

How Well Do Your Members of Congress Protect Children?



The 2001 Children's Defense Fund Action Council Nonpartisan Congressional Scorecard



CDF Action Council®

The Mission of the Movement to Leave No Child Behind®

As we enter the 21st century, America's strength reflects our courage, our compassion, our hard work, our moral values and our commitment to justice. Today, we can extend the American dream of our forefathers and foremothers to every child and family. We have the know-how, the experience, the tools, and the resources. And we have the responsibility as mothers, fathers, grandparents, and concerned and sensible people across the country.

We can build a nation where families have the support they need to make it at work and at home; where every child enters school ready to learn and leaves on the path to a productive future; where babies are likely to be born healthy, and sick children have the health care they need; where no child has to grow up in poverty; where all children are safe in their community and every child has a place to call home—and all Americans can proudly say “We Leave No Child Behind.”

Our mission and vision in the months and years ahead is to do what it takes to meet the needs of children and their parents by building on the strengths and sense of fairness of the American people, learning from the best public and private ideas and successes, and moving forward to a renewed commitment to all our children.

About the Children's Defense Fund Action Council

The mission of the Children's Defense Fund (CDF) Action Council is to Leave No Child Behind® and to ensure every child a *Healthy Start*, a *Head Start*, a *Fair Start*, a *Safe Start*, and a *Moral Start* in life and successful passage to adulthood with the help of caring families and communities.

The CDF Action Council provides a strong, effective voice for *all* the children of America who cannot vote, lobby, or speak for themselves. We pay particular attention to the needs of poor and minority children and those with disabilities. The CDF Action Council educates the nation about the needs of children and encourages preventive investments before they get sick, into trouble, drop out of school, or suffer family breakdown.

The CDF Action Council began in 1969 and is a private, nonprofit organization under Section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code. We have never taken government funds.

How Well Do Your Members of Congress Protect Children?

The 2001 Children's Defense Fund Action Council
Nonpartisan Congressional Scorecard



CDF Action Council

®

ISBN 1-881985-35-0

© 2002 by the Children's Defense Fund Action Council.

All rights reserved.

Printed in the United States of America.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
How We Compile the Congressional Scorecard	4
2001 Best and Worst Senators for Children	5
2001 Best and Worst Representatives for Children	6
State Delegation Rankings	8
2001 Best and Worst State Delegations for Children	9
Congressional Scores by State Delegation	10
Key Children's Votes in the Senate 2001	31
Key Children's Votes in the House of Representatives 2001	35
Action Agenda for 2002	39
Congressional Schedule	41

Introduction

Nearly 12 million children are poor; more than 9 million children lack health insurance; an estimated 7 million children are left home alone after school; and more than 825,000 children are victims of abuse or neglect. Members of Congress are in a powerful position to help these children and all of America's children. The Children's Defense Fund Action Council's Nonpartisan Congressional Scorecard documents how your U.S. Senators and Representatives used that power as they cast votes for children in 2001. We urge you to review the Nonpartisan Congressional Scorecard and judge for yourself whether your Senators and your Representatives "voted for children."

Senators and Representatives were scored on 10 key votes cast in 2001. Each of these votes had a significant impact on the lives and well-being of America's children. A number of votes determined the availability of important federal resources for children, such as Head Start, the Child Tax Credit, or housing assistance. Others affected children's access to health care services or quality education. Overall, we believe these votes provide a clear portrait of the importance that Members of Congress attach to investments in our nation's children.

Members of Congress also indicate their support for children in ways other than votes, such as providing strong leadership on and sponsoring legislation. This year, sponsorship of the Act to Leave No Child Behind (S. 940/H.R. 1990) has been included in the CDF Action Council scoring for Senators and Representatives. The Act to Leave No Child Behind is comprehensive legislation designed to improve the lives of our nation's children. It reflects CDF's mission, builds upon policies and programs of proven success, and was introduced in Congress by Senator Christopher Dodd (D-CT) and Representative George Miller (D-CA) in May of 2001. Many Members also introduced sections of the Act as separate bills. By the end of 2001, 10 Senators and 80 Representatives joined with more than 950 groups and organizations, more than 220 state legislators, and over 60 mayors to endorse the Act and its vision for America's children.

