



LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE ON CIVIL RIGHTS



LCCR VOTING RECORD 107TH CONGRESS



Leadership Conference on Civil Rights

The 107th Congress: The Threat to LCCR's Priorities Continues

The 107th Congress has been marked by gridlock and partisan stalemate. The Republican majority in the House consistently passed bills along party lines, jamming an almost evenly divided Senate with uncompromised partisan legislation. Due to the slim Democratic Senate majority, often neither party was able to garner the sixty votes necessary to reach cloture to move a bill.

The 107th House repeatedly passed carbon-copy legislation of Bush Administration priorities, including tax cuts for the wealthy, a homeland security bill that denies federal employees worker protections, decreased funding for welfare, and direct government funding of religious organizations that practice discrimination through the faith-based initiative/charitable choice proposal. Other measures, including most of the appropriations bills, stalled because of partisan bickering and intra-party wrangling. Despite increased support for hate crimes prevention legislation, the polarization of the Senate prevented the passage of the Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act, which would strengthen the federal response to hate crimes.

The gridlock resulted in few reform bills being enacted into law. And while both the K-12 overhaul and the election reform bill passed, serious and almost unacceptable compromises were made. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) was finally reauthorized, but much of the approved additional spending, for programs such as special education, Head Start, school construction, and closing the digital divide, was stripped from the final budget resolution conference report. The 107th Congress was able to pass an election reform bill, two years after the election debacle in Florida. The "Help America Vote Act," is an important step forward in improving election procedures and administration, but raises serious concerns about the discriminatory impact on voters with disabilities, racial and ethnic minorities, students, the elderly, and the poor.

This is a challenging time for issues important to LCCR and the civil rights and civil liberties of all citizens. LCCR can count on only 191 House members to support our priorities on most votes, while 137 representatives rarely or never support LCCR issues. While the party switch of Sen. Jim Jeffords (I-Vt.) from a Republican to an Independent gave the Democrats a bare majority, the Senate remains closely divided. Only forty Senate members support LCCR's issues on 80 percent or more of the votes in the *LCCR Voting Record*. Forty-four senators rarely or never support these issues.



Reading the *Voting Record*

Based on these votes, each legislator earns a percentage rating for support of LCCR priorities. *This rating cannot indicate the full extent of a legislator’s support for or opposition to LCCR positions and represents neither endorsement nor condemnation of any member of Congress.* LCCR has taken a sample of bills considered during the 107th Congress, excluding the lame duck session, to comprise this year’s *LCCR Voting Record*. A vote in accordance with LCCR’s position is a “+” vote; a vote contrary to LCCR’s position is a “-” vote. A blank indicates no vote was cast. A “|” indicates the member of Congress was not in office for the full term. A “X” means a member did not cast a yea or nay vote. Rep. Joseph Moakley (D-Mass.) passed away on May 28, 2001, and was succeeded by Rep. Stephen Lynch (D-Mass.). Rep. Bud Shuster (R-Pa.) retired on February 5, 2001, and was succeeded by his son, Rep. Bill Shuster (R-Pa.). Rep. Julian Dixon (D-Calif.) passed away on December 8, 2000, and was succeeded by Rep. Diane Watson (D-Calif.). Rep. Asa Hutchison (R-Ark.) retired on August 6, 2001, and was succeeded by Rep. John Boozman (R-Ark.). Rep. Joe Scarborough (R-Fla.) retired on September 6, 2001, and was succeeded by Rep. Jeff Miller (R-Fla.). Rep. Steve Largent (R-Okla.) retired on February 15, 2002, and was succeeded by Rep. John Sullivan (R-Okla.). Rep. Floyd Spence (R-S.C.) retired on August 16, 2001, and was succeeded by Rep. Joe Wilson (R-S.C.). Rep. Norman Sisisky (D-Va.) passed away on March 29, 2001, and was succeeded by Rep. J. Randy Forbes (R-Va.). Rep. James A. Traficant, Jr. (D-Ohio) was expelled from the House on July 24, 2002, and his seat remained vacant for the duration of the 107th Congress. Rep. Tony P. Hall (D-Ohio) resigned on September 9, 2002, and his seat remained vacant for the duration of the 107th Congress. Rep. Patsy T. Mink (D-Hawaii) and her seat remained vacant at the time of publication. Sen. Paul Wellstone (D-Minn.) passed away on October 25, 2002, but all the votes reviewed were taken before his death.



The *LCCR Voting Record* for the 107th Congress reflects positions taken by every senator and representative on the legislative priorities of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights (LCCR) and its coalition members.

The *Voting Record* provides significant information about elected federal legislators through the votes they cast on LCCR’s policy priorities. The priorities for the 107th Congress include election reform, education, welfare reauthorization, tax cuts, the budget, civil rights, and immigration. The *Voting Record* reflects only roll-call votes that were officially recorded on the floor of the U.S. Senate or House of Representatives. While the *Voting Record* is an important tool in monitoring the actions of Congress, it is important to recognize that it is not the sole reflection of a legislator’s record. The *Voting Record* is neither an endorsement nor a condemnation of any member of Congress.

For more information, please contact LCCR’s Public Policy Department at 202/466-3311.

VOTE DESCRIPTIONS

House Votes in the 107th Congress

Bankruptcy Overhaul

Jackson-Lee Amendment to the Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act (H.R. 333) During House consideration of the Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act, Rep. Jackson-Lee (D-Tex.) offered a “Democratic substitute” amendment to the bill. H.R. 333 makes a number of changes to the bankruptcy laws, including barring many people from filing for bankruptcy under Chapter 7, a section of the bankruptcy code that allows debts to be forgiven and instead requires them to file under Chapter 13, which requires debtors to pay off all their debts with future income. While the bill has been touted by supporters as necessary to stop abuse of bankruptcy laws, a majority of people who file are working families who have experienced a catastrophic event such as illness, job loss, or divorce, and H.R. 333 would make starting over impossible for most. In addition, hundreds of thousands of women and children who are owed child support or alimony would be harmed under H.R. 333, as it puts creditors on an equal footing with them and makes it less likely that support payments will be made. H.R. 333 will also make it much more difficult for businesses to reorganize, thereby forcing them into bankruptcy and eliminating much needed jobs. President Clinton vetoed a similar bill in late 2000.

LCCR supported the Jackson-Lee Democratic substitute amendment as an improvement to an overall objectionable bill. The Democratic substitute would have softened the “means-test” requirements of the bill. It would have increased the number of people who could file Chapter 7 bankruptcy; allowed debtors to claim more expenses including those related to foster care and health care; and eased bankruptcy-filing deadlines for businesses. It also would have prevented bankruptcy courts from selling customer lists of failed companies as “business assets,” and it would have provided more protection to tenants against eviction when they file for bankruptcy protection.

The Democratic substitute was defeated by the House (160-258). A vote in favor of the substitute was counted as a + vote. *First session Roll No. 23 (3/1/2001)*

Budget Resolution

Tax Cut in the FY02 Budget Resolution (H. Con. Res. 83) The FY02 budget resolution contained a \$1.35 trillion tax cut through FY11 and limited discretionary spending to \$661.3 billion, with a target of \$325.1 billion for defense and \$336.2 billion for non-defense, social programs.

LCCR opposed the final budget resolution because the sizeable tax cut squandered a historic opportunity to use a portion of the surplus to address unmet, critical needs of American families, such as restoring the solvency of Social Security, providing for a Medicare prescription drug benefit, and improving our nation’s public schools.



