

INTRODUCTION

The American Federation of Government Employees, AFL-CIO, is the largest federal employee union, representing 600,000 workers across the nation and overseas. Workers in virtually every function of government depend upon AFGE for legal, legislative, technical and informational services.

AFGE believes it has a responsibility to help provide good government, while ensuring that good government workers are treated fairly and equitably. In order to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of government services, federal employees must be viewed as valuable resources rather than easy targets. The union is committed to protecting and enhancing the rights of federal workers and the people who depend upon their services.

AFGE is proud to represent federal workers who touch almost every aspect of American life on a daily basis. Federal workers inspect the food we eat and the places in which we work. They protect Americans from the illicit flow of drugs, maintain the safety of the nation's borders, and keep the national defense systems prepared against any danger. They perform the duties of food inspectors, nurses, printers, cartographers, lawyers, police officers, census workers, OSHA inspectors, janitors, truck drivers, secretaries, artists, plumbers, immigration inspectors, scientists, doctors, cowboys, botanists, park rangers, computer programmers, foreign service workers, airplane mechanics, environmentalists, and writers. Like other working Americans, federal employees worry about their families, are concerned about the economy, pay their taxes, and vote.

As a labor union, AFGE is in a unique position because it is not afforded the same full-scope collective bargaining rights as unions representing private sector workers. For this reason, in addition to negotiating working conditions at the bargaining table, AFGE relies on a comprehensive legislative and political action program to deal with issues that impact the federal workforce. Issues concerning federal employee pay and benefits are ultimately decided by Congress and battles are waged on Capitol Hill to save vital government programs administered to the American public by federal workers. The following Congressional votes directly impact federal employees and other working Americans.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

1. BETTER PAY FOR THE WORKING POOR

AFGE and the rest of the labor community supported an overdue increase in the minimum wage by \$1 over two years, to \$6.15 per hour, in order to increase the standard of living of millions of families with breadwinners earning at or near the minimum wage level. The business community mounted a fierce effort to water down this increase, by stretching it out over three years. With the backing of the labor movement, however, the House passed an amendment to provide the \$1 increase, by a vote of 246-179, on March 9.

The hourly pay rate of many federal employees—including food service workers, janitors, laborers, switchboard operators, and file clerks—is connected to the minimum wage, both directly and indirectly. Some 27,500 Department of Defense (DoD) employees would see a pay increase if the minimum wage were increased. An increase in the minimum wage would help the approximately 150,000 federal employees who work at the DoD exchanges and are paid through non-appropriated funds, due to increases in prevailing wages. The 3,000 workers in the Department of Veterans Affairs Canteen Service would also benefit from an increase in the minimum wage, again from rising prevailing wages. And the 225,000 federal wage-grade employees who work in the crafts and trades would also benefit because of the impact on their private sector counterparts.

This minimum wage increase was added to a tax cut bill that was not enacted.

2. ENSHRINING AN ANTI-SPENDING BIAS IN THE CONSTITUTION

AFGE opposed the Tax Limitation Constitutional Amendment (H. J. Res. 94) which would have enshrined an anti-spending bias in the Constitution by requiring a two-thirds majority vote in both the House and the Senate in order to raise taxes. This fiscal straitjacket could only be removed if the nation goes to war or became engaged in a military conflict that threatens national security.

Since it would be nearly impossible to increase revenues, the Congress would instead be forced to eliminate important government programs and lay off valuable federal employees in order to reduce deficits. While cutting spending can be an appropriate mechanism to ensure that revenues and expenditures approximate one another, the Tax Limitation Constitutional Amendment would make cutting spending the only method to achieve deficit reduction.

When the measure was considered by the House on April 12, the vote in favor was 234-192, a margin insufficient for passage. (A two-thirds majority of those present and voting—284 in this case—is necessary to pass a Constitutional amendment.)

3. BAD BUDGET PLAN

AFGE opposed the budget resolution (H. Con. Res. 290) because it called for tax cuts for wealthier Americans and reduced funding for some domestic programs. AFGE believes that money for tax cuts would be more properly spent on making even stronger important programs like Social Security and Medicare. The budget resolution was approved, however narrowly, by a vote of 220-208, on April 13.

4. PUTTING THE GOVERNMENT ON AUTOMATIC PILOT

AFGE opposed an amendment to a budget process reform bill (H.R. 853) that was intended to prevent government shutdowns by funding agencies that do not receive their appropriations in time at the previous year's funding level.

As the union that forced the radical leaders of the 104th Congress to back down and reopen the federal government, there is no doubting the strength of AFGE's opposition to the use of shutdowns—or even threats of shutdowns—by lawmakers to gain an unfair advantage in the annual battles over the budget.

However, the way to prevent shutdowns is not to put the federal government on automatic pilot. Until the 104th Congress, shutdowns had been relatively brief, with little disruption of important governmental services. It was only when the House leadership was seized by lawmakers who deliberately staged two prolonged shutdowns—with the express aims of humiliating federal employees and ramming radical changes through the legislative process—that the prospect of closing down agencies or forcing federal employees to work without pay became a subject of speculation at the end of every fiscal year.

The best way to prevent government shutdowns is for lawmakers and the Administration to work in a bipartisan manner to craft the thirteen appropriations bills; when agreement on any or all of those funding measures is impossible, they should enact into law continuing resolutions, temporary funding measures, that last long enough for differences to be reconciled and the regular appropriations process resumed. Simply funding agencies at the previous year's spending levels on an open-ended basis would not give lawmakers any incentive to enact new appropriations measures. Agencies' workloads change and the Congress is obligated to review in a timely fashion agencies' funding needs. Sometimes, agencies will need more money; other times, they may need less.

Clearly, decisions on these crucial funding issues should be made by lawmakers, instead of being left to whatever was put into last year's legislation. It must also be noted that some lawmakers would use the automatic pilot to prevent agencies from receiving the increased appropriations necessary to handle increased workloads. Because the automatic pilot process is open-ended—in theory, it could last until the end of the fiscal year—the Congress would have an

institutional bias against increasing the nation's investment in an effective, efficient, and reliable federal government.

The House accepted AFGE's position and rejected the amendment, on May 16, by a vote of 173-236.

5. AGREEING TO A BAD TRADE DEAL WITH CHINA

AFGE, the AFL-CIO and all of its other affiliates strongly opposed Permanent Normal Trading Relations (PNTR) status for China for several reasons:

The various proposals pending for granting China PNTR status while still somehow creating alternative mechanisms for reviewing China's behavior with respect to trade agreements, human rights, labor rights, and environmental protections were all fig leaves. Such reviews are meaningless without the economic leverage currently held by the U.S. in its trading relationship with China to back them up. As few would disagree, China's conduct on all four of those issues is actually becoming worse and even more disgraceful.