The comprehensive Act to Leave No Child Behind gives the President, Congress, state and local officials and all Americans the opportunity to:

- Get every child ready for school through full funding of quality child care and Head Start, and new investments in preschool—CDF's top priorities in 2002 and 2003.
- Lift every child from poverty—half by 2004; all by 2010.
- Ensure every child and their parents health insurance.
- End child hunger through the expansion of food programs.
- Make sure every child can read by fourth grade and can graduate from school able to succeed at work and in life.
- Provide every child safe, quality after-school and summer programs so children can learn, serve, work, and stay out of trouble.
- Ensure every child a place called home and decent affordable housing.
- Protect all children from neglect, abuse, and other violence and ensure them the care they need.
- Ensure families leaving welfare the supports needed to be successful in the workplace, including health care, child care, education, and training.

Ten Senators and 48 Representatives scored 100 percent on the 2001 CDF Action Council Nonpartisan Congressional Scorecard. We are very grateful for their outstanding leadership on behalf of children and urge their constituents to thank them for making children their priority.

Eight Senators and 95 Representatives scored less than 10 percent on the 2001 CDF Action Council Nonpartisan Congressional Scorecard. Let these Members know you are dissatisfied with their votes and their record for children.

Children and Families Scored Some Significant Gains in 2001

Many Members of Congress spoke out strongly and effectively for children last year, and worked hard to help secure the services children need to grow and learn and thrive. For example:

- More than 500,000 children will be lifted out of poverty over the next 10 years as a result of Congressional action to make the Child Tax Credit (CTC) partially refundable. While the Act to Leave No Child Behind would make the CTC fully refundable and extend it to *every* child in the country, the improvements to the CTC enacted in 2001 will provide vital new tax assistance to millions of additional children in low-income working families.
- Major new education legislation was passed, which has the potential to improve our public education system. The success of the new legislation will depend upon its rigorous implementation and the adequacy of federal education funding over the next decade. For FY 2003, the Bush budget proposed only a fraction of the funds needed to implement the new law.
- Approximately 15,000 additional infants, toddlers, and preschoolers will be able to enroll in Head Start as a result of Congressional funding decisions. Not only did Congress reject the Bush administration's proposed cutback in Head Start enrollment, but also acted to make additional funds available for early learning, child care, and after-school care.
- In 2001, Congress took action to renew and increase funding for the Promoting Safe and Stable Families program to help protect abused and neglected children and promote adoptions. A new program to provide educational assistance to older youths leaving foster care was also established in 2001.
- Childhood immunizations also got a funding boost. Modest funding increases were also provided for a range of child health and youth development programs.

Missed Opportunities

Unfortunately, Congress squandered many other opportunities to help children last year. Despite considerable debate, they failed to extend health care to additional uninsured children or enact new protections and rights for children enrolled in HMOs. They failed to provide new assistance to low-income families hardest hit by the recession. Instead, the 107th Congress showered tax cuts on the wealthiest Americans, widening the gap between rich and poor and quickly draining the federal budget surplus.

After the tragic events of September 11, 2001, Congress shifted its attention to national security measures and deferred consideration of many important issues for children until 2002. During the second session of the 107th Congress in 2002, Senators and Representatives will once again cast votes that will affect the lives and futures of America's children. The CDF Action Council will be tracking these votes and will score Members on how they voted for children in 2002.

The 2001 CDF Action Council's Nonpartisan Congressional Scorecard provides you with critical information about whether your Members of Congress voted to protect the interests of children. Let them know that their votes matter!

We encourage you to call, write and visit with your Senators and Representative in their Washington, D.C. offices or when they are home in their district offices. To find out who represents you in Congress, go to the "Contact Congress" page of the CDF Action Council Web site: <http://capwiz.com/cdf/home/>. Click on "Elected Officials" and enter your zip code. You can use this site to send an e-mail directly to your Members or obtain their Washington D.C. and district contact information.