The House passed (221-207) the budget resolution conference report. A vote against passage was counted as a + vote. *First Session Roll No. 104 (5/9/2001)*

Education Funding

Cox Amendment to the No Child Left Behind Act (H.R. 1) During House floor consideration of the No Child Left Behind Act, which reauthorized the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Rep. Cox (R-Calif.) offered an amendment to reduce the total funding authorized by the bill for FY 2002 from \$22.8 to \$20.5 billion. The amendment would also restrict spending in future years by allowing the total authorization for each of the remaining four years covered by the bill to increase by only 3.5% more than the amount appropriated in the preceding fiscal year.

LCCR opposed the amendment, which would have made it more difficult to pay for the sweeping educational reforms called for by the overall bill.

The House rejected the Cox amendment (101-326). A vote against the amendment was counted as a + vote. *First Session Roll No. 143 (5/23/2001)*

Class Size Reduction

Owens Motion to Recommit with Instructions the No Child Left Behind Act (H.R. 1) During House floor debate on the No Child Left Behind Act, which reauthorized the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Rep. Owens (D-N.Y.) offered a motion to recommit the bill to the House Committee on Education and the Workforce with instructions. A “motion to recommit with instructions” is sometimes offered as a “last resort” means of amending a bill on the House floor, particularly when the minority party wishes to offer an amendment or even a complete substitute but has been prevented from doing so under the rules set for normal consideration of that particular bill.

Democrats were prevented from offering an amendment during floor debate to authorize \$2 billion in funding for school repair, renovation and construction by the Republican-controlled House Rules Committee. In an effort to get at least some funding for school construction included in H.R. 1, Rep. Owens’ motion to recommit sought only \$1.2 billion – an amount the full House had agreed to in the previous year.

LCCR supported the Owens motion to recommit because education reform must be aimed comprehensively, not only at improving student achievement but also at upgrading school facilities.

The House rejected (207-223) the Owens motion. A vote in favor of the motion to recommit was counted as a + vote. *First Session Roll No. 144 (5/23/2001)*

Faith-Based Initiative

Conyers Motion to Recommit with Instructions the Community Solutions Act of 2001 (H.R. 7). During House consideration of H.R. 7, Rep. Conyers (D-MI) offered a motion to recommit



the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary, with instructions for the Committee to adopt certain amendments and immediately return it to the full House for a vote on final passage. A “motion to recommit with instructions” is sometimes offered as a “last resort” means of amending a bill on the House floor, particularly when the minority party wishes to offer an amendment but has been prevented from doing so under the rules set for normal consideration of a particular bill.

H.R. 7, which contains President Bush’s faith-based initiative/charitable choice proposal, allows direct government funding to religious groups that provide social services without requiring compliance with anti-discrimination laws. Under H.R. 7, all state and local anti-discrimination laws would be preempted, and religious organizations would be allowed to inquire about such factors as marital status or religion in hiring practices. Furthermore, beneficiaries could also be subjected to discrimination in the delivery of services. A lesbian, for example, could be denied benefits if her sexual orientation conflicts with the tenets of the religious organization responsible for delivering federally funded services, even if such discrimination was otherwise illegal under local ordinances.

The Conyers motion to recommit with instructions would have added language to H.R. 7 to safeguard Federal, State and local civil rights laws. LCCR supported the motion because it believes that if faith-based organizations receive federal funds to provide social services, they must abide by anti-discrimination laws and must not be permitted to proselytize to recipients.

The motion to recommit failed (195-234). A vote in favor of the motion was counted as a + vote. *First Session Roll No. 253 (7/19/2001)*

Tax Cuts

Economic Security and Recovery Act of 2001 (H.R. 3090) This bill, designed to revive the slowing economy, accelerates President Bush’s \$1.3 trillion tax cut plan enacted earlier this year, but fails to invest any new resources in the economy. Also, under H.R. 3090, corporations receive large tax breaks through the elimination of the corporate minimum tax. For example, under the bill, IBM would receive a tax break of \$1.4 billion; GM, \$833 million; and GE, \$671 million.

LCCR opposed H.R. 3090 because it contains new, permanent, and non-stimulative tax breaks for businesses and the wealthy, without providing expanded unemployment and health benefits for unemployed workers. LCCR believes that an economic stimulus plan should ensure access to health care and unemployment insurance and should include subsidizing COBRA premiums; providing temporary assistance to state-based health care through Medicaid; making part-time workers eligible for unemployment insurance; and expanding unemployment insurance benefits, including using the most recent months of earnings when determining unemployment insurance eligibility.

The House passed H.R. 3090 (216-214). A vote against H.R. 3090 was counted as a + vote. *First Session Roll No. 404 (10/24/2001)*

Racial Profiling

Customs Border Security Act (H.R. 3129) The Customs Border Security Act was considered on the House Suspension Calendar. Bills considered on the Suspension Calendar are generally noncontroversial and expected to pass quickly. They cannot be amended, are provided only 40 minutes of debate, and, in return for these restrictions, must obtain a two-thirds vote to pass.

While most of the Customs Border Security Act was in fact noncontroversial, it also contained a provision that would exempt Customs officers from liability for engaging in illegal searches if they were performed in good faith. This overly broad language was included in the bill even though the Customs Service has a long history of engaging in racial profiling, often resulting in civil rights litigation. A 2000 General Accounting Office report found that while black female citizens were nine times more likely than white female citizens to be subject to x-ray searches by the Customs Service, they were less than half as likely as their white counterparts to be found carrying contraband. The “good faith” language of the bill would prevent many lawsuits aimed at ending such discriminatory practices and leave Customs officers with far less incentive to respect the civil rights of international travelers.

LCCR opposed H.R. 3129. It was defeated (256-168) because it did not obtain the required two-thirds vote necessary for passage under the *suspension of the rules* procedure. (Note: the “good faith” provision was ultimately attached to another piece of legislation and enacted into law in August 2002.) A vote against H.R. 3129 was counted as a + vote. *First session, Roll No. 478 (12/6/2001)*

Election Reform

Menendez Motion to Recommit with Instructions the Help America Vote Act (H.R. 3295) During House consideration of H.R. 3295, Rep. Menendez (D-N.J.) offered a motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on House Administration, with instructions for the Committee to adopt certain amendments and immediately return it to the full House for a vote on final passage. A “motion to recommit with instructions” is sometimes offered as a “last resort” means of amending a bill on the House floor, particularly when the minority party wishes to offer an amendment but has been prevented from doing so under the rules set for normal consideration of a particular bill.

The Menendez motion would have added language to the pending election reform legislation to ensure that Motor Voter Law provisions remained in place; secure provisional voting rights; mandate that, within five years, voting systems must provide increased opportunities for voters to correct ballot errors; and require that election guidelines be developed by the Department of Justice.

LCCR supported the motion to recommit with instructions because it would have corrected the shortcomings of H.R. 3295. The House defeated (197-226) the motion. A vote in favor of the motion was counted as a + vote. *First session Roll No. 488 (12/12/2001)*

Immigration

Enhanced Border Security and Visa Entry Reform Act (H. Res. 376) The Enhanced Border Security and Visa Entry Reform Act was considered on the House Suspension Calendar. Bills considered on the Suspension Calendar are generally noncontroversial and expected to pass quickly. They cannot be amended, are provided only 40 minutes of debate, and, in return for these restrictions, must obtain a two-thirds vote to pass.

In addition to containing a number of noncontroversial border security enhancement provisions, H. Res. 376 contained language temporarily reauthorizing an immigration law provision known as “245(i),” which refers to Section 245(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act and allows some noncitizens who are unlawfully present in the United States to become legal permanent residents without first being required to return to their home countries. This policy allows American families to remain together in the United States while awaiting the approval of a loved one’s green card. Without section 245(i), immigrants who wish to legalize their status must return to their native countries and seek admission there, a process that can take many years and could separate families for a long period of time.