The distrust that the American people have for China as a trading partner is well-founded. The most recent State Department report on China's human rights indicated that conditions in that nation "deteriorated markedly through the year, as the Government intensified efforts to suppress dissent". What makes such a report even more chilling is that Government officials understand that China's bid for enhanced trading relations meant their actions would undergo international scrutiny--and they still conducted themselves deplorably. How will they act, we can only wonder, when they have all that they want?

Giving PNTR status to China means the U.S. gives up its right to impose unilateral trade sanctions against China for both human and labor rights violations. Now, the only option left is to use a multilateral dispute mechanism that may sanction China only for violation of World Trade Organization free trade rules—but not for violations of human and labor rights. Moreover, such dispute mechanisms will not be useful, even with respect to trade, in disciplining China for the massive violations we can expect, given their well-documented record of noncompliance with existing trade agreements.

On May 24, the House voted against working Americans and granted PNTR status to China, by a vote of 237-197. Although that loss was a big disappointment, the labor movement made great strides as a result of its strong fight against China PNTR.

We in the labor movement knew from the beginning that the defeat of the Administration's controversial proposal would be difficult. Nevertheless, the labor movement mounted a forceful and nearly successful challenge to an array of money and forces unlike any ever seen in a lobbying campaign. As a result of

our efforts, workers' rights and human rights are now front and center in the public consciousness. Moreover, the scramble to include a provision in the China trade legislation addressing workers' rights and human rights, however ineffective it may be, is an historic turning point and a genuine achievement.

The issues raised by the labor movement during the long debate over China PNTR will not go away. There is no question that the world will be watching China's trade and human rights record and its impact on worldwide competition and standards. We all knew that it would take an extraordinary, long-term effort to write the new rules necessary to protect workers' rights, human rights, and the environment. With this defeat, the AFL-CIO and its affiliates will engage in this difficult fight with renewed energy and determination. We will expand our educational work raising the issues of globalization and work harder than ever to build international solidarity around the goal of democratic, sustainable growth that works for people as well as corporations. And let there be no mistake: the AFL-CIO and its affiliates will mount a huge effort to hold corporations accountable for enhancing the fundamental rights of people everywhere.

6. UNDERMINING WORKPLACE HEALTH AND SAFETY

On June 8, worker-friendly lawmakers tried to strip the Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill (H.R. 4577) of a rider that would have prevented the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) from issuing a standard to protect workers from ergonomic hazards in the workplace.

Musculoskeletal disorders (MSDs) caused by ergonomic hazards are the biggest safety and health problem in the workplace today, accounting for one-third of all serious job-related injuries. Each year, 1.8 million workers suffer from work-related MSDs; 600,000 workers experience serious injuries which result in lost work-time. Female workers are particularly affected by these injuries. Women make up 46% of the overall workforce, but in 1998 accounted for 64% of repetitive motion injuries and 71% of reported carpal tunnel syndrome cases. The costs of these injuries to workers, employers, and the country as a whole is staggering, perhaps as much as \$60 billion. The workers compensation costs alone have been estimated at \$20 billion annually.

OSHA's proposed rule would prevent 300,000 injuries each year and save \$9 billion annually in workers compensation and related costs. However, the proposed standard is so strongly opposed by the business community that OSHA has been blocked for 10 years from issuing an ergonomics standard. Despite the strong support of AFGE and the rest of the labor community, the amendment to strike the anti-ergonomic safety rider was rejected by a vote of 203-220.

It should be noted that this important standard would apply to all federal agencies—as all OSHA standards do—although OSHA cannot fine federal agencies for violations. Even with this limited application an ergonomics

standard would benefit federal employees. Although most agencies have not established ergonomics programs, the standard would provide the framework to finally rectify this dereliction. Moreover, because the standard calls for employee involvement, AFGE members would have opportunities to become active in ensuring that federal employees are protected from bad ergonomics.

In its waning days, the Clinton Administration finally managed to issue an ergonomics standard. One of the first orders of business of the 107th Congress was to repeal that standard.

7. BAD TAX CUT #1

AFGE opposed H.R. 8, legislation that would repeal the estate tax by 2010. This progressive tax plays a key role in preventing undue concentrations of wealth. The vast majority of Americans never pay estate taxes. Only 2% of estates are large enough for the tax to apply. In fact, the majority of estate tax payments are made by individuals with gross estates over \$2.5 million.

According to the Administration, H.R. 8 would benefit only 54,000 families—at a cost of \$100 billion over the next ten years and an additional \$750 billion from 2011-2020 after the estate tax has been completely repealed. Over one-half of the benefits of this tax cut would go to only 3,000 families, who would each receive, on average, a tax benefit of approximately \$7 million.

Instead of using the surplus to make even stronger important programs like Social Security and Medicare, this legislation would squander it on tax cuts for the rich. An alternative, supported by House Democrats and the Administration, would have provided tax relief for individuals with small businesses and family farms; the balance of the surplus under this plan would have been used to bolster programs that benefit working Americans. However, the interest of wealthier Americans prevailed over the public interest, and the House, on June 9, voted to repeal the estate tax by a vote of 279-136. The President vetoed the tax cut legislation on August 31. An attempt to override that veto failed on September 7.

8. AFFORDABLE DRUGS FOR SENIORS

AFGE is strongly supportive of efforts to make prescription drugs more affordable for working Americans. In fact, AFGE has taken the lead in the campaign to reduce the costs of prescription drugs for enrollees in the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program.

The powerful pharmaceutical industry has strongly opposed legislation that would guarantee affordable drug coverage for seniors and the disabled. In its place, the big drug companies put forward a sham proposal (H.R. 4680) that would simply provide subsidies to private insurance companies to encourage them to

offer mere Medigap type prescription drug coverage for some seniors and the disabled.

An alternative (H.R. 4770) supported by Congressional Democrats and the Administration would have offered prescription drug coverage through Medicare, instead of through private insurance plans, with smaller premiums and no deductible. This alternative would have covered all seniors and persons with disabilities. That legislation has been bottled up in committee.

On June 28, however, the private interest of the pharmaceutical industry triumphed over the public interest in affordable prescription drug coverage, and the fake plan in H.R. 4680 was narrowly approved, by a vote of 217-214.

9. BAD TAX CUT #2

For similar reasons, AFGE opposed the so-called “marriage penalty” tax cut bill (H.R. 4810) because it would disproportionately benefit wealthier Americans and deprive the treasury of tax dollars that clearly would be better used to make even stronger important programs like Social Security and Medicare. As with the repeal of the estate tax, the significant loss of revenue would likely lead to a loss of resources for important federal programs—especially if there is a downturn in the economy. And, as we all know, when reductions in spending have to be made as a result of ballooning deficits caused by lost revenues, it’s programs that serve working Americans that will be slashed and bashed to pay for tax cuts enjoyed disproportionately by the rich.

