

SENATE

1. DEFENSE DOWNSIZING (286)

Summary: AFGE opposed BRAC, particularly since it would give work to contractors without public-private competition.

AFGE is particularly opposed to any base closure and realignment process (BRAC) that institutionalizes the role of privatization-in-place (PIP). The Senate defense authorization bill explicitly allowed the next BRAC Commission to privatize-in-place facilities if it were “cost-effective.”

PIP would allow DoD to avoid closures required by BRAC by keeping the installations in operation through PIP and would help contractors by giving them work without public-private competition.

Taxpayers and federal employees are the real losers. When bases that are ordered closed by a BRAC commission are kept open through privatization-in-place, it’s an acknowledgement that either they never should have been closed in the first place or the work performed at those installations should have been shifted to other installations. That’s particularly unfair to the civilian employees who lose their federal jobs for no good reason. They should have been able to keep doing their work as federal employees at that installation or to follow their work to other installations. PIP is also bad for civilian employees who work on bases that aren’t closed or privatized-in-place. More than a few installations are suffering from excess capacity and need to secure additional work in order to become more cost-efficient. If work is not shifted from closed installations (because of PIP) to surviving installations, it just makes those surviving installations that much more vulnerable to the next BRAC.

PIP is also bad for taxpayers. BRAC is supposed to be about reducing DoD’s unneeded infrastructure so as to minimize excess capacity. However, PIP is all about maintaining excess capacity—as long as it can be shifted to the private sector. Here’s what the General Accounting Office had to say about PIP:

“As a general rule, privatization-in-place has not optimized reductions in excess capacity and operating costs in the infrastructure owned and operated by the Department of Defense—a major base realignment and closure objective. Rather than closing facilities and transferring defense work to other underutilized defense facilities in the public or private sector to reduce excess capacity, privatization-in-place allows work to remain at the original sites to be performed by the private sector. While the Department no longer owns the infrastructure, it continues to support it through payments for contract work performed at those facilities. Indirectly, the Department continues

to pay for excess capacity, and as a result, the goal of eliminating excess capacity may be realized more in form than in substance.”

If there has to be BRAC, then it should be used for its actual purpose: making DoD more efficient through the reduction of *genuinely* excess infrastructure. If DoD wants to shift even more work to the private sector, then Pentagon privateers should be required to subject such work to the usual public-private competition process.

Senator Jim Bunning (R-KY) offered an amendment to strike the provision in the defense authorization bill (S. 1438) that authorized additional BRAC in 2003. On September 25, Senator John Warner offered a motion to kill the Bunning anti-BRAC amendment. Although opposed by AFGE, the Warner motion passed by a vote of 53-47. In the conference to the defense authorization bill, House conferees managed to push BRAC back to 2005.

2. BOOSTING DVA’S BUDGET (84)

Summary: AFGE supported an effort to increase the ability of DVA’s hard-working employees to provide the nation’s veterans with the health care that they have earned through their service and sacrifice.

AFGE supported an amendment offered by Senator Paul Wellstone (D-MN) to the budget resolution (H. Con. Res. 83) that would have provided the Department of Veterans Affairs (DVA) with a much-needed funding increase. The money necessary to pay for better veterans care would have come from a slight reduction in the massive tax cuts called for elsewhere in the measure for corporations and the wealthy.

Senator Tim Johnson (D-SD), a cosponsor of Senator Wellstone’s amendment, declared that, “While I am pleased that this budget includes an increase in outlays, I am disappointed that it falls short of the funding level proposed in the authoritative Independent Budget endorsed by 40 veterans groups and medical societies, including AMVETS, the Disabled American Veterans, the Paralyzed Veterans of America, and the VFW.

“That is why I join Senator Wellstone in offering an amendment today that would increase appropriations for veterans health care by \$1.718 billion over the Budget Committee’s level. With our amendment, the Senate budget resolution would include an increase in appropriations of \$2.6 billion for veterans health care over last year’s funding level. Our amendment pays for this increase in health care for our nation’s veterans with a modest decrease in the \$1.6 trillion in tax cuts proposed by the President. For a number of years, the VA had to contend with a flat-line appropriation for veterans’ health care as the cost of health care far outpaced the rate of inflation. As a result, the VA experienced

deep cuts at a time when it should have been addressing the growing need for medical care for this country's veterans.