LCCR believes that section 245(i) should be permanently reauthorized, but nonetheless supported the more limited extension provided by H. Res. 376. It passed (275-137) the House, although the 245(i) provision was ultimately stripped out on the Senate side before the rest of the bill was enacted into law. A vote in favor of H. Res. 376 was counted as a + vote. *Second Session Roll No. 53 (3/12/2002)*

Food Stamps for Immigrants

Baca Motion to Instruct Conferees on the Farm Security Act (H.R. 2646) While the differences between the House and Senate versions of the Farm Security Act were being resolved in a joint House-Senate conference committee, Rep. Baca (D-Calif.) offered a motion to instruct the House conferees to agree to language in the Senate version that would expand the eligibility of children, legal immigrants, refugees and people with disabilities to receive food stamps. A motion to instruct conferees is not binding on the conference committee, but such a motion is important because it reflects the will of the full House with respect to a certain aspect of House-Senate negotiations.

A controversial welfare reform bill, enacted in 1996, stripped nearly all legal immigrants of eligibility to receive food stamps. Congress, realizing that the 1996 changes had been too harsh, partially restored food stamp benefits for immigrants in 1998. It only did so, however, for children and elderly who had arrived in the United States before 1996, which still left most other immigrants ineligible. The Senate-passed language would have expanded upon the 1998 restoration by allowing legal residents to seek food stamp relief if they have lived in the United States for five years, and by permitting children to receive food stamps regardless of when they entered the country. In addition, it would have required an immigrant to have four years of work history in order to qualify, as opposed to ten years under current law.

LCCR supported the motion to instruct conferees, which the House approved (244-171). The version of the bill ultimately signed into law contained some, but not all, of the Senate food stamp provisions. A vote in favor of the motion to instruct was counted as a + vote. *Second Session Roll No. 106 (4/23/2002)*

Welfare Reauthorization

Personal Responsibility, Work, and Family Promotion Act of 2002 (H.R. 4737) This bill to reauthorize the federal welfare program, sponsored by Rep. Pryce (R-Ohio), incorporates President Bush's welfare reform proposals to require increased work requirements for single mothers of 40 hours per week, reduce state flexibility to provide education and training, and freeze Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) funding for the next five years.

LCCR believes that any welfare reauthorization must adhere to fundamental principles of equality, fairness and social justice, and identify effective strategies that offer welfare recipients the best chance to find and keep stable jobs, provide support to themselves and their families, and achieve some level of economic independence. H.R. 4737, however, imposes heavy new financial burdens on the states, while at the same time seriously limiting the flexibility of states to develop their own approaches to moving people off welfare through a “one-size-fits-all” approach. It also provides inadequate increases in funding for childcare, and unfairly continues the existing ban on providing assistance to legal immigrants.

The House passed H.R. 4737 (229-197). A vote against H.R. 4737 was counted as a + vote. *Second Session Roll No. 170 (5/16/2002)*

Labor Rights

Waxman Amendment to Homeland Security Act (H.R. 5005) During House floor consideration of the Homeland Security Act, Rep. Waxman (D-Calif.) offered an amendment to eliminate so-called “management flexibility” language from the bill. The management flexibility provisions, supported by the President, would allow the Secretary of the newly created Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to waive union rights and civil service protections for the approximately 170,000 federal employees that would be transferred from other departments. Under the Administration’s proposal, federal employees could be fired without cause, whistleblowers would have little protection against retaliation, and unions would be powerless against abusive or self-protective political employees under the new “flexibility” – a flexibility that does nothing to advance the cause of homeland security.

The House Committee on Government Reform had unanimously approved language that would have left the union rights and civil service protections of DHS employees fully intact. However, language was stripped out by the House Select Committee on Homeland Security, chaired by Rep. Arney (R-Tex.). The Waxman amendment would have deleted the Arney language and restored the original provisions.

LCCR supported the Waxman amendment. It was defeated by the House (208-220). *Second Session Roll No. 360 (7/26/2002)*



House Votes in the 107th Congress

	% Support When Voting	% Support All Votes	Bankruptcy Overhaul	Budget Resolution	Education Funding	Class Size Reduction	Faith-Based Initiative	Tax Cuts	Racial Profiling	Election Reform	Immigration	Food Stamps	Welfare Reauthorization	Labor Rights
<u>Alabama</u>														
Aderholt (R)	8%	8%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bachus, S. (R)	8%	8%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Callahan (R)	8%	8%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cramer (D)	45%	42%	X	-	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	+
Everett (R)	8%	8%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hilliard (D)	92%	92%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+
Riley (R)	8%	8%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<u>Alaska</u>														
Young, D. (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	X	X	-	-	-	-
<u>Arizona</u>														
Flake (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hayworth (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kolbe (R)	25%	25%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-
Pastor (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Shadegg (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stump (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<u>Arkansas</u>														
Berry (D)	83%	83%	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+
Boozman (R)	0%	0%	I	I	I	I	I	I	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hutchinson, A. (R)	0%	0%	-	-	X	-	-	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
Ross (D)	75%	75%	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+
Snyder (D)	91%	83%	X	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+
<u>California</u>														
Baca (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Becerra (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Berman (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+



	% Support When Voting	% Support All Votes	Bankruptcy Overhaul	Budget Resolution	Education Funding	Class Size Reduction	Faith-Based Initiative	Tax Cuts	Racial Profiling	Election Reform	Immigration	Food Stamps	Welfare Reauthorization	Labor Rights
Bono (R)	17%	17%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-
Calvert (R)	17%	17%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
Capps (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Condit (D)	82%	75%	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	X	+	+
Cox (R)	8%	8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
Cunningham (R)	18%	17%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	X
Davis, S. (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Dooley (D)	91%	83%	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	X	+	+	+	+
Doolittle (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	X	-	-	-
Dreier (R)	25%	25%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-
Eshoo (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Farr (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Filner (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Gallegly (R)	8%	8%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Harman (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Henger (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Honda (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Horn (R)	17%	17%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-
Hunter (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Issa (R)	8%	8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
Lantos (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Lee (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Lewis, Jerry (R)	17%	17%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-
Lofgren (D)	92%	92%	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Matsui (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
McKeon (R)	17%	17%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
Millender-McDonald (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+



	% Support When Voting	% Support All Votes	Bankruptcy Overhaul	Budget Resolution	Education Funding	Class Size Reduction	Faith-Based Initiative	Tax Cuts	Racial Profiling	Election Reform	Immigration	Food Stamps	Welfare Reauthorization	Labor Rights
Miller, George (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Miller, Gary (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Napolitano (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Ose (R)	25%	25%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-
Pelosi (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Pombo (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	X	-
Radanovich (R)	9%	8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	X	-	-	-
Rohrabacher (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Roybal-Allard (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Royce (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sanchez (D)	92%	92%	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Schiff (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Sherman (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Solis (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Stark (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Tauscher (D)	92%	92%	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Thomas, B. (R)	17%	17%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
Thompson, M. (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Waters (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Watson (D)	100%	67%	I	I	I	I	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Waxman (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Woolsey (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
<u>Colorado</u>														
DeGette (D)	100%	92%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	X	+	+
Hefley (R)	8%	8%	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
McInnis (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Schaffer (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tancredo (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-