Again, a more moderate “marriage tax” alternative was put forward by House Democrats and the Administration, one that would have provided tax relief to middle income couples. However, it was rejected in favor of another tax cut designed to benefit wealthier Americans, on July 12, by a vote of 269-159. The tax cut legislation was vetoed by the President. An attempt to override that veto failed on September 13.

10. CUTTING HEALTH CARE BENEFITS FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

On July 20, during consideration of the Treasury-Postal appropriations bill (H.R. 4871), the House rejected, by a vote of 184-230, an amendment by Representative Rosa DeLauro (D-CT) that would have eliminated a prohibition against federal health insurance plans from covering abortions except in case of rape, incest, or to protect the life of the woman. Although AFGE is neutral on the issue of abortion, the union believes that such a prohibition constitutes an arbitrary reduction by the Congress in the health care coverage of federal employees.

11. KEEPING CONTRACTORS HONEST

AFGE and the rest of the labor community opposed an effort to prevent the Administration from issuing “Contractor Responsibility” regulations that would allow agencies to deny contracts to contractors that routinely violate labor, civil rights, environmental, consumer or other laws. It is outrageous that, year after year, the federal government rewards law-breaking contractors with billions and billions of taxpayer dollars.

However, just as contractors strongly opposed the TRAC Act (H.R. 3766) because it would have eliminated their corporate welfare by holding them accountable to the taxpayers, the contractors fiercely resisted the “Contractor Responsibility” regulations because they would have finally been held accountable to the law. An amendment to the Treasury-Postal appropriations bill (H.R. 4871) to stop the Administration from issuing the “Contractor Responsibility” regulations prevailed, on July 20, by a vote of 228-190.

Some lawmakers insist that the “Contractor Responsibility” regulations would have no impact on federal employees. Don’t believe them. Contractors are currently able to underbid federal employees because they keep their costs down illegally, by busting unions, abusing the environment, or failing to ensure safe and healthy workplaces. The “Contractor Responsibility” regulations would simply allow agencies to refuse to contract with such firms until they clean up their swamps.

In its waning days, the Clinton Administration finally managed to issue the contractor responsibility rules. Contractors, along with their friends in the Bush Administration and the 107th Congress, are plotting to repeal these rules.

	Minimum Wage	Bad Tax Limit	Bad Budget	Gov't On Autopilot	Bad Trade With China	Ergonomics	Bad Tax Cut #1	Affordable Drugs	Bad Tax Cut #2	FEHBP Cut	Contractor Responsibility	AFGE SCORE
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
Florida (cont.)												
McCollum (R)	?	W	W	?	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	0%
Meek (D) *	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	100%
Mica (R)	W	W	W	W	R	W	W	W	W	W	W	9%
Miller (R)	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	0%
Ros-Lehtinen (R)	R	W	W	W	R	W	W	W	W	W	R	27%
Scarborough (R)	?	W	W	W	?	W	W	W	W	W	W	0%
Shaw (R)	W	R	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	9%
Stearns (R)	W	W	W	W	R	W	W	W	W	W	W	9%
Thurman (D) *	R	R	R	R	W	R	R	R	R	R	R	91%
Weldon (R)	W	W	W	W	R	W	W	W	W	W	W	9%
Wexler (D) *	R	R	?	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	100%
Young (R)	R	W	W	R	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	18%
Georgia												
Barr (R)	W	W	W	W	R	W	W	W	W	W	W	9%
Bishop (D) *	R	W	R	R	W	R	W	R	W	R	R	64%
Chambliss (R)	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	0%
Collins (R)	W	W	W	R	R	W	W	W	W	W	W	18%
Deal (R)	W	W	W	W	R	W	W	W	W	W	W	9%
Isakson (R)	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	0%
Kingston (R)	W	W	W	W	R	W	W	W	W	W	W	9%
Lewis (D) *	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	100%
Linder (R)	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	0%
McKinney (D) *	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	W	R	R	91%
Norwood (R)	W	W	W	W	R	W	W	W	W	W	W	9%
Hawaii												
Abercrombie (D) *	R	R	R	R	R	R	W	R	R	R	R	91%
Mink (D) *	R	R	R	R	R	R	W	R	W	R	R	82%
Idaho												
Chenoweth-Hage (R)	W	W	W	R	R	W	W	R	?	W	W	30%
Simpson (R)	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	0%
Illinois												
Biggert (R)	W	W	W	R	W	W	W	W	W	R	W	18%
Blagojevich (D) *	R	R	R	R	R	R	W	R	W	R	R	82%
Costello (D) *	R	R	R	R	R	R	W	R	W	W	R	73%

	Minimum Wage	Bad Tax Limit	Bad Budget	Gov't On Autopilot	Bad Trade With China	Ergonomics	Bad Tax Cut #1	Affordable Drugs	Bad Tax Cut #2	FEHBP Cut	Contractor Responsibility	AFGE SCORE
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
Illinois (cont.)												
Crane (R)	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	0%
Davis (D) *	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	100%
Evans (D) *	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	100%
Ewing (R)	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	0%
Gutierrez (D) *	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	100%
Hastert (R)	?	?	W	?	W	W	W	W	W	?	?	0%
Hyde (R)	R	R	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	R	27%
Jackson (D) *	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	100%
LaHood (R)	R	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	9%
Lipinski (D) *	R	R	R	R	R	R	W	R	W	W	R	73%
Manzullo (R)	W	W	W	R	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	9%
Phelps (D) *	R	R	R	R	R	R	W	R	W	W	R	73%
Porter (R)	W	R	R	W	W	W	W	W	W	R	W	27%
Rush (D) *	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	?	R	100%
Schakowsky (D) *	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	100%
Shimkus (R)	R	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	R	18%
Weller (R)	R	W	W	W	W	R	W	W	W	?	?	22%
Indiana												
Burton (R)	W	W	W	W	R	W	W	W	W	?	?	11%
Buyer (R)	W	W	W	W	R	W	W	W	W	W	W	9%
Carson (D) *	R	R	R	R	W	R	R	R	?	R	R	90%
Hill (D) *	R	R	R	R	W	R	R	R	R	R	R	91%
Hostettler (R) *	W	R	W	W	R	W	W	R	W	W	W	27%
McIntosh (R)	W	W	W	?	W	W	W	W	W	?	?	0%
Pease (R)	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	0%
Roemer (D) *	R	W	R	R	W	R	W	R	W	?	?	56%
Souder (R)	W	W	W	W	R	W	W	W	W	W	W	9%
Visclosky (D) *	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	100%
Iowa												
Boswell (D) *	R	W	R	R	W	R	W	R	W	R	R	64%
Ganske (R)	R	W	W	?	W	W	W	R	W	W	W	20%
Latham (R)	W	W	W	R	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	9%
Leach (R) *	R	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	9%
Nussle (R)	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	0%
Kansas												
Moore (D) *	R	R	R	R	W	R	W	R	W	R	R	73%