“Without a total increase of \$2.6 billion above last year's appropriation in veterans health care, the VA will likely be unable to address the treatment of Hepatitis C, emergency medical services, increased costs due to medical inflation, and long-term care initiatives. The Independent Budget highlights the need to increase funding in a number of important health care initiatives including: an additional \$523 million for mental health care; an additional \$848 million for long-term care; an additional \$25 million to restore the Spinal Cord Injury program; an additional \$75 million to help homeless veterans.”

Senator Wellstone framed the debate succinctly: “It is a simple question of priorities: the country can honor its commitment to our citizen-soldiers who carried the battle over there, or we can institute a tax cut that mostly benefits the very wealthiest people who least need one...The VA health care budget has experienced deep cuts in real terms over the past decade, at a time when it should have been addressing the needs of an aging and increasingly health care-dependent veterans population.”

On April 6, Senator Wellstone's amendment was approved by a vote of 53-46. Ultimately, however, the Congress did not agree to increase DVA's budget to the extent sought by Senator Wellstone.

3. WORKPLACE HEALTH (15)

Summary: AFGE opposed legislation that disapproved of a sensible ergonomics rule to promote workplace health and safety.

AFGE and the rest of the labor movement strongly opposed a joint resolution (S. J. Res. 6) that would put the Congress on record as opposing a sensible rule issued by the Clinton Administration to promote workplace health and safety.

Senator Paul Wellstone (D-MN), who was one of the leaders of the effort to defend the ergonomics rule from attacks by Big Business, reported that “(e)ach year, there are 1.8 million workers who suffer from ergonomics disorders... 600,000 men and women have injuries so severe they are forced to take off work...I think this is a class issue...I think precious few Senators really understand what these statistics mean in personal terms because, frankly, we are talking about a part of the population that is not well represented in the Congress, not well represented in the Senate. We are talking about working-class people. I do not think most Senators have loved ones who are doing this work, whether it is blue-collar work or white-collar work...Frankly, there are interests that for 10 years have done everything they could to oppose any kind of rule providing people at the workplace with this protection...

“(The ergonomics rule is) not complicated: One, the standard simply calls for employers to provide employees with basic information about ergonomic disorders so that if you are working and you are experiencing these symptoms, you know what is happening to you before it is too late. Then the employer need not do anything more, that is, unless a worker or an employee reports a disorder or a symptom which is a sign of the disorder. The worker says: I can barely move my wrist; my fingers are swelling; I am in pain. Then there is a problem. First the employer lets the workers know, gives them information so people can understand what might be happening to them. That is a terrible idea?”

“Then if the employee should come to the employer and say, I have a problem, it is up to the employer to determine whether or not what has been reported is an ergonomic incident. There are clear criteria laid out. If that threshold is reached, then the employer is obliged to work with his or her employees to identify and analyze the hazards and develop a program to deal with those hazards...”

“(P)aying attention to ergonomics...is cost effective. Estimates are that the \$4.5 billion annually it will take to implement these standards will result in \$9.1 billion annually of savings which are recouped from the lost productivity, lost tax payments, administrative costs, and workers comp. You do the prevention. We have this rule. You have this standard. You prevent injuries. You have more productivity. Workers are not absent from work, and you have fewer workers comp claims. We have also lived up to our values: We have provided protection for hard-working people.”

Despite the opposition of AFGE and the rest of the labor movement, the Senate repealed the pro-worker health and safety rule, on March 6, by a vote of 56-44. The House passed a similar measure.

4. PAYCHECK DECEPTION (46)

Summary: AFGE opposed an effort to penalize unions for aggressively representing the interests of their members in the political process.

In an obvious effort to punish organized labor for steadfastly standing up for the interests of working Americans, President Bush and Senate Republican leaders attempted to add a “paycheck deception” amendment to the campaign finance legislation (S. 27).

“‘Paycheck protection’ arose as a direct response to organized labor’s aggressive education and mobilization efforts among working families that in 1996 and 1998 energized millions of members of union households to vote for pro-worker members of Congress,” Laurence E. Gold, AFL-CIO associate general counsel, told the Senate in 1999. “Working families had an even greater

impact on the 2000 elections, narrowing the anti-worker majority in the House, winning enough Senate races to evenly split that body and with a huge mobilization and turnout, almost denying President Bush the White House.”