How We Compile the Congressional Scorecard

The CDF Action Council's Nonpartisan Congressional Scorecard scores Members of Congress based on the key votes they cast for children on the floor and the co-sponsorship of important legislation in the U.S. House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate during 2001. Members of the House cast a total of 512 recorded votes in 2001, while Senators cast 380 recorded votes. Some of the votes were on the final approval—or defeat—of a particular bill or resolution. A number of other votes were for or against amendments offered to change the bill or resolution under consideration. Still other votes were procedural in nature—such as a vote on a motion to table an amendment—yet procedural votes also can have a substantive impact on the outcome of the legislation. This year, the CDF Action Council includes the co-sponsorship of the Act to Leave No Child Behind (S. 940/H.R. 1990), comprehensive and important legislation for children, in the Congressional Scorecard.

Members also often cast “voice votes” on a number of bills and resolutions or adopt them by “unanimous consent.” In these cases, there is no record to indicate how an individual Member voted and therefore these votes are not part of the Congressional Scorecard.

We counted a missed vote as a vote against children because children need every possible vote. While we acknowledge that some missed votes are unavoidable due to Member or family illness, it is not possible for us to determine the reason behind each missed vote. Members who did not serve an entire term in office are not scored or included in state averages.

The recorded vote for each Senator and Representative is taken from CQ.com, an Internet-based legislative database. The descriptions for each vote are based on those provided by the *Congressional Quarterly*.

This scorecard is part of the CDF Action Council's ongoing policy analysis and advocacy activities for children. **The scores are not to be taken as an endorsement for or opposition to any candidate.**

CDF Action Council Congressional Scorecard - 2001

2001 Best & Worst Senators for Children

Senate

The average Senate score for children was 57 percent. There were 10 Senators who scored 100 percent; 8 Senators scored below 10 percent.

The Best Senators for Children - Scored 100% (10 Senators)

Clinton (NY)	100%	Mikulski (MD)	100%
Dayton (MN)	100%	Reed, Jack (RI)	100%
Dodd (CT)	100%	Sarbanes (MD)	100%
Inouye (HI)	100%	Schumer (NY)	100%
Kennedy (MA)	100%	Wellstone (MN)	100%

The Worst Senators for Children - Scored Below 10% (8 Senators)

Allard (CO)	9%	Smith, Robert (NH)	9%
Enzi (WY)	9%	Voinovich (OH)	9%
Gramm, Phil (TX)	9%	Helms (NC)	0%
Kyl (AZ)	9%	Nickles (OK)	0%

CDF Action Council Congressional Scorecard - 2001

2001 Best & Worst Representatives for Children

The average House score for children was 49 percent. There were 48 Representatives who scored 100 percent; 95 Representatives scored below 10 percent.

The Best Representatives for Children - Scored 100% (48 Representatives)

Baldwin (WI)	100%	Lee (CA)	100%
Becerra (CA)	100%	Lewis, John (GA)	100%
Berman (CA)	100%	McKinney (GA)	100%
Blagojevich (IL)	100%	Meeks, Gregory (NY)	100%
Bonior (MI)	100%	Millender-McDonald (CA)	100%
Brown, Corrine (FL)	100%	Miller, George (CA)	100%
Carson, Julia (IN)	100%	Mink (HI)	100%
Clay (MO)	100%	Nadler (NY)	100%
Crowley (NY)	100%	Owens (NY)	100%
Davis, Danny (IL)	100%	Payne (NJ)	100%
DeFazio (OR)	100%	Pelosi (CA)	100%
DeLauro (CT)	100%	Rangel (NY)	100%
Engel (NY)	100%	Sanders (VT)	100%
Fattah (PA)	100%	Schakowsky (IL)	100%
Filner (CA)	100%	Scott (VA)	100%
Gutierrez (IL)	100%	Serrano (NY)	100%
Jackson, Jesse, Jr. (IL)	100%	Slaughter (NY)	100%
Jackson-Lee, Sheila (TX)	100%	Solis (CA)	100%
Jones, Stephanie Tubbs (OH)	100%	Towns (NY)	100%
Kaptur (OH)	100%	Velazquez (NY)	100%
Kennedy, Patrick (RI)	100%	Waters (CA)	100%
Kilpatrick (MI)	100%	Watt, Mel (NC)	100%
Kucinich (OH)	100%	Waxman (CA)	100%
LaFalce (NY)	100%	Woolsey (CA)	100%