	Minimum Wage	Bad Tax Limit	Bad Budget	Gov't On Autopilot	Bad Trade With China	Ergonomics	Bad Tax Cut #1	Affordable Drugs	Bad Tax Cut #2	FEHBP Cut	Contractor Responsibility	AFGE SCORE
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
Kansas (cont.)												
Moran (R)	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	0%
Ryun (R)	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	0%
Tiaht (R)	W	W	W	R	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	9%
Kentucky												
Fletcher (R)	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	0%
Lewis (R) *	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	0%
Lucas (D) *	W	W	R	R	W	R	W	R	W	W	W	36%
Northup (R)	W	W	W	R	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	9%
Rogers (R)	W	W	W	R	R	W	W	W	W	W	W	18%
Whitfield (R)	W	W	W	W	W	W	?	W	W	W	W	0%
Louisiana												
Baker (R)	W	W	W	?	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	0%
Cooksey (R)	?	W	W	R	W	W	W	W	W	?	?	13%
Jefferson (D) *	R	R	R	R	W	R	W	R	R	R	R	82%
John (D)	R	W	R	R	W	W	W	R	W	W	W	36%
McCrery (R)	W	W	W	?	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	0%
Tauzin (R)	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	0%
Vitter (R)	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	0%
Maine												
Allen (D) *	R	R	R	R	W	R	R	R	R	R	R	91%
Baldacci (D) *	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	100%
Maryland												
Bartlett (R)	W	W	W	W	R	W	W	W	W	W	W	9%
Cardin (D) *	R	R	R	R	W	R	R	R	R	R	R	91%
Cummings (D) *	R	?	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	100%
Ehrlich (R)	W	W	W	W	R	W	W	W	W	R	W	18%
Gilchrest (R) *	R	W	W	R	W	W	W	W	W	R	W	27%
Hoyer (D) *	R	R	R	R	W	R	R	R	R	R	R	91%
Morella (R) *	R	R	R	W	W	W	W	R	W	R	W	45%
Wynn (D) *	R	R	R	W	R	R	W	R	R	R	R	82%
Massachusetts												
Capuano (D) *	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	100%
Delahunt (D) *	R	R	R	?	R	R	W	R	R	?	?	88%
Frank (D) *	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	100%
Markey (D) *	R	R	R	R	R	?	?	?	R	R	R	100%

	Minimum Wage	Bad Tax Limit	Bad Budget	Gov't On Autopilot	Bad Trade With China	Ergonomics	Bad Tax Cut #1	Affordable Drugs	Bad Tax Cut #2	FEHBP Cut	Contractor Responsibility	AFGE SCORE
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
Massachusetts (cont.)												
McGovern (D) *	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	100%
Meehan (D)	R	R	R	R	W	R	R	R	R	R	R	91%
Moakley (D) *	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	W	R	91%
Neal (D) *	R	R	R	R	W	R	R	R	R	W	R	82%
Olver (D) *	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	100%
Tierney (D) *	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	100%
Michigan												
Barcia (D) *	R	W	R	R	R	W	W	R	W	W	R	55%
Bonior (D) *	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	W	R	91%
Camp (R)	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	0%
Conyers (D) *	R	R	R	R	R	R	?	R	R	R	R	100%
Dingell (D) *	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	W	R	91%
Ehlers (R)	R	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	9%
Hoekstra (R)	W	W	W	W	R	W	W	W	W	W	W	9%
Kildee (D) *	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	W	R	91%
Kilpatrick (D) *	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	100%
Knollenberg (R)	W	W	W	R	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	9%
Levin (D) *	R	R	R	R	W	R	R	R	R	R	R	91%
Rivers (D) *	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	100%
Smith (R)	W	W	W	W	W	?	?	R	W	W	W	11%
Stabenow (D) *	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	W	R	R	91%
Stupak (D) *	R	R	R	?	R	R	R	R	W	W	R	80%
Upton (R)	R	W	W	R	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	18%
Minnesota												
Gutknecht (R) *	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	0%
Luther (D) *	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	100%
Minge (D) *	R	R	R	W	W	R	R	R	R	R	R	82%
Oberstar (D) *	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	W	R	91%
Peterson (D) *	R	R	R	R	R	R	W	W	R	W	R	73%
Ramstad (R)	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	R	W	9%
Sabo (D) *	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	100%
Vento (D) *	?	R	R	R	R	?	?	?	?	?	?	100%
Mississippi												
Pickering (R)	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	0%
Shows (D) *	R	W	R	W	R	W	W	R	W	W	R	45%
Taylor (D)	R	W	R	W	R	W	R	R	R	W	W	55%

	Minimum Wage	Bad Tax Limit	Bad Budget	Gov't On Autopilot	Bad Trade With China	Ergonomics	Bad Tax Cut #1	Affordable Drugs	Bad Tax Cut #2	FEHBP Cut	Contractor Responsibility	AFGE SCORE
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
Mississippi (cont.)												
Thompson (D) *	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	W	R	R	91%
Wicker (R)	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	0%
Missouri												
Blunt (R)	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	0%
Clay (D) *	R	R	R	R	R	?	?	R	R	?	?	100%
Danner (D) *	R	W	R	R	R	?	?	R	W	W	R	67%
Emerson (R)	W	W	W	R	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	9%
Gephardt (D) *	R	?	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	100%
Hulshof (R)	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	0%
McCarthy (D) *	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	100%
Skelton (D)	R	W	R	R	W	W	W	R	W	W	R	45%
Talent (R)	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	0%
Montana												
Hill (R)	W	R	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	9%
Nebraska												
Barrett (R)	W	W	W	R	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	9%
Bereuter (R)	W	R	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	9%
Terry (R)	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	0%
Nevada												
Berkley (D) *	R	W	R	R	R	R	W	R	W	R	R	73%
Gibbons (R)	R	W	W	R	R	W	W	W	W	W	W	27%
New Hampshire												
Bass (R)	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	R	W	9%
Sununu (R)	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	0%
New Jersey												
Andrews (D) *	R	W	R	R	R	R	W	R	R	R	R	82%
Franks (R)	R	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	R	W	18%
Frelinghuysen (R)	R	W	W	R	W	W	W	W	W	R	W	27%
Holt (D) *	R	R	R	R	R	R	W	R	W	R	R	82%
LoBiondo (R) *	R	W	W	W	R	R	W	W	W	W	W	27%
Menendez (D) *	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	100%
Pallone (D) *	R	W	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	91%
Pascrell (D) *	R	R	R	R	R	R	W	R	W	R	R	82%
Payne (D) *	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	100%
Rothman (D) *	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	100%
Roukema (R)	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	R	W	9%