	% Support When Voting	% Support All Votes	Bankruptcy Overhaul	Budget Resolution	Education Funding	Class Size Reduction	Faith-Based Initiative	Tax Cuts	Racial Profiling	Election Reform	Immigration	Food Stamps	Welfare Reauthorization	Labor Rights
Udall, M. (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
<u>Connecticut</u>														
DeLauro (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Johnson, N. (R)	33%	33%	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-
Larson, J. (D)	92%	92%	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Maloney, J. (D)	83%	83%	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+
Shays (R)	42%	42%	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	-	-
Simmons (R)	25%	25%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-
<u>Delaware</u>														
Castle (R)	25%	25%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-
<u>Florida</u>														
Bilirakis (R)	8%	8%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Boyd (D)	67%	67%	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	-	+
Brown, C. (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Crenshaw (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Davis, Jim (D)	92%	92%	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Deutsch (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Diaz-Balart (R)	25%	25%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-
Foley (R)	25%	25%	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	-	-
Goss (R)	17%	17%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
Hastings, A. (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Keller (R)	8%	8%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Meek, C. (D)	100%	92%	+	+	+	+	+	+	X	+	+	+	+	+
Mica (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Miller, J. (R)	0%	0%	I	I	I	I	I	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Miller, D. (R)	0%	0%	-	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Putnam (R)	8%	8%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ros-Lehtinen (R)	27%	25%	X	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-



	% Support When Voting	% Support All Votes	Bankruptcy Overhaul	Budget Resolution	Education Funding	Class Size Reduction	Faith-Based Initiative	Tax Cuts	Racial Profiling	Election Reform	Immigration	Food Stamps	Welfare Reauthorization	Labor Rights
Scarborough (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
Shaw (R)	25%	25%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-
Stearns (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Thurman, K. (D)	92%	92%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+
Weldon, D. (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Wexler (D)	91%	83%	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	X	+	+	+
Young, C.W. (R)	8%	8%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<u>Georgia</u>														
Barr (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bishop (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Chambliss (R)	8%	8%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Collins, M. (R)	8%	8%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Deal (R)	0%	0%	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Isakson (R)	8%	8%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kingston (R)	0%	0%	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lewis, John (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Linder (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
McKinney (D)	100%	92%	+	+	+	+	X	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Norwood (R)	0%	0%	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<u>Hawaii</u>														
Abercrombie (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Mink (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
<u>Idaho</u>														
Otter (R)	17%	17%	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	-
Simpson (R)	17%	17%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
<u>Illinois</u>														
Biggart (R)	25%	25%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-
Blagojevich (D)	100%	83%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	X	X	+	+



	% Support When Voting	% Support All Votes	Bankruptcy Overhaul	Budget Resolution	Education Funding	Class Size Reduction	Faith-Based Initiative	Tax Cuts	Racial Profiling	Election Reform	Immigration	Food Stamps	Welfare Reauthorization	Labor Rights
Costello (D)	92%	92%	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+
Crane (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	X	-	-
Davis, D. (D)	100%	92%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	X	+	+	+
Evans (D)	100%	92%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	X	+	+	+	+
Gutierrez (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Hastert (R)	0%	0%	X	-	X	-	X	-	X	X	X	X	-	X
Hyde (R)	17%	17%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
Jackson, J. (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Johnson, Timothy (R)	25%	25%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-
Kirk (R)	25%	25%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-
LaHood (R)	17%	17%	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lipinski (D)	73%	67%	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	X	+	+	+
Manzullo (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Phelps (D)	67%	67%	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+
Rush (D)	100%	92%	+	+	X	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Schakowsky (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Shimkus (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Weller (R)	25%	25%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-
<u>Indiana</u>														
Burton (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	X	-	-	-
Buyer (R)	20%	17%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	X	+	-	X	-
Carson, J. (D)	100%	92%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	X	+	+	+
Hill (D)	91%	83%	-	+	+	+	+	X	+	+	+	+	+	+
Hostettler (R)	8%	8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-
Kerns (R)	8%	8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-
Pence (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Roemer (D)	92%	92%	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Souder (R)	17%	17%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-



	% Support When Voting	% Support All Votes	Bankruptcy Overhaul	Budget Resolution	Education Funding	Class Size Reduction	Faith-Based Initiative	Tax Cuts	Racial Profiling	Election Reform	Immigration	Food Stamps	Welfare Reauthorization	Labor Rights
Visclosky (D)	90%	75%	+	+	X	X	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+
<u>Iowa</u>														
Boswell (D)	83%	83%	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+
Ganske (R)	18%	17%	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	X	-	-
Latham (R)	25%	25%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-
Leach (R)	42%	42%	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	-	-
Nussle (R)	8%	8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
<u>Kansas</u>														
Moore (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Moran, Jerry (R)	17%	17%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-
Ryun, J. (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tiaht (R)	17%	17%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-
<u>Kentucky</u>														
Fletcher (R)	17%	17%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
Lewis, R. (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lucas, K. (D)	25%	25%	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
Northup (R)	17%	17%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
Rogers, H. (R)	17%	17%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
Whitfield (R)	8%	8%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<u>Louisiana</u>														
Baker (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cooksey (R)	8%	8%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Jefferson (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
John (D)	67%	67%	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+
McCrery (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tauzin (R)	17%	17%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
Vitter (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-



	% Support When Voting	% Support All Votes	Bankruptcy Overhaul	Budget Resolution	Education Funding	Class Size Reduction	Faith-Based Initiative	Tax Cuts	Racial Profiling	Election Reform	Immigration	Food Stamps	Welfare Reauthorization	Labor Rights
<u>Maine</u>														
Allen, T. (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Baldacci (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
<u>Maryland</u>														
Bartlett (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cardin (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Cummings (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Ehrlich (R)	8%	8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
Gilchrest (R)	20%	17%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	X	-	X
Hoyer (D)	92%	92%	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Morella (R)	67%	67%	-	-	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+
Wynn (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
<u>Massachusetts</u>														
Capuano (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Delahunt (D)	100%	92%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	X	+	+	+	+
Frank, Barney (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Lynch (D)	100%	58%	I	I	I	I	I	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Markey (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
McGovern (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Meehan (D)	100%	83%	+	+	+	+	X	+	+	+	+	+	+	X
Moakley (D)	100%	17%	+	+	X	X	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
Neal (D)	100%	92%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	X	+	+	+
Olver (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Tierney (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
<u>Michigan</u>														
Barcia (D)	83%	83%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	+
Bonior (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Camp (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-



	% Support When Voting	% Support All Votes	Bankruptcy Overhaul	Budget Resolution	Education Funding	Class Size Reduction	Faith-Based Initiative	Tax Cuts	Racial Profiling	Election Reform	Immigration	Food Stamps	Welfare Reauthorization	Labor Rights
Conyers (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Dingell (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Ehlers (R)	25%	25%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-
Hoekstra (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kildee (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Kilpatrick (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Knollenberg (R)	8%	8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
Levin, S. (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Rivers (D)	100%	92%	+	X	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Rogers, M. (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Smith, N. (R)	8%	8%	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stupak (D)	92%	92%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+
Upton (R)	8%	8%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<u>Minnesota</u>														
Gutknecht (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kennedy, M. (R)	8%	8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
Luther (D)	83%	83%	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+
McCollum (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Oberstar (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Peterson, C. (D)	58%	58%	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+
Ramstad (R)	17%	17%	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-
Sabo (D)	92%	92%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
<u>Mississippi</u>														
Pickering (R)	8%	8%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Shows (D)	50%	50%	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	+
Taylor, G. (D)	33%	33%	-	+	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+
Thompson, B. (D)	100%	92%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	X	+	+	+
Wicker (R)	8%	8%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-