Since taking office President Bush and his supporters have reiterated their call for a "paycheck deception" provision in any campaign reform legislation, supposedly to "protect" union members. But as Mr. Gold told the Senate, the U.S. Supreme Court's 1988 Beck decision gives union-represented employees who object to their union's political, legislative or other non-collective bargaining actions a mechanism to "opt out."

On March 23, the Senate rejected this latest effort at condemning union members to "paycheck deception," by a vote of 53-40.

5. SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION (108)

Summary: AFGE endorsed legislation to increase spending for necessary school construction.

AFGE supported an amendment to an education bill (S. 1) to authorize spending for the construction and renovation of public elementary and secondary school buildings.

As Senator Tom Harkin (D-IA), the author of the amendment, noted on the floor: "Our children deserve the best when it comes to education--all children; not just a few but all. It is not right that some kids get the best in schooling and the best of teachers and the best of school buildings and other kids are put into rundown, dilapidated, old buildings that are not even safe as far as fire and safety codes go. Children deserve modern school buildings with access to technology. They deserve small classes so they can get the teacher's attention when they need extra help. It is not just our kids who deserve this, it is the future of our country that deserves this, cries out for it, demands it..."

"The average school building in the United States is 42 years old...Seventy-five percent of our Nation's school buildings are inadequate. The average cost of capital investments needed to upgrade and replace our schools is \$3,800 per student. Since 1998, the total need has increased from \$112 billion to \$127 billion. That is just to bring the existing public schools, elementary and secondary schools we have in America, up to fire and safety code and to upgrade them in terms of the latest technology. It does not refer to the amount of money we are going to need to build the new school buildings." That is going to require a lot more money in the future. Right now we have an all-time high of \$53.2 billion. This will grow. Over the next 10 years, it is going to be necessary to build an additional 6,000 schools. That number is not even reflected here. This \$127 billion is needed now to repair and modernize existing schools."

Although supported by AFGE and the rest of the labor movement, Senator Harkin's amendment was defeated by a vote of 49-50, on May 16.

6. SCHOOL VOUCHERS (179)

Summary: AFGE opposed a demonstration voucher program because it would have weakened the nation's public schools.

AFGE, like the AFL-CIO and its affiliates, opposed an effort by Senator Judd Gregg (R-NH) to add an amendment to an education bill to establish a school voucher demonstration program. AFGE opposes vouchers because public funding of private or religious education transfers precious tax dollars from public schools—which are free and open to all children, accountable to taxpayers and parents alike, and essential to our democracy—to private and religious schools that charge for their services, select their students on the basis of religious or academic or family or personal characteristics, and are accountable only to their boards and clients.

Senator Patty Murray (D-WA) opposed Senator Gregg's amendment because, she said, it would have moved "this country and our public schools in the wrong direction. All of us stand for equal opportunity for all children. This amendment might open doors to a few children, but it would shut them for many others. In the Senate, we are fighting to improve our public schools with resources. This amendment uses public funds to send a few students to private schools rather than investing in schools that serve all of our children. We need to think about the consequences of this voucher amendment. In the bill before us, we are insisting on accountability for the use of Federal funds. This voucher program would funnel taxpayer dollars into schools that are not accountable to the public at all. Beyond lack of accountability, let's remember that private schools don't even have to meet the same academic standards required for all public schools. Not all private schools are created equal. There are a lot of good ones, but there are some with lower quality and lower standards, and our tax dollars would go to them as well with no accountability...Vouchers undermine our public schools; vouchers leave children behind; vouchers mean less accountability; and vouchers are a distraction from the hard but essential work of ensuring that all public schools are good schools."

Those who support a strong public school system managed to prevail when Senator Gregg's amendment was defeated, on June 12, by a vote of 41-58.

7. DANGEROUS TRUCKS (250)

Summary: AFGE supported an effort to ensure that foreign trucks operating in the U.S. meet the same standards as American trucks.

