**Data on Financial Industry Political Contributions**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Financial Industry PAC Money | | |
|  | DCCC | NRCC |
| Q1 2009 | $90,000 | $105,000 |
| Q2 2009 | $35,000 | $78,000 |
| Q3 2009 | $40,250 | $59,500 |
| Q4 2009 | $25,000 | $51,000 |
| Q1 2010 | $75,000 | $90,000 |
| Cycle Total | $265,250 | $383,500 |

NRCC Receipts Before TARP Repayment:

Bank of America:

Repaid TARP [12/9/09](http://dealbook.blogs.nytimes.com/2009/12/10/bank-of-america-finishes-tarp-repayment/)

NRCC took $15,000 on [5/7/09](http://herndon1.sdrdc.com/pdf/263/29992250263/29992250263.pdf#navpanes=0)

US Bancorp:

Repaid TARP [6/16/09](http://latimesblogs.latimes.com/money_co/2009/06/treasury-gets-55-billion-in-tarp-repayments-today.html)

NRCC took $5000 [3/16/09](http://herndon1.sdrdc.com/pdf/920/29933575920/29933575920.pdf#navpanes=0)  
NRCC took $10000 [6/9/09](http://herndon1.sdrdc.com/pdf/351/29992492351/29992492351.pdf#navpanes=0) (Questionable if you want to use this one since they had started the process of repayment.

Capital One:

Repaid TARP [6/17/09](http://latimesblogs.latimes.com/money_co/2009/06/treasury-gets-55-billion-in-tarp-repayments-today.html)