	% Support When Voting	% Support All Votes	Bankruptcy Overhaul	Budget Resolution	Education Funding	Class Size Reduction	Faith-Based Initiative	Tax Cuts	Racial Profiling	Election Reform	Immigration	Food Stamps	Welfare Reauthorization	Labor Rights
<u>Missouri</u>														
Akin (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Blunt (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	X
Clay (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Emerson (R)	9%	8%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	X	-	-
Gephardt (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Graves (R)	8%	8%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hulshof (R)	8%	8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-
McCarthy, K. (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Skelton (D)	75%	75%	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+
<u>Montana</u>														
Rehberg (R)	8%	8%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<u>Nebraska</u>														
Bereuter (R)	8%	8%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Osborne (R)	25%	25%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-
Terry (R)	17%	17%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
<u>Nevada</u>														
Berkley (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Gibbons (R)	17%	17%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
<u>New Hampshire</u>														
Bass (R)	17%	17%	-	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sununu (R)	17%	17%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
<u>New Jersey</u>														
Andrews (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Ferguson (R)	17%	17%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-
Frelinghuysen (R)	8%	8%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Holt (D)	92%	92%	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
LoBiondo (R)	17%	17%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-



	% Support When Voting	% Support All Votes	Bankruptcy Overhaul	Budget Resolution	Education Funding	Class Size Reduction	Faith-Based Initiative	Tax Cuts	Racial Profiling	Election Reform	Immigration	Food Stamps	Welfare Reauthorization	Labor Rights
Menendez (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Pallone (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Pascrell (D)	92%	92%	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Payne (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Rothman (D)	100%	92%	X	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Roukema (R)	9%	8%	-	-	+	-	-	-	X	-	-	-	-	-
Saxton (R)	8%	8%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Smith, C. (R)	25%	25%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-
<u>New Mexico</u>														
Skeen (R)	25%	25%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-
Udall, T. (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Wilson, H. (R)	25%	25%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-
<u>New York</u>														
Ackerman (D)	100%	92%	X	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Boehlert (R)	25%	25%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-
Crowley (D)	92%	92%	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Engel (D)	100%	92%	+	+	+	+	X	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Fossella (R)	17%	17%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
Gilman (R)	25%	25%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-
Grucci (R)	25%	25%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-
Hinchey (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Houghton (R)	18%	17%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	X	-	-
Israel (D)	92%	92%	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+
Kelly (R)	25%	25%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-
King, P. (R)	27%	25%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	X	-
LaFalce (D)	92%	92%	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+
Lowey (D)	100%	92%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	X	+	+	+
Maloney, C. (D)	92%	92%	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+



	% Support When Voting	% Support All Votes	Bankruptcy Overhaul	Budget Resolution	Education Funding	Class Size Reduction	Faith-Based Initiative	Tax Cuts	Racial Profiling	Election Reform	Immigration	Food Stamps	Welfare Reauthorization	Labor Rights
McCarthy, C. (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
McHugh (R)	25%	25%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-
McNulty (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Meeks, G. (D)	100%	92%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	X	+	+
Nadler (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Owens (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Quinn (R)	36%	33%	-	-	+	-	-	+	X	-	+	+	-	-
Rangel (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Reynolds (R)	17%	17%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
Serrano (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Slaughter (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Sweeney (R)	18%	17%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	X	+	-	-
Towns (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Velazquez (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Walsh (R)	25%	25%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-
Weiner (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
<u>North Carolina</u>														
Ballenger (R)	8%	8%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Burr (R)	8%	8%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Clayton (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Coble (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Etheridge (D)	92%	92%	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+
Hayes (R)	8%	8%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Jones, W. (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
McIntyre (D)	75%	75%	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	+	+
Myrick (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Price, D. (D)	92%	92%	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+
Taylor, C. (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-



	% Support When Voting	% Support All Votes	Bankruptcy Overhaul	Budget Resolution	Education Funding	Class Size Reduction	Faith-Based Initiative	Tax Cuts	Racial Profiling	Election Reform	Immigration	Food Stamps	Welfare Reauthorization	Labor Rights
Watt, M. (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
<u>North Dakota</u>														
Pomeroy (D)	83%	83%	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+
<u>Ohio</u>														
Boehner (R)	17%	17%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
Brown, S. (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Chabot (R)	8%	8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
Gillmor (R)	25%	25%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-
Hall, T. (D)	83%	83%	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+
Hobson (R)	17%	17%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
Jones, S. (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Kaptur (D)	83%	83%	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	+
Kucinich (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
LaTourette (R)	18%	17%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	X	-	-
Ney (R)	17%	17%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
Oxley (R)	17%	17%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
Portman (R)	8%	8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
Pryce, D. (R)	18%	17%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	X	-	-
Regula (R)	17%	17%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
Sawyer (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Strickland (D)	92%	92%	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Tiberi (R)	8%	8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
Traficant (D)	25%	17%	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	-	X	X	X	I
<u>Oklahoma</u>														
Carson, B. (D)	83%	83%	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+
Istook (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Largent (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	I	I	I	I
Lucas, F. (R)	8%	8%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-



	% Support When Voting	% Support All Votes	Bankruptcy Overhaul	Budget Resolution	Education Funding	Class Size Reduction	Faith-Based Initiative	Tax Cuts	Racial Profiling	Election Reform	Immigration	Food Stamps	Welfare Reauthorization	Labor Rights
Sullivan (R)	0%	0%	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	-	-	-	-
Watkins (R)	17%	17%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
Watts, J.C. (R)	17%	17%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
<u>Oregon</u>														
Blumenauer (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
DeFazio (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Hooley (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Walden (R)	8%	8%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Wu (D)	83%	83%	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+
<u>Pennsylvania</u>														
Borski (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Brady, R. (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Coyne (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Doyle (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
English (R)	17%	17%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
Fattah (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Gekas (R)	17%	17%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-
Greenwood (R)	8%	8%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hart (R)	17%	17%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
Hoeffel (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Holden (D)	92%	92%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+
Kanjorski (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Mascara (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Murtha (D)	100%	92%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	X	+
Peterson, J. (R)	8%	8%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pitts (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Platts (R)	8%	8%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sherwood (R)	17%	17%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-



	% Support When Voting	% Support All Votes	Bankruptcy Overhaul	Budget Resolution	Education Funding	Class Size Reduction	Faith-Based Initiative	Tax Cuts	Racial Profiling	Election Reform	Immigration	Food Stamps	Welfare Reauthorization	Labor Rights
Shuster, Bill (R)	10%	8%	I	I	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Toomey (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Weldon, C. (R)	8%	8%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<u>Rhode Island</u>														
Kennedy, P. (D)	92%	92%	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Langevin (D)	92%	92%	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+
<u>South Carolina</u>														
Brown, H. (R)	8%	8%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Clyburn (D)	100%	92%	+	+	+	+	+	+	X	+	+	+	+	+
DeMint (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Graham, L. (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Spence (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	X	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
Spratt (D)	91%	83%	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	X	+	+
Wilson, J. (R)	0%	0%	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	-	-	-	-
<u>South Dakota</u>														
Thune (R)	25%	25%	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-
<u>Tennessee</u>														
Bryant (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Clement (D)	75%	75%	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	+
Duncan (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ford (D)	92%	92%	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Gordon, B. (D)	75%	75%	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	+
Hilleary (R)	9%	8%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	X	-	-	-
Jenkins (R)	8%	8%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tanner (D)	73%	67%	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	X	+
Wamp (R)	8%	8%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<u>Texas</u>														
Armey (R)	8%	8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-