AFGE, like other AFL-CIO affiliates, supported the efforts of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters to safeguard American highways from the threat of dangerous foreign trucks. According to the Teamsters, “as many as 25% of trucks coming to the U.S. from Mexico contain toxic or hazardous materials. According to a recent independent study, only 1 out of 14 of those trucks are properly marked to show the dangerous chemicals that are inside. As the recent GAO study shows, no border inspection program can ensure that the significant deficiencies in the condition and safety of trucks in Mexico will disappear once they cross the border.” Also according to the Teamsters, Mexican trucks are three times as old as U.S. trucks, up to twice as heavy, not required to comply with the same tough guidelines for air emissions placed on U.S. trucks, and not necessarily insured to operate in the U.S.

AFGE supported an amendment to the Transportation Appropriations Bill (H.R. 2299) offered by Senator Patty Murray (D-WA) to establish a border truck inspection program to allow Mexican trucks to receive three-month permits if they pass rigorous safety inspections. An AFGE-supported motion to kill a hostile amendment to the Murray amendment was passed, on July 25, by a vote of 65-35. Although the Bush Administration fought successfully to water down some of the safety provisions, the agreement that emerged from the conference report was based on the original Murray amendment.

8. HELPING AVIATION WORKERS (293)

Summary: AFGE supported legislation to help aviation workers who lost their jobs in the aftermath of the September 11 terrorist attacks, particularly since the airlines for whom they worked had already received a massive bailout.

On October 11, Senator Jean Carnahan (D-MO) offered an amendment to the aviation security legislation that would have authorized \$1.9 billion over the next two years to extend unemployment, job-training, and health benefits to aviation industry workers displaced because of the September 11 terrorist attacks.

As Senator Carnahan noted, the Senate “acted swiftly and with unity in response to the September 11 terrorist attacks. We...created a \$15 billion relief package to help stabilize our Nation's airlines...but we have not yet acted on behalf of the tens of thousands of Americans who have lost their jobs as a result of these attacks. Now is the time to do something for the workers...We cannot delay any longer. Some of my colleagues have spoken in opposition to my amendment, by

arguing that we have already helped airline workers by providing assistance to airlines. That is only half right. By helping the airlines avoid bankruptcy, we saved many jobs. However, we have not done anything for the families of the 140,000 airline industry employees who are losing their jobs despite the airline stabilization package. The \$15 billion we gave to the airlines is not helping those families pay their mortgage. That money is not helping them put food on the dinner table. And that money certainly is not helping them pay for health insurance for their families. The modest assistance provided in this amendment will help these families deal with a tough situation.”

While the Senate was willing to bail out the airline industry, the Senate couldn't bring itself to provide assistance to displaced airline industry workers, rejecting Senator Carnahan's amendment by a vote of 56-44. (Sixty votes were necessary to overcome a filibuster against Senator Carnahan's amendment.)

9. BAD BUDGET RESOLUTION (98)

Summary: AFGE strongly opposed a budget resolution that included tax cuts for corporations and the wealthy so large that they would eat up the hard-earned surpluses and then generate substantial federal deficits.

AFGE strongly opposed the budget resolution conference report (H. Con. Res. 83), which the Senate passed by a vote of 53-47, on May 10. Among other things, the measure called for a \$1.35 trillion tax cut in fiscal years 2001-2011. Such a huge tax cut is fiscally irresponsible: it will absorb the entire federal budget surplus over the next decade and even generate a budget deficit of over \$1 trillion.

Federal employees know what federal budget deficits mean. The programs they care about and the service they work so hard to deliver will be drastically reduced. For federal employees personally, budget deficits mean being forced to suffer cuts in their jobs, pay, health care benefits, and retirement benefits. Indeed, federal employees know this from experience, having endured cuts of more than \$200 billion in the past 20 years to help get the federal budget in balance. For federal employees, the budget resolution, with its fiscally irresponsible tax cut, could be a potentially disastrous “Back to the Future.”

10. BAD INCOME TAX CUT (165)

Summary: AFGE opposed a tax cut bill that will force the federal government into deficit in order to provide tax cuts to the wealthy.

The Senate on May 23 approved, 62-38, an 11-year, \$1.35 trillion tax cut bill (H.R. 1836) that included the main elements of President Bush's tax cut proposal.

The final vote came after the rejection of several amendments designed to shift more tax cut benefits to middle- and lower-income people, and to trim the overall size of the tax cut in order to provide funding for Social Security, a Medicare prescription drug benefit, and public education.

