025	499%
21	<i>Jane Haman</i>	Cal-36	10,558	\$1,085,460,396	492%
22	Hamilton Fish	N.Y.-19	9,510	\$977,716,268	443%
23	Bob Franks	N.J.-7	9,145	\$940,190,881	426%
24	Bill Baker	Cal-10	8,663	\$890,636,807	404%
25	James Talent	Mo-2	8,561	\$880,150,260	399%
26	<i>Lynn Woolsey</i>	Cal-6	8,106	\$833,372,037	378%
27	<i>Barney Frank</i>	Mass-4	8,094	\$832,138,326	377%
28	Carlos Moorhead	Cal-27	7,830	\$804,996,675	365%
29	Newt Gingrich	Ga-6	7,773	\$799,136,546	362%
30	Dick Arney	Tex-26	7,772	\$799,033,737	362%
31	Harris Fawell	Ill-13	7,724	\$794,098,891	360%
32	Curt Weldon	Pa-7	7,557	\$776,929,741	352%
33	Benjamin Gilman	N.Y.-20	7,335	\$754,106,081	342%
34	David Levy	N.Y.-4	7,327	\$753,283,607	341%
35	<i>James Moran</i>	Va-8	7,114	\$731,385,230	332%
36	Gary Franks	Conn-5	7,038	\$723,571,724	328%
37	<i>Harry Johnston</i>	Fla-19	7,032	\$722,954,869	328%
38	<i>John Lewis</i>	Ga-5	6,967	\$716,272,265	325%
39	Jim Ramstad	Minn-3	6,898	\$709,178,425	321%
40	Philip Crane	Ill-8	6,896	\$708,972,806	321%
41	John Kyl	Az-4	6,613	\$679,877,780	308%
42	<i>Norman Mineta</i>	Cal-15	6,587	\$677,204,738	307%
43	Ileana Ros-Lehtinen	Fla-18	6,545	\$672,886,748	305%
44	<i>Dan Rostenkowski</i>	Ill-5	6,506	\$668,877,186	303%
45	Randy Cunningham	Cal-51	6,346	\$652,427,701	296%
46	<i>Peter Deutsch</i>	Fla-20	6,335	\$651,296,799	295%
47	Porter Goss	Fla-14	6,293	\$646,978,809	293%
48	Ron Packard	Cal-48	6,239	\$641,427,108	291%
49	Herbert Klein (D)	N.J.-8	6,077	\$624,772,005	283%
50	<i>Sidney Yates</i>	Ill-9	6,034	\$620,351,205	281%

"SOAK THE RICH" TAX INCREASE BY STATE

Rank	State	1995 Estimated Population (In thousands)	Number of Tax-payers Affected by Higher Rates	Total "Soak-The-Rich" Taxes Taken From State, Per Capita	Tax Increase As Percent of National Median Average
1	Connecticut	3,404	38,909	\$1,175	277%
2	New Jersey	8,092	72,224	\$918	216%
3	New York	18,269	148,562	\$836	197%
4	Massachusetts	6,228	43,496	\$718	169%
5	California	32,000	218,777	\$703	166%
6	Illinois	11,782	79,214	\$691	163%
7	Maryland	5,011	32,161	\$660	156%
8	Nevada	1,352	8,625	\$656	155%
9	Florida	14,016	87,826	\$644	152%
10	Hawaii	1,192	6,771	\$584	138%
11	Delaware	711	3,801	\$550	130%
12	Washington	5,152	27,491	\$549	129%
13	Texas	17,598	90,111	\$526	124%
14	Minnesota	4,529	22,960	\$521	123%
15	Colorado	3,529	17,837	\$520	123%
16	Pennsylvania	12,114	60,308	\$512	121%
17	Alaska	566	2,817	\$512	121%
18	Virginia	6,568	31,689	\$496	117%
19	Rhode Island	1,041	4,950	\$489	115%
20	Georgia	6,844	31,709	\$476	112%
21	New Hampshire	1,175	5,390	\$472	111%
22	Kansas	2,535	11,042	\$448	106%
23	Michigan	9,508	41,107	\$444	105%
24	Ohio	11,019	46,217	\$431	102%
25	Oregon	2,984	12,350	\$426	100%
26	Wisconsin	5,027	20,645	\$422	100%
27	Missouri	5,257	21,439	\$419	99%
28	Tennessee	5,096	20,469	\$413	97%
29	Arizona	4,017	15,744	\$403	95%
30	Wyoming	454	1,704	\$386	91%
31	Indiana	5,707	21,347	\$385	91%
32	Louisiana	4,223	15,672	\$382	90%
33	North Carolina	6,874	25,112	\$376	89%
34	Nebraska	1,618	5,811	\$369	87%
35	Alabama	4,100	14,449	\$362	85%
36	Oklahoma	3,203	10,858	\$349	82%
37	Kentucky	3,749	12,491	\$343	81%
38	Utah	1,857	5,907	\$327	77%
39	Vermont	589	1,865	\$326	77%
40	Iowa	2,843	8,801	\$318	75%
41	South Carolina	3,585	10,884	\$312	74%
42	South Dakota	712	2,155	\$311	73%
43	Idaho	1,043	3,154	\$311	73%
44	Maine	1,274	3,767	\$304	72%
45	North Dakota	653	1,796	\$283	67%
46	Arkansas	2,409	6,585	\$281	66%
47	Montana	811	2,096	\$266	63%
48	New Mexico	1,605	4,136	\$265	63%
49	West Virginia	1,792	4,442	\$255	60%
50	Mississippi	2,623	6,082	\$238	56%