	% Support When Voting	% Support All Votes	Bankruptcy Overhaul	Budget Resolution	Education Funding	Class Size Reduction	Faith-Based Initiative	Tax Cuts	Racial Profiling	Election Reform	Immigration	Food Stamps	Welfare Reauthorization	Labor Rights
Barton (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	X	-	-	-
Bentsen (D)	82%	75%	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	X	+	+	+
Bonilla (R)	17%	17%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
Brady, K. (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Combest (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	X	X
Culberson (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
DeLay (R)	8%	8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
Doggett (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Edwards, C. (D)	83%	83%	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+
Frost (D)	92%	92%	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Gonzalez (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Granger (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	X	-	-	-	-
Green, G. (D)	92%	92%	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+
Hall, R. (D)	17%	17%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-
Hinojosa (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Jackson-Lee, S. (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Johnson, Sam (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	X	-	-	-
Johnson, E.B. (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Lampson (D)	100%	92%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	X	+
Ortiz (D)	92%	92%	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+
Paul (R)	33%	33%	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	+	-
Reyes (D)	92%	92%	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+
Rodriguez (D)	100%	92%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	X	+	+
Sandlin (D)	92%	92%	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Sessions, P. (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Smith, L. (R)	8%	8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
Stenholm (D)	58%	58%	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
Thornberry (R)	8%	8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-



	% Support When Voting	% Support All Votes	Bankruptcy Overhaul	Budget Resolution	Education Funding	Class Size Reduction	Faith-Based Initiative	Tax Cuts	Racial Profiling	Election Reform	Immigration	Food Stamps	Welfare Reauthorization	Labor Rights
Turner (D)	83%	83%	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
<u>Utah</u>														
Cannon (R)	9%	8%	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
Hansen (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Matheson (D)	83%	83%	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+
<u>Vermont</u>														
Sanders (I)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
<u>Virginia</u>														
Boucher (D)	92%	92%	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Cantor (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Davis, Jo Ann (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Davis, T. (R)	25%	25%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-
Forbes (R)	0%	0%	I	I	I	I	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Goode (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Goodlatte (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Moran, James (D)	83%	83%	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+
Schrock (R)	8%	8%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Scott (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Sisisky (D)	0%	0%	-	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
Wolf (R)	8%	8%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<u>Washington</u>														
Baird (D)	82%	75%	X	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+
Dicks (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Dunn (R)	17%	17%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
Hastings, D. (R)	8%	8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
Inslee (D)	100%	92%	X	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Larsen, R. (D)	83%	83%	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+
McDermott (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+



	% Support When Voting	% Support All Votes	Bankruptcy Overhaul	Budget Resolution	Education Funding	Class Size Reduction	Faith-Based Initiative	Tax Cuts	Racial Profiling	Election Reform	Immigration	Food Stamps	Welfare Reauthorization	Labor Rights
Nethercutt (R)	17%	17%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
Smith, A. (D)	73%	67%	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	X	+	+
<u>West Virginia</u>														
Capito (R)	8%	8%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mollohan (D)	75%	75%	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+
Rahall (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
<u>Wisconsin</u>														
Baldwin (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Barrett (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Green, M. (R)	17%	17%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
Kind, R. (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Kleczka (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Obey (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Petri (R)	17%	17%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
Ryan, P. (R)	8%	8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
Sensenbrenner (R)	8%	8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
<u>Wyoming</u>														
Cubin (R)	0%	0%	-	X	X	X	-	X	X	X	-	-	-	-



VOTE DESCRIPTIONS

Senate Votes in the 107th Congress

Ashcroft Confirmation

Confirmation of John Ashcroft as United States Attorney General When President George W. Bush nominated former Sen. John Ashcroft (R-Mo.) for the position of U.S. attorney general, LCCR questioned Ashcroft's ability to enforce the very laws he had opposed throughout his career. As a senator, Ashcroft built a track record of opposition to civil rights, particularly on the issues of hate crimes and affirmative action, which underscored his lack of commitment to the rights of women and minorities and to equality for all.

LCCR opposed Ashcroft's nomination because of his extreme record of opposition to civil rights and liberties. On February 1, 2001, the Senate confirmed John Ashcroft as U.S. attorney general (58-42). A vote against the confirmation of John Ashcroft was a + vote. *First Session Roll No. 8 (2/1/2001)*.

Bankruptcy Overhaul

Predatory Lending (S. 420) During the Senate's consideration of the "Bankruptcy Reform Act of 2001," a bill to overhaul our nation's bankruptcy rules, Sen. Durbin (D-Ill.) offered an amendment to invalidate claims against borrowers if the creditor has committed material violations of the Truth in Lending Act. Sen. Hatch (R-Utah) made a motion to table (or kill) the Durbin amendment.

LCCR supported the Durbin amendment because creditors who engage in predatory lending through the commission of material violations of the Truth in Lending Act should not be rewarded by the bankruptcy system. Predatory lending practices, which can include a broad range of strategies that target and disproportionately affect vulnerable populations, particularly minority and low-income borrowers, female single-headed households and the elderly, too often lead minority families to foreclosure and minority neighborhoods to ruin. Today, predatory lending is one of the greatest threats to families working to achieve financial security.

The motion to table the Durbin amendment passed (50-49). A vote against the motion to table the Durbin amendment was a + vote. *First Session Roll No. 18 (3/8/2001)*.

Education Spending

Harkin Amendment to the FY02 Budget Resolution (H. Con. Res. 83) During consideration of the FY02 budget resolution, Sen. Harkin (D-Iowa) offered an amendment to reduce the size of the \$1.35 trillion tax cut (contained within the budget resolution) by \$448 billion and increase education spending by \$224 billion over ten years. The Harkin amendment would have provided full funding for special education through the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, doubled the budget for Title I (disadvantaged schools); increased the maximum Pell Grant by \$600 to \$4,350; increased funding for Head Start and school construction; tripled funding for



professional development to help close the digital divide; increased early intervention and college work-study funding; and continued funding toward the goal of hiring 100,000 new teachers. In addition, the Harkin amendment included an increase of approximately \$224 billion for debt reduction over ten years.

LCCR supported the Harkin amendment, which would have improved public education by providing additional resources.

The Senate adopted the Harkin amendment (53-47). However, the amendment was ultimately stripped from the final budget resolution conference report. A vote in favor of the Harkin Amendment was a + vote. *First Session Roll No. 69 (4/4/2001)*.

Community Technology Centers

Community Technology Centers (S. 1) On May 9, 2001, the Senate adopted (50-49) an amendment sponsored by Senators Mikulski (D-Md.) and Kennedy (D-Mass.) to create community technology centers in the Department of Education. This amendment was part of the Senate's work in overhauling the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). The purpose of the amendment was to assist eligible applicants to create or expand community technology centers that would provide disadvantaged residents of economically distressed urban and rural communities with access to information technology and related training. The program authorizes the Secretary of Education to award grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements on a competitive basis to create, expand, or provide technical assistance and support to community technology centers.

LCCR supported the Mikulski amendment because policies aimed at addressing the digital divide are a top Leadership Conference priority. In our society, economic disparities often translate into disparities in educational opportunity. This program, by providing access to information technology for those in urban and rural low-income communities, is an important step toward addressing that gap.

The Senate adopted the Mikulski amendment (50-49). A vote in favor of the Mikulski amendment was a + vote. *First Session Roll No. 96 (5/9/2001)*.

Budget Resolution

Fiscal Year 2002 Budget Resolution Limits Discretionary Spending

Includes \$1.35 Trillion Tax Cut (H. Con. Res. 83) The FY02 budget resolution would establish the Congressional budget for the U.S. for fiscal year 2002, as well as fiscal years 2002 to 2011. The plan heavily favored tax cuts over program increases – 88% of its total cost went to tax cuts, while 12% was left for increased program funding, leaving many programs under funded or in jeopardy.