	Minimum Wage	Bad Tax Limit	Bad Budget	Gov't On Autopilot	Bad Trade With China	Ergonomics	Bad Tax Cut #1	Affordable Drugs	Bad Tax Cut #2	FEHBP Cut	Contractor Responsibility	AFGE SCORE
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
New Jersey (cont.)												
Saxton (R) *	R	W	W	R	R	R	W	W	W	W	W	36%
Smith (R) *	R	W	W	W	R	R	W	W	W	W	R	36%
New Mexico												
Skeen (R)	W	W	W	R	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	9%
Udall (D) *	R	R	R	?	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	100%
Wilson (R)	R	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	9%
New York												
Ackerman (D) *	R	R	R	?	W	R	R	R	R	R	R	90%
Boehlert (R)	R	R	W	W	W	R	W	W	W	R	W	36%
Crowley (D)	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	W	R	91%
Engel (D) *	R	R	R	?	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	100%
Forbes (D) *	R	W	R	W	R	R	W	R	?	W	R	60%
Fossella (R)	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	0%
Gilman (R) *	R	W	W	R	R	?	?	W	W	R	R	56%
Hinchey (D) *	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	100%
Houghton (R)	R	?	?	W	W	W	W	W	W	R	W	22%
Kelly (R)	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	R	W	9%
King (R)	R	W	W	W	R	R	W	W	W	W	R	36%
LaFalce (D) *	R	R	R	R	W	R	R	R	R	W	R	82%
Lazio (R)	R	W	W	W	W	?	?	W	W	R	W	22%
Lowey (D)	R	R	R	?	W	R	R	R	R	R	R	90%
Maloney (D) *	R	R	R	?	W	R	R	R	R	R	R	90%
McCarthy (D) *	R	W	R	R	R	R	W	R	W	R	W	64%
McHugh (R) *	R	W	W	W	W	R	W	W	W	W	W	18%
McNulty (D) *	R	R	R	?	R	R	W	R	?	W	R	78%
Meeks (D) *	R	R	R	?	W	R	R	R	R	R	R	90%
Nadler (D) *	R	R	R	?	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	100%
Owens (D) *	R	R	R	?	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	100%
Quinn (R) *	R	W	W	W	R	R	W	W	W	W	R	36%
Rangel (D) *	R	R	R	?	W	R	R	R	R	R	R	90%
Reynolds (R)	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	0%
Serrano (D) *	R	R	R	?	W	R	R	R	R	R	R	90%
Slaughter (D) *	R	R	R	?	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	100%
Sweeney (R)	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	R	R	18%
Towns (D) *	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	100%
Velazquez (D) *	R	R	R	R	R	R	W	R	R	R	R	91%

	Minimum Wage	Bad Tax Limit	Bad Budget	Gov't On Autopilot	Bad Trade With China	Ergonomics	Bad Tax Cut #1	Affordable Drugs	Bad Tax Cut #2	FEHBP Cut	Contractor Responsibility	AFGE SCORE
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
Ohio (cont.)												
Traficant (D) *	R	W	W	R	R	R	W	W	W	W	W	36%
Oklahoma												
Coburn (R)	W	W	W	W	R	W	W	R	W	W	W	18%
Istook (R)	W	W	W	W	W	?	?	R	W	W	W	11%
Largent (R)	W	W	W	?	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	0%
Lucas (R)	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	0%
Watkins (R)	W	?	W	R	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	10%
Watts (R)	W	W	W	R	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	9%
Oregon												
Blumenauer (D) *	R	R	R	R	W	R	?	R	R	R	R	90%
DeFazio (D) *	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	100%
Hooley (D) *	R	R	R	R	W	R	W	R	W	R	R	73%
Walden (R)	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	0%
Wu (D) *	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	W	R	W	82%
Pennsylvania												
Borski (D) *	R	R	?	R	R	R	R	R	R	W	R	90%
Brady (D) *	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	100%
Coyne (D) *	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	100%
Doyle (D) *	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	W	W	R	82%
English (R)	R	W	W	W	W	R	W	W	W	W	W	18%
Fattah (D) *	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	100%
Gekas (R) *	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	0%
Goodling (R)	W	W	W	W	R	W	W	W	W	W	W	9%
Greenwood (R)	R	W	W	W	W	?	W	W	W	R	W	20%
Hoeffel (D) *	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	100%
Holden (D) *	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	W	R	91%
Kanjorski (D) *	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	W	R	91%
Klink (D) *	R	R	R	R	R	?	?	R	R	W	R	89%
Mascara (D) *	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	W	W	R	82%
Murtha (D) *	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	W	R	91%
Peterson (R)	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	0%
Pitts (R)	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	0%
Sherwood (R)	R	W	W	R	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	18%
Shuster (R)	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	0%
Toomey (R)	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	0%
Weldon (R)	R	W	W	W	W	R	W	W	W	W	W	18%

	Minimum Wage	Bad Tax Limit	Bad Budget	Gov't On Autopilot	Bad Trade With China	Ergonomics	Bad Tax Cut #1	Affordable Drugs	Bad Tax Cut #2	FEHBP Cut	Contractor Responsibility	AFGE SCORE
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
Rhode Island												
Kennedy (D) *	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	100%
Weygand (D) *	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	W	R	91%
South Carolina												
Clyburn (D) *	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	W	R	R	91%
DeMint (R)	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	0%
Graham (R)	W	W	W	W	R	W	W	W	W	W	W	9%
Sanford (R)	W	W	R	W	R	W	W	R	W	W	W	27%
Spence (R)	?	W	W	R	R	W	W	W	W	W	W	20%
Spratt (D) *	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	W	R	W	82%
South Dakota												
Thune (R)	R	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	9%
Tennessee												
Bryant (R)	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	0%
Clement (D) *	R	R	R	R	R	W	W	R	W	R	R	73%
Duncan (R)	W	W	W	W	R	W	W	W	W	W	W	9%
Ford (D) *	R	R	R	R	W	R	W	R	R	R	R	82%
Gordon (D) *	R	W	R	R	R	R	W	R	W	R	R	73%
Hilleary (R)	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	0%
Jenkins (R)	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	0%
Tanner (D)	R	R	R	R	W	W	W	R	R	R	W	64%
Wamp (R)	W	W	W	R	R	W	W	W	W	W	W	18%
Texas												
Archer (R)	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	0%
Armey (R)	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	0%
Barton (R)	W	W	W	W	R	W	W	W	W	?	?	11%
Bentsen (D)	R	R	R	R	W	R	R	R	R	R	R	91%
Bonilla (R)	W	W	W	R	W	W	W	W	W	R	W	18%
Brady (R)	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	0%
Combest (R)	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	0%
DeLay (R)	W	W	W	R	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	9%
Doggett (D)	R	R	R	W	W	R	R	R	R	R	R	82%
Edwards (D) *	R	R	R	R	W	R	R	R	R	W	R	82%
Frost (D) *	R	R	R	R	W	R	R	R	R	R	R	91%
Gonzalez (D) *	R	R	R	R	W	R	R	R	R	R	R	91%