AFGE strongly opposed the tax cut bill because it is fiscally irresponsible, absorbing the entire federal budget surplus over the next decade and then generating a budget deficit of over \$1 trillion. The legislation is also fundamentally unfair in that its benefits are heavily skewed toward the richest one percent and away from middle- and lower-income working families.

11. ECONOMIC STIMULUS (338)

Summary: AFGE supported an economic stimulus package that would have helped workers as well as businesses.

On November 14, the Senate rejected a carefully-crafted stimulus package to boost an economy that is suffering from a months-long slowdown and the aftershock of the September 11 terrorist attacks.

This stimulus package, which had been endorsed by the AFL-CIO and its affiliates, evenly divided its funds between helping workers and cutting taxes. A stimulus package that had been passed earlier by the House (H.R. 3090) was devoted almost entirely to cutting taxes for corporations and the wealthy.

The Senate's pro-labor stimulus package, by contrast, extended unemployment insurance benefits by an additional 13 weeks for all workers who exhaust their regular benefits; provided a modest increase in weekly benefits; and provided benefits to part-time and low-wage workers who have paid into the unemployment fund but do not qualify for benefits in many states. The legislation also provided a 75 percent premium subsidy for laid-off workers and their families to maintain their health insurance coverage under a special federal program. It also established a temporary state Medicaid program for workers without employer-provided health insurance, and provided additional funds for states to spend on Medicaid.

The pro-labor stimulus package was offered by Senator Max Baucus (D-MT) as an amendment to H.R. 3090. Senator Pete Domenici (R-NM) raised a point of order against Senator Baucus' amendment, asserting that it was in violation of the Budget Act. Senator Baucus' motion to waive the law generated a majority of votes, 51-47, but fell short of the required three-fifths majority. Ultimately, the Congress and the President were unable to agree on any economic stimulus package.

12. PRESCRIPTION DRUGS (117)

Summary: AFGE supported legislation that would have merely delayed a tax cut for the very wealthy until all Americans were given prescription drug coverage.

AFGE supported an amendment offered by Senator Jay Rockefeller (D-WV) to H.R. 1836 that would have delayed its tax cut for the wealthiest Americans until a subsequent law had been enacted to ensure prescription drug coverage for all Americans.

As Senator Rockefeller declared, “(M)y amendment is a very simple one. It asks Senators to choose between whether or not they would rather first implement...a universal prescription drug provision for all Americans before the top income tax bracket reduction would become available. It does not eliminate the income tax reduction. It only says we have to do the prescription drug provision first. We have a year and a half to do it. That is plenty of time.”

Senator Charles Grassley (R-IA) insisted that Senator Rockefeller’s amendment was in violation of the Budget Act. Senator Rockefeller’s motion to waive the Budget Act failed, by a vote of 48-51, on May 21.

13. PATIENTS’ BILL OF RIGHTS (220)

Summary: AFGE supported a real Patients’ Bill of Rights that would make health care providers accountable to all Americans.

Despite the threat of a veto by President Bush, the Senate passed a real Patients’ Bill of Rights (S. 1052) to make health care more accountable for all Americans, on June 29, by a vote of 59-36.

Senate Majority Leader Tom Daschle (D-SD) described the legislation in the days before the vote: “This bill ensures that doctors, not insurance companies, make medical decisions. It guarantees patients the right to hear all treatment options, not just the cheapest ones. It says you have the right to go to the nearest emergency room when you need emergency care. It guarantees you the right to see a specialist if you need one. It gives women the right to see an obstetrician-gynecologist without having to see another doctor to get permission. And it guarantees that parents can choose a pediatrician as their child’s primary care provider. But rights without remedies are no rights at all. That is why our bill guarantees people the right to appeal decisions by their Health Maintenance Organization (HMO) to an independent review board, and get a timely response. Finally, our bill allows people to hold HMO’s accountable when their decisions harm patients—the same way doctors and employers—and everyone else in America—is held accountable for their actions...”

“Opponents will claim that guaranteeing these rights will cost too much. They say people will lose their insurance because insurance premiums will go through the roof. The facts show otherwise. According to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, (S. 1052) would increase employee premiums an average of about \$1.20 a month for real rights that can be enforced--\$1.20 a month.”