HOW MEMBERS BETRAYED THEIR CONSTITUENTS

Members of Congress: Those italicized and bolded voted in favor of tax hike (all Democrats). Those voting no were Republicans except where noted.	District	Number of Taxpayers in District Affected by Income Tax Hike	Combined Increase in Income Tax and Medicare Tax Burden by District	Impact of Tax Increase Compared to National Median Average	National Rank (Out of 435)
		Alabama			
Sonny Callahan	Ala-1	2,097	\$215,591,064	98%	223
Terry Everett	Ala-2	1,939	\$199,347,197	90%	245
Glen Browder (D)	Ala-3	1,317	\$135,399,824	61%	357
<i>Tom Bevill</i>	Ala-4	1,202	\$123,576,757	56%	377
<i>Bud Cramer</i>	Ala-5	2,008	\$206,441,038	94%	235
Spencer Bachus	Ala-6	5,292	\$544,066,718	247%	61
<i>Earl Hilliard</i>	Ala-7	595	\$61,171,523	28%	429
		Alaska			
Don Young	Ak-Al	2,817	\$289,613,746	131%	150
		Arizona			
Sam Coppersmith (D)	Az-1	2,229	\$229,161,889	104%	209
<i>Ed Pastor</i>	Az-2	624	\$64,152,992	29%	427
Bob Stump	Az-3	1,531	\$157,401,010	71%	314
John Kyl	Az-4	6,613	\$679,877,780	308%	41
Jim Kolbe	Az-5	2,863	\$294,342,973	133%	148
<i>Karan English</i>	Az-6	1,884	\$193,692,687	88%	259
		Arkansas			
<i>Blanche Lambert</i>	Ark-1	1,406	\$144,549,850	66%	339
Ray Thornton (D)	Ark-2	2,244	\$230,704,028	105%	205
Tim Hutchinson	Ark-3	1,676	\$172,308,356	78%	292
Jay Dickey	Ark-4	1,258	\$129,334,076	59%	367
		California			
<i>Dan Hamburg</i>	Cal-01	2,252	\$231,526,502	105%	203
Wally Herger	Cal-02	1,697	\$174,467,351	79%	286
<i>Vic Fazio</i>	Cal-03	1,784	\$183,411,758	83%	276
John Doolittle	Cal-04	2,768	\$284,576,092	129%	157
<i>Robert Matsui</i>	Cal-05	2,246	\$230,909,647	105%	204
<i>Lynn Woolsey</i>	Cal-06	8,106	\$833,372,037	378%	26
<i>George Miller</i>	Cal-07	1,443	\$148,353,793	67%	330
<i>Nancy Pelosi</i>	Cal-08	5,968	\$613,565,793	278%	51
<i>Ron Dellums</i>	Cal-09	4,566	\$469,427,180	213%	81
Bill Baker	Cal-10	8,663	\$890,636,807	404%	24
Richard Pombo	Cal-11	2,030	\$208,702,842	95%	232
<i>Tom Lantos</i>	Cal-12	5,941	\$610,789,942	277%	52
<i>Fortney (Pete) Stark</i>	Cal-13	2,410	\$247,770,369	112%	186
<i>Anna Eshoo</i>	Cal-14	10,758	\$1,106,022,252	501%	19
<i>Norman Mineta</i>	Cal-15	6,587	\$677,204,738	307%	42
<i>Don Edwards</i>	Cal-16	1,881	\$193,384,259	88%	261
<i>Sam Farr</i>	Cal-17	3,255	\$334,644,212	152%	131
Gary Condit (D)	Cal-18	1,891	\$194,412,352	88%	255
Richard Lehman (D)	Cal-19	2,573	\$264,528,282	120%	173
Calvin Dooley (D)	Cal-20	871	\$89,546,884	41%	412