	Minimum Wage	Bad Tax Limit	Bad Budget	Gov't On Autopilot	Bad Trade With China	Ergonomics	Bad Tax Cut #1	Affordable Drugs	Bad Tax Cut #2	FEHBP Cut	Contractor Responsibility	AFGE SCORE
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
Virginia (cont.)												
Sisisky (D) *	R	R	W	R	R	W	W	R	W	R	R	64%
Wolf (R)	W	W	W	R	R	W	W	W	W	W	W	18%
Washington												
Baird (D) *	R	R	R	R	W	R	W	R	W	R	R	73%
Dicks (D) *	R	R	R	R	W	R	R	R	R	R	R	91%
Dunn (R)	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	0%
Hastings (R)	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	0%
Inslee (D) *	R	R	R	R	W	R	W	R	W	R	W	64%
McDermott (D) *	R	R	R	R	W	R	?	R	R	R	R	90%
Metcalfe (R)	R	W	W	W	R	R	W	W	W	W	W	27%
Nethercutt (R)	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	0%
Smith (D)	?	R	R	R	W	?	?	R	?	?	?	80%
West Virginia												
Mollohan (D) *	R	R	R	R	R	R	W	R	R	W	R	82%
Rahall (D) *	R	R	R	R	R	R	W	R	R	W	R	82%
Wise (D) *	R	R	R	R	R	R	W	R	W	R	R	82%
Wisconsin												
Baldwin (D) *	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	100%
Barrett (D)	R	R	R	?	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	100%
Green (R)	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	0%
Kind (D) *	R	R	R	R	W	R	?	R	R	R	R	90%
Kleczka (D) *	R	R	R	W	R	R	R	R	R	W	R	82%
Obey (D)	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	100%
Petri (R) *	W	W	W	W	W	R	W	W	W	W	W	9%
Ryan (R)	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	0%
Sensenbrenner (R)	W	W	W	W	R	W	W	W	W	W	W	9%
Wyoming												
Cubin (R)	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	0%

Key	
R	Voted Right
W	Voted Wrong
?	Did Not Vote
* sponsor or cosponsor of the Truthfulness, Responsibility, and Accountability in Contracting (TRAC) Act (H.R.3766)	

SENATE

1. INVESTING IN THE FUTURE

AFGE supported an amendment offered by Senator George Voinovich (R-OH) to the Senate budget resolution (S.Con.Res. 101) that would have eliminated the tax cut proposal from the measure. The measure would have devoted the surpluses to paying down the national debt, rather than use most of them on tax cuts that were skewed disproportionately for the wealthy. AFGE has consistently advocated using the surpluses to make Social Security and Medicare even stronger and addressing long-ignored needs ranging from veterans care to the environment to education. While AFGE would not have devoted the surpluses exclusively to reducing the national debt, this union shares the interest of the amendment's author in ensuring that the surpluses are invested in America's future. Unfortunately, the Voinovich amendment was defeated, by a vote of 44-56, on April 7.

2. BETTER PAY FOR THE WORKING POOR

AFGE and the rest of the labor community supported an overdue increase in the minimum wage by \$1 over two years, to \$6.15 per hour, in order to increase the standard of living of millions of families with breadwinners earning at or near the minimum wage level. The business community mounted a fierce effort to water down this increase, by stretching it out over three years. With the backing of the labor movement, however, the Senate passed Senator Edward Kennedy's (D-MA) sense-of-the-Senate amendment to the budget resolution (S.Con.Res. 101) that put the chamber on record as favoring the \$1 increase, by a vote of 51-48, on April 7. Unfortunately, the budget resolution conference report did not include the labor-endorsed increase in the minimum wage.

The hourly pay rate of many federal employees—including food service workers, janitors, laborers, switchboard operators, and file clerks—is connected to the minimum wage, both directly and indirectly. Some 27,500 Department of Defense (DoD) employees would see a pay increase if the minimum wage were increased. An increase in the minimum wage would help the approximately 150,000 federal employees who work at the DoD exchanges and are paid through non-appropriated funds, due to increases in prevailing wages. The 3,000 workers in the Department of Veterans Affairs Canteen Service would also benefit from an increase in the minimum wage, again from rising prevailing wages. And the 225,000 federal wage-grade employees who work in the crafts and trades would also benefit because of the impact on their private sector counterparts.

3. BAD BUDGET PLAN

AFGE opposed the budget resolution (H. Con. Res. 290) because it called for tax cuts for wealthier Americans and reduced funding for some domestic programs. AFGE believes that money for tax cuts would be more properly spent on making even stronger important programs like Social Security and Medicare.

Senator Frank Lautenberg (D-NJ), the ranking Democrat on the Budget Committee, summed up concerns about the budget resolution: "The budget conference report calls for costly and risky tax breaks that would raid Social Security surpluses. It proposes deep cuts in domestic programs such as education and health care and law enforcement and veterans benefits and environmental protection. It fails to ensure that seniors will be provided with a meaningful prescription drug benefit."

The budget resolution was approved, however, largely along party lines, by a vote of 50-48, on April 13.

4. BASE CLOSURES

AFGE opposed an amendment to the defense authorization bill (S. 2549), offered by Senator John McCain (R-AZ), which would have imposed two more rounds of the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) process, one round in 2003 and another in 2005.

AFGE opposes additional BRAC for several reasons, among them: how the process was politically exploited the last time in order to benefit contractors, proposals for more BRAC fail to take into account all of the previous reductions in infrastructure, and how BRAC perpetuates the policy of placing infrastructure cuts disproportionately on federal employees.

Fortunately, the Senate rejected the McCain amendment by a vote of 35-63, on June 7.

5. PATIENT BILL OF RIGHTS

AFGE supported an amendment offered by Senator Tom Daschle (D-SD) to the defense authorization bill (S. 2549) that would have established a real patients' bill of rights. Nearly 161 million Americans obtain health coverage through some form of managed care. These Americans face continuous barriers from a system that too often is more interested in lowering costs than in providing quality health care.