NRCC took $15000 [2/18/09](http://herndon1.sdrdc.com/pdf/746/29933372746/29933372746.pdf#navpanes=0)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Bank of America |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Cycle** | **Total** | **Democrats** | **Republicans** | **% to Dems** | **% to Repubs** |
| 2010 | $822,383 | $380,260 | $442,123 | 46% | 54% |
| 2008 | $2,967,713 | $1,659,406 | $1,307,686 | 56% | 44% |
| 2006 | $2,099,533 | $930,331 | $1,154,653 | 44% | 55% |
| 2004 | $2,355,286 | $1,077,849 | $1,275,987 | 46% | 54% |
| 2002 | $1,193,660 | $608,066 | $585,294 | 51% | 49% |
| 2000 | $1,649,522 | $741,005 | $902,730 | 45% | 55% |
| 1998 | $2,114,390 | $805,290 | $1,307,600 | 38% | 62% |
| 1996 | $2,066,542 | $860,158 | $1,204,884 | 42% | 58% |
| 1994 | $1,282,815 | $732,579 | $550,236 | 57% | 43% |
| 1992 | $603,030 | $319,526 | $282,304 | 53% | 47% |
| 1990 | $161,568 | $85,683 | $75,885 | 53% | 47% |
| **TOTAL** | **$17,316,442** | **$8,200,153** | **$9,089,382** | **47%** | **53%** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Goldman |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Cycle** | **Total** | **Democrats** | **Republicans** | **% to Dems** | **% to Repubs** |
| 2010 | $693,675 | $476,375 | $217,300 | 69% | 31% |
| 2008 | $5,934,089 | $4,463,788 | $1,459,961 | 75% | 25% |
| 2006 | $3,495,866 | $2,185,461 | $1,276,455 | 63% | 37% |
| 2004 | $6,411,038 | $3,956,253 | $2,436,285 | 62% | 38% |
| 2002 | $3,487,835 | $2,292,040 | $1,194,795 | 66% | 34% |
| 2000 | $4,431,977 | $2,763,185 | $1,662,292 | 62% | 38% |
| 1998 | $1,938,166 | $1,225,252 | $683,914 | 63% | 35% |
| 1996 | $1,816,563 | $997,747 | $816,316 | 55% | 45% |
| 1994 | $1,026,235 | $562,760 | $462,675 | 55% | 45% |
| 1992 | $1,659,310 | $908,295 | $750,515 | 55% | 45% |
| 1990 | $717,621 | $473,716 | $243,905 | 66% | 34% |
| **TOTAL** | **$31,612,375** | **$20,304,872** | **$11,204,413** | **64%** | **35%** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| JPMorgan |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Cycle** | **Total** | **Democrats** | **Republicans** | **% to Dems** | **% to Repubs** |
| 2010 | $592,444 | $325,366 | $266,578 | 55% | 45% |
| 2008 | $4,818,750 | $2,968,530 | $1,846,670 | 62% | 38% |
| 2006 | $2,204,056 | $1,207,053 | $966,352 | 55% | 44% |
| 2004 | $3,158,666 | $1,624,537 | $1,533,879 | 51% | 49% |
| 2002 | $1,217,022 | $648,329 | $568,393 | 53% | 47% |
| 2000 | $2,511,930 | $1,224,825 | $1,278,855 | 49% | 51% |
| 1998 | $1,481,605 | $514,523 | $965,332 | 35% | 65% |
| 1996 | $1,570,517 | $522,195 | $1,047,372 | 33% | 67% |
| 1994 | $941,242 | $468,469 | $471,573 | 50% | 50% |
| 1992 | $967,696 | $507,206 | $459,240 | 52% | 48% |
| 1990 | $665,125 | $356,646 | $308,479 | 54% | 46% |
| **TOTAL** | **$20,129,053** | **$10,367,679** | **$9,712,723** | **52%** | **48%** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Citigroup |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Cycle** | **Total** | **Democrats** | **Republicans** | **% to Dems** | **% to Repubs** |
| 2010 | $633,810 | $312,400 | $321,410 | 49% | 51% |
| 2008 | $4,879,138 | $3,078,958 | $1,795,180 | 63% | 37% |
| 2006 | $2,583,066 | $1,379,967 | $1,133,649 | 53% | 44% |
| 2004 | $3,080,640 | $1,613,015 | $1,460,223 | 52% | 47% |
| 2002 | $3,032,555 | $1,431,534 | $1,600,021 | 47% | 53% |
| 2000 | $4,001,426 | $2,053,736 | $1,936,640 | 51% | 48% |
| 1998 | $2,748,229 | $1,130,670 | $1,612,309 | 41% | 59% |
| 1996 | $2,471,160 | $858,685 | $1,610,775 | 35% | 65% |
| 1994 | $1,225,029 | $621,855 | $599,409 | 51% | 49% |
| 1992 | $1,496,392 | $675,581 | $817,062 | 45% | 55% |
| 1990 | $1,027,973 | $510,109 | $517,864 | 50% | 50% |
| **TOTAL** | **$27,179,418** | **$13,666,510** | **$13,404,542** | **50%** | **49%** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Morgan Stanley |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Cycle** | **Total** | **Democrats** | **Republicans** | **% to Dems** | **% to Repubs** |
| 2010 | $624,529 | $317,492 | $304,537 | 51% | 49% |
| 2008 | $3,715,685 | $2,109,282 | $1,596,418 | 57% | 43% |
| 2006 | $1,943,033 | $959,409 | $958,924 | 49% | 49% |
| 2004 | $3,290,584 | $1,303,969 | $1,985,615 | 40% | 60% |
| 2002 | $1,900,492 | $679,890 | $1,220,402 | 36% | 64% |
| 2000 | $2,656,627 | $1,092,517 | $1,554,360 | 41% | 59% |
| 1998 | $1,009,844 | $399,685 | $603,159 | 40% | 60% |
| 1996 | $1,096,327 | $500,142 | $594,685 | 46% | 54% |
| 1994 | $902,580 | $475,505 | $425,825 | 53% | 47% |
| 1992 | $1,005,878 | $479,331 | $525,547 | 48% | 52% |
| 1990 | $440,155 | $209,025 | $231,130 | 48% | 53% |
| **TOTAL** | **$18,585,734** | **$8,526,247** | **$10,000,602** | **46%** | **54%** |

# GOP Chases Wall Street Donors

## Data Show Fund-Raisers Begin Capitalizing on Bankers' Regret Over Backing Obama

### By [BRODY MULLINS](http://online.wsj.com/search/term.html?KEYWORDS=BRODY+MULLINS&bylinesearch=true) And [NEIL KING JR.](http://online.wsj.com/search/term.html?KEYWORDS=NEIL+KING+JR.&bylinesearch=true)

### <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703575004575043612216461790.html#printMode>

Republicans are stepping up their campaign to win donations from Wall Street, trying to capitalize on an increasing sense of regret among executives at big financial institutions for backing Democrats in 2008.