Despite the efforts of Senator Daschle and his likeminded colleagues, the Congress was unable to come to an agreement with the President on a real Patients’ Bill of Rights.

14. ASHCROFT NOMINATION (8)

Summary: AFGE opposed the confirmation of former Senator Ashcroft to be Attorney General because of his consistently anti-labor record.

The President’s nomination of former Senator John Ashcroft (R-MO) to be the Attorney General raised concerns throughout the nation’s progressive community. Given Mr. Ashcroft’s dogged opposition to desegregating St. Louis, MO, public schools, his unfair treatment of presidential judicial nominees, and his consistent opposition to basic worker protections, the AFL-CIO and its affiliates opposed Ashcroft’s confirmation.

As the AFL-CIO pointed out, as a Senator, Mr. Ashcroft “led the fight to gut overtime pay protections, sponsoring unsuccessful legislation that would have replaced the 40-hour work week with an 80-hours-over-two-weeks frame for computing overtime eligibility. In addition, the bill would have allowed employers to substitute comp time for overtime pay. Mr. Ashcroft has also supported so-called paycheck protection proposals and the TEAM Act, which could legitimize company unions, and voted against prevailing wage protections on taxpayer-funded federal construction projects. He voted to raise the caps on the number of skilled worker and agricultural guestworker visas. He voted against a universal Medicare prescription drug benefit for the elderly and disabled. He voted to repeal affirmative action programs. And in 1996, he was one of only 24 Senators who voted against raising the minimum wage.” During his tenure as Governor of Missouri, Ashcroft compiled a similar anti-worker record, according to the AFL-CIO.

However, the Senate voted to confirm Ashcroft’s nomination, by a vote of 58-42, on February 1.

15. GRAHAM CONFIRMATION (242)

Summary: AFGE opposed the confirmation of a controversial academic to be the nation's top regulation reviewer because he had opposed important health, safety, and environmental regulations.

Exacerbating concerns that the Administration was working with Big Business to roll back sensible health, safety, and environmental regulations that protect countless Americans, the President nominated controversial academic John Graham to be the Administrator for the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, a little known part of the all-powerful Office of Management and Budget that is responsible for reviewing rules and regulations proposed by agencies before they can be implemented.

As the AFL-CIO pointed out, "For years as Director of the Harvard Center for Risk Analysis, Dr. Graham has repeatedly taken the position that cost and economic efficiency should be a more important, if not the determinative consideration, in setting standards and regulation. He has argued for the use of strict cost-benefit and cost-efficiency analysis, even though for many workplace safety and environmental regulations, such analyses are not appropriate or possible or are explicitly prohibited by the underlying statute. If Dr. Graham's views dictated public policy, workplace regulations like benzene and cotton dust would not have been issued because the benefit of these rules are hard to quantify and are diminished because they occur over many years. Similarly, regulations pertaining to rare catastrophic events such as chemical plant explosions or common sense requirements like those for lighted exit signs couldn't pass Dr. Graham's strict cost-benefit test."

Dr. Graham's nomination was confirmed, by a vote of 61-37, on July 19.

	BRAC	Veterans	Ergonomics	Paycheck Deception	School Construction	Vouchers	Trucks	Aviation Workers	Budget	Tax Cut	Stimulus	Prescription Drugs	Patients Rights	Ashcroft	Graham	AFGE Score
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	
Vermont																
Patrick Leahy (D)	W	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	93
James Jeffords (I)	W	R	W	R	W	R	R	R	R	W	R	R	W	W	W	53
Washington																
Patty Murray (D)	R	R	R	?	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	100
Maria Cantwell (D)	W	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	93
Wisconsin																
Herb Kohl (D)	W	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	W	R	R	R	R	R	87
Russell Feingold (D)	W	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	W	W	80
West Virginia																
Robert Byrd (D)	W	R	R	R	R	W	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	W	W	73
John Rockefeller (D)	W	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	93
Wyoming																
Craig Thomas (R)	R	W	W	W	W	R	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	13
Michael Enzi (R)	W	W	W	W	W	R	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	7

KEY

- R Voted Right
- W Voted Wrong
- ? Did Not Vote