LCCR opposed the final budget resolution because the sizeable tax cut squandered a historic opportunity to use a portion of the surplus to address unmet, critical needs of U.S. families, such



as restoring the solvency of Social Security, providing for a Medicare prescription drug benefit, and improving our nation's schools.

The Senate passed (53-47) the budget resolution conference report. A vote against passage was a + vote. *First Session Roll No. 98 (5/10/2001).*

Student Assessment

Student Testing (S. 1) The amendment, offered by Sen. Wellstone (D-Minn.) to the ESEA Reauthorization bill, would authorize funding to help states ensure high-quality tests and allow for consideration of multiple measures – rather than a single test – in evaluating schools and students. The Wellstone Amendment would have authorized \$200 million in FY2002 and additional funds in the subsequent six years to help states devise assessment systems that characterize student achievement in a variety of proficiencies.

LCCR supported this amendment sought to allow states to develop tests that are of higher quality and better meet the localized needs of their students, their parents, and their teachers. LCCR wants to make sure our states and school districts can design the kinds of tests that are comprehensive, have multiple measures, are coherent, actually measure what is being taught, and assess progress over time.

This Amendment was adopted (50-47). A vote in favor of the Wellstone amendment was a + vote. *First Session Roll No. 99 (5/10/2001).*

Bilingual Education

Bilingual Education (S. 1) This amendment, sponsored by Sen. Lincoln (D-Ark.) would authorize \$750 million in FY2002 for bilingual education programs. The funds would go toward: (1) providing that schools, local educational agencies, and States have the resources they need to assist all limited English proficient students in attaining proficiency in the English language; (2) providing for the development and implementation of bilingual education programs and language instruction educational programs that are tied to scientifically based research, and that effectively serve limited English proficient students; and (3) providing for the development of programs that strengthen and improve the professional training of educational personnel who work with limited English proficient students.

LCCR supports a commitment on the part of the federal government to give states the resources they need to help all limited English proficient students attain proficiency in the English language and achieve high levels of learning in all subjects.

The amendment was adopted (62-34). A vote in favor of the Lincoln amendment was a + vote. *First Session Roll No. 100 (5/10/02).*

Class Size Reduction

Class Size Reduction (S. 1) This amendment to the ESEA Reauthorization Bill, sponsored by Sen. Murray (D-Wash.), would restore class size reduction as a separate program within the Department of Education. The underlying bill combined class-size and professional development funds and did not ensure that funds would be spent to reduce class size. The amendment would set aside \$7.1 billion over five years to reduce class size by hiring more teachers.

LCCR supported this amendment because it would have maintained the integrity of the class size reduction initiative so that teachers have a greater opportunity to meet the learning needs of their students. Studies have clearly demonstrated the positive impact of class size reduction on teaching and learning.

The amendment was defeated (50-48). A vote in favor of the Murray amendment was a + vote. *First Session Roll No. 103 (5/15/2001).*

Tax Cuts

Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 (H.R. 1836) On May 26, 2001, the Senate approved the conference report on H.R. 1836, the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001, clearing the measure for the President. This bill offered a \$1.35 trillion tax cut package for individuals. Some provisions of the bill included a reduction in individual tax brackets, a phase-out of the estate tax, a one-time tax rebate for taxpayers who met an income requirement, a partially refundable child tax credit, and an expansion of benefits under the Earned Income Tax Credit for married couples who are both working.

LCCR opposed the tax cut legislation because it provided for a series of back-loaded tax cuts, overwhelmingly skewed to the wealthiest Americans, while jeopardizing the ability to fund other priorities that would benefit families, such as extending the solvency of Social Security, providing for a Medicare prescription drug benefit, reducing our national debt, and improving our nation's schools. Further, this agreement jeopardized resources and programs that are vital to our nation's small business, workforce, environmental protection, energy efficiency and housing needs.

The Senate agreed to the conference report on H.R. 1836 (58-33). A vote against approval of the conference report was a + vote. *First Session Roll No. 170 (5/26/2001).*

Access to School Facilities

Amendment to the Better Education for Students and Teachers Act (S. 1) During Senate consideration of S. 1, Sen. Jesse Helms (R-N.C.) offered an amendment to require federal educational funds to be withheld from any public elementary or secondary school that bars the Boy Scouts, or any other youth group that denies membership to gays and lesbians, access to school facilities, if the school allows any other group to use their facilities.



LCCR opposed this amendment because: 1) schools are already required to give all groups equal access to school facilities and it bestows upon the Boy Scouts and other youth groups unique rights that are not available to student-led groups and 2) the amendment imposes on local school boards authority to set standards for the use of their own facilities.

The Senate adopted the Helms amendment (51-49). A vote against the amendment was a + vote. *First Session Roll No. 189 (6/14/2001).*

Voting Rights

Restoring the Right to Vote (S. 565) This amendment, offered by Sen. Reid (D-Nev.) would restore the right to vote in federal elections to persons who have been previously convicted of a felony and who have fully served their prison sentences.

LCCR supported the Reid amendment because the right to vote is a fundamental right that should not be lost because a person has a prior felony conviction. A felony conviction should not equal a lifetime denial of the right to vote. This policy is a threat to our basic democratic values and its impact on the African American community is profound: of the 4 million Americans who are unable to vote because they have been convicted of a felony, 1.4 million are African-American men. That equals 13% of the entire adult African-American male population. In five states, including Florida, over ¼ of the adult male Black population is disenfranchised.

The Reid Amendment failed (31-63). A vote in favor of the Reid amendment was a + vote. *Second Session Roll No. 31 (2/14/2002).*

Election Reform

Photo Identification for First-Time Voters (S. 565) The Election Reform bill considered by the Senate included a provision that required first time voters who registered by mail to present photo identification or other proof of residency (such as a utility bill) to verify their identity. Sen. Schumer (D-N.Y.) introduced an amendment to permit the use of a signature, personal mark, or attestation for verification. Sen. Bond (R-Mo.) made a motion to table (or kill) the amendment.

LCCR supported the Schumer Amendment because the identification provisions included in the Senate bill would have a discriminatory impact on a large number of voters, especially people with disabilities, racial and ethnic minorities, students, the elderly, and the poor, who are substantially less likely to have photo identification than other voters. Additionally, having states implement this requirement prior to the 2004 presidential election, without the statewide list in place, is a dangerous experiment that runs the risk of creating additional chaos at the polls.

This motion failed (46-51). A vote against the Bond motion was a + vote. *Second Session Roll No. 38 (2/27/2002).*



Hate Crimes Prevention

Cloture Vote on the Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act of 2001 (S. 625) Current hate crimes law leaves federal prosecutors powerless to intervene in bias-motivated crimes when they cannot also establish that the crime was committed because of the victim's involvement in a "federally-protected activity" such as serving on a jury, attending a public school, or voting. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act (LLEEA) would enhance the federal response to hate crime violence by covering *all* violent crimes based on race, color, religion, or national origin. In addition, the LLEEA would permit federal involvement in the prosecution of bias-motivated crimes based on the victim's gender, sexual orientation, or disability. This expansion is critical in order to protect members of these groups from this most egregious form of discrimination.

LCCR supports S. 625 because hate crimes are serious, well-documented problems that remain inadequately prosecuted and recognized. LCCR believes that Congress must give law enforcement the tools it needs to combat this kind of violence and to help ensure that every American can live in an environment free of the terror brought on by hate violence.

The Senate voted on a motion on June 11, 2002, to invoke cloture on the hate crimes bill. Cloture limits debate and allows a vote on a bill while preventing opponents from offering unrelated amendments. The only way to have stopped a filibuster and allowed the Senate to debate and vote on the LLEEA would have been for 60 senators to vote "yes" on the cloture motion. The motion failed (54-43). A vote for cloture was a + vote. *Second Session Roll No. 147 (6/11/2002)*.