In discussions with Wall Street executives, Republicans are striving to make the case that they are banks' best hope of preventing President Barack Obama and congressional Democrats from cracking down on Wall Street.

GOP strategists hope to benefit from the reaction to the White House's populist rhetoric and proposals, which range from sharp critiques of bonuses to a tax on big Wall Street banks, caps on executive pay and curbs on business practices deemed too risky.

Democrats have dominated Wall Street's fund-raising circles in recent elections. Mr. Obama himself raised millions of dollars from employees of [Goldman Sachs Group](http://online.wsj.com/public/quotes/main.html?type=djn&symbol=GS) Inc., [Citigroup](http://online.wsj.com/public/quotes/main.html?type=djn&symbol=C) Inc., [J.P. Morgan Chase](http://online.wsj.com/public/quotes/main.html?type=djn&symbol=JPM) & Co. and other Wall Street firms.

Now, at least some Wall Street executives have reduced their political contributions to the Democratic Party and its candidates, according to fund-raising reports and interviews with executives at financial-services firms.

Last week, House Minority Leader John Boehner of Ohio made a pitch to Democratic contributor James Dimon, the chairman and chief executive of J.P. Morgan, over drinks at a Capitol Hill restaurant, according to people familiar with the matter.

Mr. Boehner told Mr. Dimon congressional Republicans had stood up to Mr. Obama's efforts to curb pay and impose new regulations. The Republican leader also said he was disappointed many on Wall Street continue to donate their money to Democrats, according to the people familiar with the matter.

A spokeswoman for J.P. Morgan declined to comment Wednesday.

"I sense a lot of dissatisfaction and a lot of buyer's remorse on Wall Street," said Rep. Eric Cantor (R., Va.), the second-ranking House Republican and a top Wall Street fund-raiser for his party.

A complete picture of Wall Street's 2009 campaign donations won't be available for a few weeks. Through the third quarter, campaign-finance reports show that some major Wall Street players began sending an increasing share of their donations to Republicans. Many of those donations came toward the end of this period, because many banks had essentially shut down their political giving at the height of the financial crisis.

Through the first nine months of 2009, about 54% of donations from [Bank of America](http://online.wsj.com/public/quotes/main.html?type=djn&symbol=BAC) Corp.'s political action committee and employees went to Republicans, according to campaign-finance data compiled by the nonpartisan Center for Responsive Politics. That was a switch from the 2008 campaign, when 56% of the company's donations went to Democrats. Shirley Norton, a BofA spokeswoman, said it doesn't base PAC donations on party affiliation.

Donations from the PACs and employees of J.P. Morgan and Citigroup also trended toward Republicans during the same period, according to the data. Spokeswomen for the banks declined to comment.

During the 2008 campaign, Mr. Obama received nearly $15 million in donations from people who worked in the securities and investment industry, according to the CRP data. Employees of Goldman Sachs donated nearly $1 million to his campaign. By contrast, Mr. Obama's Republican opponent, Arizona Sen. John McCain, received $8.7 million from the securities and investment sector, according to the data.

Wall Street executives who supported Mr. Obama during the presidential campaign said there had been growing signs of discontent. These Democrats predicted that the unease would depress fund raising as the 2010 election heats up.

One major Democratic fund-raiser on Wall Street said that some people who raised money for Mr. Obama's campaign felt burned. "They put themselves on the line internally with their companies for Obama, and now they look stupid," this person said.

The White House referred calls seeking comment to the Democratic National Committee. A DNC spokesman said: "It's not surprising that Republicans are seeking money from the same banking industry they are the champions of. The relationship between Wall Street and Republicans is symbiotic."

Recently, Mr. Obama has repeatedly blasted the industry in speeches, leading critics to charge that he is vilifying Wall Street for political purposes.

"I see people that philosophically oppose Obama's policies getting a lot more engaged," said former Republican Sen. Phil Gramm, who now serves as the vice chairman of investment-banking firm UBS Securities LLC.

Mr. Gramm, who served briefly as a presidential campaign adviser to Sen. John McCain in 2008, said Mr. Obama has gone too far in his criticisms of the industry. "It is easy for politicians to overdo this vilification thing, but I don't remember a president in my lifetime engaging in it to the extent that Obama has," Mr. Gramm said. "And at some point it turns on you."