CDF Action Council Congressional Scorecard - 2001 (continued)

The Worst House Representatives for Children - Scored Below 10% (95 Representatives)

Armey (TX)	9%	Norwood (GA)	9%
Barr (GA)	9%	Nussle (IA)	9%
Barton (TX)	9%	Paul (TX)	9%
Blunt (MO)	9%	Pombo (CA)	9%
Bono (CA)	9%	Portman (OH)	9%
Brady, Kevin (TX)	9%	Radanovich (CA)	9%
Bryant (TN)	9%	Rogers, Michael (MI)	9%
Burton (IN)	9%	Ryan, Paul (WI)	9%
Camp (MI)	9%	Schaffer (CO)	9%
Cannon (UT)	9%	Shimkus (IL)	9%
Chabot (OH)	9%	Smith, Lamar (TX)	9%
Coble (NC)	9%	Souder (IN)	9%
Combest (TX)	9%	Stearns (FL)	9%
Crenshaw (FL)	9%	Stump (AZ)	9%
Culberson (TX)	9%	Tancredo (CO)	9%
Davis, Jo Ann (VA)	9%	Taylor, Charles (NC)	9%
Deal (GA)	9%	Thornberry (TX)	9%
DeLay (TX)	9%	Tiahrt (KS)	9%
DeMint (SC)	9%	Vitter (LA)	9%
Doolittle (CA)	9%	Akin (MO)	0%
Ehrlich (MD)	9%	Baker (LA)	0%
Foley (FL)	9%	Bartlett (MD)	0%
Goode (VA)	9%	Cantor (VA)	0%
Graham (SC)	9%	Cox (CA)	0%
Granger (TX)	9%	Crane (IL)	0%
Gutknecht (MN)	9%	Cubin (WY)	0%
Hansen (UT)	9%	Duncan (TN)	0%
Hastings, Doc (WA)	9%	Flake (AZ)	0%
Hefley (CO)	9%	Goodlatte (VA)	0%
Herger (CA)	9%	Hastert (IL)	0%
Hoekstra (MI)	9%	Hayworth (AZ)	0%
Hulshof (MO)	9%	Hostettler (IN)	0%
Hunter (CA)	9%	Kerns (IN)	0%
Issa (CA)	9%	McInnis (CO)	0%
Istook (OK)	9%	Otter (ID)	0%
Johnson, Sam (TX)	9%	Pence (IN)	0%
Jones, Walter (NC)	9%	Pitts (PA)	0%
Kennedy, Mark (MN)	9%	Rohrabacher (CA)	0%
Kingston (GA)	9%	Royce (CA)	0%
Knollenberg (MI)	9%	Ryun, Jim (KS)	0%
Largent (OK)	9%	Sensenbrenner (WI)	0%
Lewis, Jerry (CA)	9%	Sessions (TX)	0%
Lewis, Ron (KY)	9%	Shadegg (AZ)	0%
Linder (GA)	9%	Toomey (PA)	0%
McCrery (LA)	9%	Weldon, Dave (FL)	0%
Mica (FL)	9%	Young, Don (AK)	0%
Miller, Dan (FL)	9%		
Miller, Gary G. (CA)	9%		
Myrick (NC)	9%		