HOW MEMBERS BETRAYED THEIR CONSTITUENTS

Members of Congress: Those italicized and bolded voted in favor of tax hike (all Democrats). Those voting no were Republicans except where noted.	District	Number of Taxpayers in District Affected by Income Tax Hike	Combined Increase in Income Tax and Medicare Tax Burden by District	Impact of Tax Increase Compared to National Median Average	National Rank (Out of 435)
Bill Thomas	Cal-21	1,958	\$201,300,573	91%	241
Michael Huffington	Cal-22	4,165	\$428,200,658	194%	96
Elton Gallegly	Cal-23	3,304	\$339,681,867	154%	128
Anthony Beilenson	Cal-24	12,749	\$1,310,715,532	594%	9
Howard McKeon	Cal-25	4,966	\$510,550,893	231%	73
Howard Berman	Cal-26	1,331	\$136,839,154	62%	355
Carlos Moorhead	Cal-27	7,830	\$804,996,675	365%	28
David Dreier	Cal-28	4,734	\$486,699,139	221%	77
Henry Waxman	Cal-29	22,714	\$2,335,210,023	1058%	2
Xavier Becerra	Cal-30	962	\$98,902,529	45%	399
Matthew Martinez	Cal-31	779	\$80,088,430	36%	423
Julian Dixon	Cal-32	3,477	\$357,467,872	162%	121
Lucille Roybal-Allard	Cal-33	456	\$46,881,032	21%	433
Esteban Torres	Cal-34	1,422	\$146,194,799	66%	335
Maxine Waters	Cal-35	605	\$62,199,615	28%	428
Jane Harman	Cal-36	10,558	\$1,085,460,396	492%	21
Walter Tucker	Cal-37	625	\$64,255,801	29%	426
Steve Horn	Cal-38	3,366	\$346,056,042	157%	125
Ed Royce	Cal-39	4,320	\$444,136,097	201%	91
Jerry Lewis	Cal-40	2,230	\$229,264,698	104%	208
Jay Kim	Cal-41	3,498	\$359,626,867	163%	119
George Brown	Cal-42	1,044	\$107,332,890	49%	390
Ken Calvert	Cal-43	2,345	\$241,087,765	109%	192
Alfred McCandless	Cal-44	3,266	\$335,775,114	152%	130
Dana Rohrabacher	Cal-45	5,846	\$601,023,061	272%	53
Robert Dornan	Cal-46	794	\$81,630,570	37%	418
Chris Cox	Cal-47	10,957	\$1,126,481,299	511%	17
Ron Packard	Cal-48	6,239	\$641,427,108	291%	48
Lynn Schenk	Cal-49	5,406	\$555,786,977	252%	60
Bob Filner	Cal-50	733	\$75,359,203	34%	424
Randy Cunningham	Cal-51	6,346	\$652,427,701	296%	45
Duncan Hunter	Cal-52	2,060	\$211,787,120	96%	227
		Colorado			
Pat Schroeder	Col-1	3,662	\$376,487,589	171%	113
David Skaggs	Col-2	2,365	\$243,143,951	110%	190
Scott McInnis	Col-3	2,197	\$225,871,992	102%	213
Wayne Allard	Col-4	1,888	\$194,103,924	88%	256
Joel Hefley	Col-5	3,223	\$331,354,315	150%	132
Dan Schaefer	Col-6	4,501	\$462,744,577	210%	83
		Connecticut			
Barbara Kennelly	Conn-1	4,425	\$454,931,071	206%	87
Sam Gejdenson	Conn-2	2,490	\$255,995,111	116%	177
Rosa DeLauro	Conn-3	4,023	\$413,601,740	187%	102
Christopher Shays	Conn-4	16,086	\$1,653,790,105	750%	4