Labor Rights

Workers' Rights at the Department of Homeland Security (S. 2452) The Senate Government Affairs Committee, Chaired by Sen. Lieberman (D-Conn.) passed a bill to create a Department of Homeland Security that would consolidate twenty-two federal agencies into a single Department focused on protecting the United States against the threat of terrorism. Despite substantial agreement between the Senate bill and the Bush Administration's proposal, the Republicans in the Senate have continued to vote against ending debate on consideration of the bill because of language that protects the rights of workers. The Senate Republicans have refused to agree to a vote on the Government Affairs Committee bill unless it includes provisions that would give the Administration unprecedented and unchecked power to waive any and all civil service protections and collective bargaining rights, essentially rewriting the law wherever and whenever it sees fit.

LCCR supports retaining the bi-partisan provisions on civil service and collective bargaining in the Government Affairs Committee bill to create a Department of Homeland Security.

On September 26, 2002, a motion was filed to end debate on consideration of the bill, to allow the Senate to proceed to a vote. This motion was defeated (50-49) (60 votes are needed to end debate). A vote for cloture was a + vote. *Second Session Roll No. 226 (9/26/2002)*.



Senate Votes in the 107th Congress

	% Support When Voting	% Support All Votes	Ashcroft Confirmation	Bankruptcy Overhaul	Education Spending	Technology Centers	Budget Resolution	Student Assessment	Bilingual Education	Class Size Reduction	Tax Cuts	School Facilities	Voting Rights	Election Reform	Hate Crimes	Labor Rights
Alabama																
Sessions, J. (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Shelby (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Alaska																
Murkowski (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stevens (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	X	-	-	-
Arizona																
Kyl (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
McCain (R)	14%	14%	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-
Arkansas																
Hutchinson, T. (R)	7%	7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lincoln (D)	93%	93%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+
California																
Boxer (D)	100%	86%	+	+	+	+	+	X	X	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Feinstein (D)	86%	86%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	+
Colorado																
Allard (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Campbell, B. (R)	15%	14%	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	X	-	-	-
Connecticut																
Dodd (D)	86%	86%	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+
Lieberman (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Delaware																
Biden (D)	93%	93%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+
Carper (D)	93%	93%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+
Florida																
Graham, B. (D)	93%	93%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+
Nelson, Bill (D)	93%	93%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+



	% Support When Voting	% Support All Votes	Ashcroft Confirmation	Bankruptcy Overhaul	Education Spending	Technology Centers	Budget Resolution	Student Assessment	Bilingual Education	Class Size Reduction	Tax Cuts	School Facilities	Voting Rights	Election Reform	Hate Crimes	Labor Rights
Georgia																
Cleland (D)	86%	86%	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+
Miller, Z. (D)	38%	36%	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	X	-	-	+	+	+	-
Hawaii																
Akaka (D)	100%	86%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	X	X	+	+	+	+	+
Inouye (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Idaho																
Craig (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Crapo (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	X	X	-	-	-	-	-	X	-
Illinois																
Durbin (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Fitzgerald (R)	8%	7%	-	X	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Indiana																
Bayh (D)	93%	93%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+
Lugar (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Iowa																
Grassley (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Harkin (D)	93%	93%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+
Kansas																
Brownback (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Roberts (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kentucky																
Bunning (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
McConnell (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Louisiana																
Breaux (D)	62%	57%	-	+	+	+	-	+	X	+	-	-	-	+	+	+
Landrieu (D)	85%	79%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	X
Maine																



	% Support When Voting	% Support All Votes	Ashcroft Confirmation	Bankruptcy Overhaul	Education Spending	Technology Centers	Budget Resolution	Student Assessment	Bilingual Education	Class Size Reduction	Tax Cuts	School Facilities	Voting Rights	Election Reform	Hate Crimes	Labor Rights
Collins, S. (R)	21%	21%	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-
Snowe (R)	29%	29%	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	+	-
Maryland																
Mikulski (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Sarbanes (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Massachusetts																
Kennedy, E. (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Kerry, J. (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Michigan																
Levin, C. (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Stabenow (D)	93%	93%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+
Minnesota																
Dayton (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Wellstone (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Mississippi																
Cochran (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lott (R)	7%	7%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Missouri																
Bond (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	X	-
Carnahan (D)	79%	79%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	+
Montana																
Baucus, M. (D)	79%	79%	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	+
Burns (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nebraska																
Hagel (R)	7%	7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-
Nelson, Ben (D)	64%	64%	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	+
Nevada																
Ensign (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	X	X	-	-	-	-	X	-	-



	% Support When Voting	% Support All Votes	Ashcroft Confirmation	Bankruptcy Overhaul	Education Spending	Technology Centers	Budget Resolution	Student Assessment	Bilingual Education	Class Size Reduction	Tax Cuts	School Facilities	Voting Rights	Election Reform	Hate Crimes	Labor Rights
Reid, H. (D)	100%	93%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	X	+	+
New Hampshire																
Gregg (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Smith, R.C. (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
New Jersey																
Corzine (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Torricelli (D)	79%	79%	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	+
New Mexico																
Bingaman (D)	100%	93%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	X	+	+	+	+	+
Domenici (R)	8%	7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	X	-	X	-	-	-
New York																
Clinton (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Schumer (D)	93%	93%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+
North Carolina																
Edwards, J. (D)	93%	93%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+
Helms (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
North Dakota																
Conrad (D)	79%	79%	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+
Dorgan (D)	79%	79%	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+
Ohio																
DeWine (R)	14%	14%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	-
Voinovich (R)	14%	14%	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-
Oklahoma																
Inhofe (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nickles (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oregon																
Smith, G. (R)	23%	21%	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	X	+	+	-
Wyden (D)	93%	93%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+



	% Support When Voting	% Support All Votes	Ashcroft Confirmation	Bankruptcy Overhaul	Education Spending	Technology Centers	Budget Resolution	Student Assessment	Bilingual Education	Class Size Reduction	Tax Cuts	School Facilities	Voting Rights	Election Reform	Hate Crimes	Labor Rights
Pennsylvania																
Santorum (R)	7%	7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
Specter (R)	36%	36%	-	+	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	-	-
Rhode Island																
Chafee (R)	50%	50%	-	-	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+
Reed, J. (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
South Carolina																
Hollings (D)	93%	93%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+
Thurmond, S. (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
South Dakota																
Daschle (D)	93%	93%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+
Johnson, Tim (D)	71%	71%	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	+
Tennessee																
Frist (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Thompson, F. (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Texas																
Gramm, P. (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hutchison, K. (R)	7%	7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Utah																
Bennett (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	X	-	-	-
Hatch (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	X	X	-	-
Vermont																
Jeffords (I)	71%	71%	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+
Leahy (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Virginia																
Allen, G. (R)	7%	7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Warner (R)	7%	7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Washington																



	% Support When Voting	% Support All Votes	Ashcroft Confirmation	Bankruptcy Overhaul	Education Spending	Technology Centers	Budget Resolution	Student Assessment	Bilingual Education	Class Size Reduction	Tax Cuts	School Facilities	Voting Rights	Election Reform	Hate Crimes	Labor Rights
Cantwell (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Murray (D)	100%	93%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	X	+	+	+	+	+
West Virginia																
Byrd (D)	71%	71%	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+
Rockefeller (D)	93%	93%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+
Wisconsin																
Feingold (D)	93%	93%	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Kohl (D)	93%	93%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+
Wyoming																
Enzi (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	X	-	-	-	-	-
Thomas, C. (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-