**McConnell's Wall Street meeting prompts criticism from Democrats**

By Perry Bacon Jr.  
Washington Post staff writer  
Tuesday, April 20, 2010; 4:45 PM

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/04/20/AR2010042003323_pf.html>

A meeting between Wall Street executives and Republican leaders emboldened Democrats in the past week to aggressively attack one of their chief antagonists: Senate Republican Leader [Mitch McConnell](http://www.whorunsgov.com/Profiles/Mitch_McConnell) (R-Ky.)

Since the news surfaced that McConnell and [Sen. John Cornyn](http://www.whorunsgov.com/Profiles/John_Cornyn) (R-Tex.) met with financial chiefs in New York this month, on the eve of the Senate debate on a regulatory reform bill, Democrats have suggested Republicans are organizing against the legislation to curry favor and campaign donations from Wall Street, as Cornyn is the head of the Senate Republican campaign arm. Both men have denied that charge, and McConnell has defended the meeting as simply discussing legislation with people on wall street.

Though on Monday [he appeared to soften](http://voices.washingtonpost.com/44/2010/04/mcconnell-softens-tone-on-fina.html) in his opposition to the regulatory overhaul, Democrats have used the meeting specifically to take on McConnell. The Democratic National Committee has runs ads attacking him, Democratic lawmakers have slammed him in speeches on the Senate floor and [President Obama](http://www.whorunsgov.com/Profiles/Barack_Obama) has repeatedly scolded him in recent speeches.

"Now, the Senate Republican leader, he paid a visit to Wall Street a week or two ago. He took along the chairman of their campaign committee," Obama said at a speech in Los Angeles on Monday night. "He met with some of the movers and shakers up there. I don't know exactly what was discussed. All I can tell you is when he came back, he promptly announced he would oppose the financial regulatory reform. He would oppose it. Shocking. And once again, he's threatening to tie up the Senate with a [filibuster](http://projects.washingtonpost.com/politicsglossary/legislative/filibuster/) to try to block progress."

McConnell, in a speech Monday, criticized "people [who] come down to scream and yell about my suggestions and my motives" and called on Democrats to "skip the character attacks on anyone who dares to point out flaws with the bill."

McConnell has said that a $50 billion fund that the financial firms would pay into for liquidating bankrupt firms constitutes a "bailout fund," even though it would not be funded by the federal government as the 2008 rescue of Wall Street firms was. Obama has [called that assertion "cynical and deceptive,"](http://voices.washingtonpost.com/44/2010/04/obama-urges-financial-regulato.html?hpid=topnews) but administration officials have signaled they would support stripping the fund from the legislation.

Several Republicans have signaled they might back the final version of the legislation, but so far McConnell has organized all 41 Republicans against the bill.

Unified opposition by Republicans, and Democratic frustration with it, has been a theme of the past 15 months on Capitol Hill. In an ad last month -- called "What's Wrong With Washington?" -- the DNC highlighted McConnell's opposition to health-care legislation.

The Kentucky Republican, well-regarded in his party for this strategic acumen, generally revels in being cast as a blocker of key legislation that he opposes. McConnell has long filled one of the walls in his office with editorial cartoons that depict him, and most of them are negative.

A cartoon last year by the Chattanooga (Tenn.) Times Free Press shows two banners on a street corner. On the left is one with a picture of Obama's face and the word "HOPE" written below it. The other shows a scowling McConnell with the word "NOPE" below his face.

Since Obama became president, McConnell has successfully slowed the administration's push to close the military prison at Guantanamo Bay, blocked numerous executive branch nominees and pushed all 41 [GOP](http://projects.washingtonpost.com/politicsglossary/party-affiliated/GOP/) senators to oppose the health-care law.

McConnell has said the party in the minority is regularly accused of obstructionism, but the Wall Street meeting has heightened the criticism and put the Republican leader on the defense.

Asked about the meeting in an interview on CNN on Sunday, McConnell defended the session and said he was simply "gathering information" from people on Wall Street about their views on the bill.

Democrats aren't likely to be satisfied with that explanation. [Senate Majority Leader Harry M. Reid](http://www.whorunsgov.com/Profiles/Harry_M._Reid) (D-Nev.)'s office declared on Tuesday "it is past time for Senator McConnell to come clean regarding the nature of his closed-door meetings with Wall Street executives."