The Daschle amendment would have ensured real patient protections for all privately insured Americans, and is supported by more than 300 groups representing doctors, nurses, and patients, as well as other health providers and

advocates for persons with disabilities, children, women, and families. The Daschle amendment was opposed by the insurance industry, however, which pushed legislation (S. 1344) that, unlike the Daschle amendment, covered only one-third of privately insured Americans and would have failed to ensure that doctors, not insurers, made medical decisions and that Health Maintenance Organizations would be held responsible when their decisions kill or injure patients.

Although the same legislation had been passed earlier on a bipartisan basis by the House of Representatives, Senator Don Nickles (R-OK) moved to kill the Daschle amendment. Unfortunately, Nickles' motion passed by a vote of 51-48, on June 8.

6. PREVENTING HATE CRIMES

AFGE supported an amendment offered by Senator Edward Kennedy (D-MA) to the defense authorization bill (S. 2549) that would have broadened the categories covered by hate crimes to include gender, sexual orientation and disability. The amendment would also have made it easier for the federal government to get involved in the investigation and prosecution of hate crimes.

As Senator Carl Levin (D-MI), who offered the amendment on Senator Kennedy's behalf, noted: "Hate crimes are a special threat in a society founded on `liberty and justice for all.' Too many acts of violence and bigotry in the last years have put our nation's commitment to diversity in jeopardy."

On June 20, the Kennedy amendment was accepted, by a vote of 57-42. Despite a 232-192 vote in the House of Representatives instructing that the chamber's conferees to the defense authorization bill should agree to the Senate's language, the House Republican leadership opposed the Kennedy amendment; even more disturbing, despite the bipartisan support for the Kennedy amendment, as shown by the June 20 vote, Senate conferees to the defense authorization bill voted, 11-9—along party lines it is believed—to also abandon the measure.

7. UNDERMINING WORKPLACE HEALTH AND SAFETY

On June 22, Senator Michael Enzi (R-WY) tried to attach a bad rider to the Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill (H.R. 4577) that would have prevented the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) from issuing a standard to protect workers from ergonomic hazards in the workplace.

Musculoskeletal disorders (MSDs) caused by ergonomic hazards are the biggest safety and health problem in the workplace today, accounting for one-third of all serious job-related injuries. Each year, 1.8 million workers suffer from work-related MSDs; 600,000 workers experience serious injuries which result in lost

work-time. Female workers are particularly affected by these injuries. Women make up 46% of the overall workforce, but in 1998 accounted for 64% of repetitive motion injuries and 71% of reported carpal tunnel syndrome cases. The costs of these injuries to workers, employers, and the country as a whole is staggering, perhaps as much as \$60 billion. The workers compensation costs alone have been estimated at \$20 billion annually.

OSHA's proposed rule would prevent 300,000 injuries each year and save \$9 billion annually in workers compensation and related costs. However, the proposed standard is so strongly opposed by the business community that OSHA has been blocked for 10 years from issuing an ergonomics standard. Despite the strong support of AFGE and the rest of the labor community, the Enzi amendment to prohibit the use of funds to establish and enforce a temporary or final ergonomic standard prevailed, by a vote of 57-41.

It should be noted that this important standard would apply to all federal agencies—as all OSHA standards do—although OSHA cannot fine federal agencies for violations. Even with this limited application an ergonomics standard would benefit federal employees. Although most agencies have not established ergonomics programs, the standard would provide the framework to finally rectify this dereliction. Moreover, because the standard calls for employee involvement, AFGE members would have opportunities to become active in ensuring that federal employees are protected from bad ergonomics.

8. AFFORDABLE DRUGS FOR SENIORS

AFGE is strongly supportive of efforts to make prescription drugs more affordable for working Americans. In fact, AFGE has taken the lead in the campaign to reduce the costs of prescription drugs for enrollees in the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program. The powerful pharmaceutical industry, however, has strongly opposed legislation that would guarantee affordable drug coverage for seniors and the disabled.

On June 22, Senator Charles Robb (D-VA) offered an AFGE-backed amendment to the Labor-Health and Human Services-Education appropriations bill (H.R. 4577) that would have required that a prescription drug benefit program be established under Medicare. Under the moderate Robb plan, Medicare would contribute at least 50 percent of the cost of premiums for beneficiaries, and the beneficiaries themselves would pay a \$250 deductible. However, along largely party lines, the Robb amendment was defeated by a vote of 44-53.

9. BAD TAX CUT #1

AFGE opposed H.R. 8, legislation that would repeal the estate tax by 2010. This progressive tax plays a key role in preventing undue concentrations of wealth. The vast majority of Americans never pay estate taxes. Only 2% of estates are

large enough for the tax to apply. In fact, the majority of estate tax payments are made by individuals with gross estates over \$2.5 million.

According to the Administration, H.R. 8 would benefit only 54,000 families—at a cost of \$100 billion over the next ten years and an additional \$750 billion from 2011-2020 after the estate tax has been completely repealed. Over one-half of the benefits of this tax cut would go to only 3,000 families, who would each receive, on average, a tax benefit of approximately \$7 million.

Instead of using the surplus to make even stronger important programs like Social Security and Medicare, this legislation would squander it on tax cuts for the rich. An alternative, supported by Senate Democrats and the Administration, would have provided tax relief for individuals with small businesses and family farms; the balance of the surplus under this plan would have been used to bolster programs that benefit working Americans. However, the interest of wealthier Americans prevailed over the public interest, and the Senate, on July 14, voted to repeal the estate tax by a vote of 59-39. Fortunately, President Clinton vetoed this legislation and his veto was sustained in the House of Representatives.

10. PREVENTING WAGE DISCRIMINATION

AFGE supported an amendment by Senator Tom Harkin (D-IA) to a tax bill (H.R. 4810) that would have allowed workers who won their wage discrimination claims in court to collect punitive and compensatory damages in addition to back wages.

According to Senator Harkin, the legislation would “put new money into employer education and honor employers with best practices. (Finally), it would ensure that women cannot be retaliated against by their employers for sharing pay information.”

Although the legislation had the support of groups ranging from the AFL-CIO to the Business and Professional Women, a motion to force the Senate to consider the Harkin amendment was rejected, by a vote of 45-53, on July 17.

11. BAD TAX CUT #2

AFGE opposed the so-called “marriage penalty” tax cut bill (H.R. 4810) because it would disproportionately benefit wealthier Americans and deprive the treasury of tax dollars that clearly would be better used to make even stronger important programs like Social Security and Medicare. As with the repeal of the estate tax, the significant loss of revenue would likely lead to a loss of resources for important federal programs—especially if there is a downturn in the economy. And, as we all know, when reductions in spending have to be made as a result of ballooning deficits caused by lost revenues, it's programs that serve working

Americans that will be slashed and bashed to pay for tax cuts enjoyed disproportionately by the rich.

Again, a more moderate “marriage tax” alternative was put forward by Senate Democrats and the Administration, one that would have provided tax relief to middle income couples. However, it was rejected in favor of another tax cut designed to benefit wealthier Americans, on July 21, by a vote of 60-34. President Clinton vetoed this legislation and his veto was sustained in the House of Representatives.

12. AGREEING TO A BAD TRADE DEAL WITH CHINA

AFGE, the AFL-CIO and all of its other affiliates strongly opposed Permanent Normal Trading Relations (PNTR) status for China for several reasons:

The various proposals pending for granting China PNTR status while still somehow creating alternative mechanisms for reviewing China’s behavior with respect to trade agreements, human rights, labor rights, and environmental protections were all fig leaves. Such reviews are meaningless without the economic leverage currently held by the U.S. in its trading relationship with China to back them up. As few would disagree, China’s conduct on all four of those issues is actually becoming worse and even more disgraceful.

The distrust that the American people have for China as a trading partner is well-founded. The most recent State Department report on China’s human rights indicated that conditions in that nation “deteriorated markedly through the year, as the Government intensified efforts to suppress dissent”. What makes such a report even more chilling is that Government officials understand that China’s bid for enhanced trading relations meant their actions would undergo international scrutiny--and they still conducted themselves deplorably. How will they act, we can only wonder, when they have all that they want?

Giving PNTR status to China means the U.S. gives up its right to impose unilateral trade sanctions against China for both human and labor rights violations. Now, the only option left is to use a multilateral dispute mechanism that may sanction China only for violation of World Trade Organization free trade rules—but not for violations of human and labor rights. Moreover, such dispute mechanisms will not be useful, even with respect to trade, in disciplining China for the massive violations we can expect, given their well-documented record of noncompliance with existing trade agreements.

On September 19, the Senate voted against working Americans and granted PNTR status to China, by a vote of 83-15. Although that loss was a big disappointment, the labor movement made great strides as a result of its strong fight against China PNTR.

We in the labor movement knew from the beginning that the defeat of the Administration's controversial proposal would be difficult. Nevertheless, the labor movement mounted a forceful and nearly successful challenge to an array of money and forces unlike any ever seen in a lobbying campaign. As a result of our efforts, workers' rights and human rights are now front and center in the public consciousness. Moreover, the scramble to include a provision in the China trade legislation addressing workers' rights and human rights, however ineffective it may be, is an historic turning point and a genuine achievement.

The issues raised by the labor movement during the long debate over China PNTR will not go away. There is no question that the world will be watching China's trade and human rights record and its impact on worldwide competition and standards. We all knew that it would take an extraordinary, long-term effort to write the new rules necessary to protect workers' rights, human rights, and the environment. With this defeat, the AFL-CIO and its affiliates will engage in this difficult fight with renewed energy and determination. We will expand our educational work raising the issues of globalization and work harder than ever to build international solidarity around the goal of democratic, sustainable growth that works for people as well as corporations. And let there be no mistake: the AFL-CIO and its affiliates will mount a huge effort to hold corporations accountable for enhancing the fundamental rights of people everywhere.

2000 Senate Voting Record

	Investing In Future	Minimum Wage	Bad Budget	Base Closures	Health Care	Hate Crimes	Ergonomics	Affordable Drugs	Bad Tax Cut #1	Wage Discrimination	Bad Tax Cut #2	Bad Trade With China	AFGE SCORE
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Alabama													
Sessions (R)	W	W	W	R	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	8%
Shelby (R)	W	W	W	R	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	8%
Alaska													
Murkowski (R)	W	W	W	R	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	8%
Stevens (R)	W	W	W	R	W	R	W	W	W	W	W	W	17%
Arizona													
Kyl (R)	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	0%
McCain (R)	R	W	R	W	R	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	25%
Arkansas													
Hutchinson (R)	W	W	W	R	W	W	W	W	?	?	W	R	20%
Lincoln (D)	R	R	R	W	R	R	W	R	W	R	R	W	67%
California													
Boxer (D)	R	R	R	R	R	R	?	?	R	R	?	W	89%
Feinstein (D)	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	W	R	W	W	75%
Colorado													
Allard (R)	W	W	W	R	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	8%
Campbell (R)	W	W	W	R	W	W	W	?	W	W	W	R	18%
Connecticut													
Dodd (D) *	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	W	92%
Lieberman (D) *	R	R	R	W	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	?	91%
Delaware													
Biden (D)	R	R	R	W	R	R	R	R	R	R	W	W	75%
Roth (R)	W	R	?	W	W	R	W	W	W	W	W	W	18%
Florida													
Graham (D)	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	W	92%
Mack (R)	W	W	W	R	W	R	W	W	W	W	W	W	17%
Georgia													
Cleland (D)	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	W	R	W	W	75%
Coverdell (R)	W	W	W	R	W	W	W	W	W	?	d	d	11%

	Investing In Future	Minimum Wage	Bad Budget	Base Closures	Health Care	Hate Crimes	Ergonomics	Affordable Drugs	Bad Tax Cut #1	Wage Discrimination	Bad Tax Cut #2	Bad Trade With China	AFGE SCORE
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Massachusetts													
Kennedy (D) *	R	R	R	W	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	W	83%
Kerry (D)	R	R	R	W	R	R	R	R	R	R	?	W	82%
Michigan													
Abraham (R)	W	W	W	R	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	8%
Levin (D)	R	R	R	W	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	W	83%
Minnesota													
Grams (R)	W	W	W	R	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	8%
Wellstone (D) *	R	R	R	W	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	92%
Mississippi													
Cochran (R)	W	W	W	R	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	8%
Lott (R)	W	W	W	R	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	8%
Missouri													
Ashcroft (R)	W	W	W	R	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	8%
Bond (R)	W	W	W	R	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	8%
Montana													
Baucus (D)	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	W	92%
Burns (R)	W	W	W	R	W	R	W	W	W	W	W	W	17%
Nebraska													
Hagel (R)	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	0%
Kerrey (D) *	W	R	R	W	R	R	R	R	R	R	?	W	73%
Nevada													
Bryan (D)	R	R	R	W	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	W	83%
Reid (D) *	R	R	R	W	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	92%
New Hampshire													
Gregg (R)	W	W	W	R	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	8%
Smith (R)	W	W	W	R	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	R	17%
New Jersey													
Lautenberg (D) *	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	W	92%
Torricelli (D) *	W	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	W	R	W	W	67%

Key

R Voted Right

W Voted Wrong

? Did Not Vote

d Died In Office

* sponsor or cosponsor of the Truthfulness, Responsibility, and Accountability in Contracting (TRAC) Act (S.2841)