CDF Action Council Congressional Scorecard - 2001

State Delegation Rankings

State	Avg. Score	Rank	State	Avg. Score	Rank
Hawaii	91	1	Pennsylvania	47	25
Rhode Island	91	1	South Carolina	45	27
North Dakota	88	3	Mississippi	45	27
Vermont	88	3	North Carolina	45	27
Massachusetts	88	3	Iowa	44	30
West Virginia	75	6	Florida	44	30
Oregon	74	7	Ohio	42	32
Arkansas	71	8	Louisiana	40	33
Delaware	70	9	Indiana	40	33
South Dakota	70	9	Georgia	38	35
Maine	68	11	Virginia	36	36
New York	68	11	Tennessee	34	37
Washington	67	13	Montana	33	38
Minnesota	65	14	Nebraska	31	39
Connecticut	61	15	Colorado	31	39
Wisconsin	61	15	Alabama	29	41
New Jersey	61	15	Utah	27	42
Maryland	60	18	Kansas	24	43
Michigan	60	18	Kentucky	22	44
California	60	18	Oklahoma	20	45
Nevada	55	21	Arizona	18	46
Illinois	52	22	New Hampshire	16	47
New Mexico	49	23	Alaska	15	48
Texas	48	24	Idaho	14	49
Missouri	47	25	Wyoming	9	50

NOTE: This state average is comprised by averaging the scores of each Senator and Representative from the state.

CDF Action Council Congressional Scorecard - 2001

2001 Best & Worst State Delegations for Children

Best State Delegations for Children

State	Score	Rank
Hawaii	91	1
Rhode Island	91	1
North Dakota	88	3
Vermont	88	3
Massachusetts	88	3
West Virginia	75	6
Oregon	74	7
Arkansas	71	8
Delaware	70	9
South Dakota	70	9

Worst State Delegations for Children

Alabama	29	41
Utah	27	42
Kansas	24	43
Kentucky	22	44
Oklahoma	20	45
Arizona	18	46
New Hampshire	16	47
Alaska	15	48
Idaho	14	49
Wyoming	9	50

NOTE: This state average is comprised by averaging the scores of each Senator and Representative from the state.

Congressional Scores by State Delegation

Alabama

SENATE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>69</u>	<u>94</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>105</u>	<u>130</u>	<u>154</u>	<u>159</u>	<u>220</u>	<u>338</u>	<u>378</u>	Co-Sponsor of	SCORE
CDF Action Council position:	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	S. 940/H.R. 1990	
Sen. Sessions (R)	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	No	27%
Sen. Shelby (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	No	18%
HOUSE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>70</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>117</u>	<u>118</u>	<u>143</u>	<u>282</u>	<u>284</u>	<u>329</u>	<u>404</u>	<u>504</u>		
CDF Action Council position:	Nay	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea		
Rep. Aderholt (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Bachus (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Callahan (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Cramer (D)	+	-	?	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	No	55%
Rep. Everett (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Hilliard (D)	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	No	73%
Rep. Riley (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
											State Average:	29%
											State Rank:	41

Alaska

SENATE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>69</u>	<u>94</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>105</u>	<u>130</u>	<u>154</u>	<u>159</u>	<u>220</u>	<u>338</u>	<u>378</u>	Co-Sponsor of	SCORE
CDF Action Council position:	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	S. 940/H.R. 1990	
Sen. Murkowski (R)	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	?	-	+	No	27%
Sen. Stevens (R)	-	-	-	-	?	-	+	-	-	+	No	18%
HOUSE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>70</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>117</u>	<u>118</u>	<u>143</u>	<u>282</u>	<u>284</u>	<u>329</u>	<u>404</u>	<u>504</u>		
CDF Action Council position:	Nay	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea		
Rep. Young, Don (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	?	No	0%
											State Average:	15%
											State Rank:	48

Arizona

SENATE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>69</u>	<u>94</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>105</u>	<u>130</u>	<u>154</u>	<u>159</u>	<u>220</u>	<u>338</u>	<u>378</u>	Co-Sponsor of	SCORE
CDF Action Council position:	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	S. 940/H.R. 1990	
Sen. Kyl (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	No	9%
Sen. McCain (R)	-	+	-	-	-	-	?	+	?	-	No	18%
HOUSE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>70</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>117</u>	<u>118</u>	<u>143</u>	<u>282</u>	<u>284</u>	<u>329</u>	<u>404</u>	<u>504</u>		
CDF Action Council position:	Nay	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea		
Rep. Flake (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	No	0%
Rep. Hayworth (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	No	0%
Rep. Kolbe (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Pastor (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
Rep. Shadegg (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	No	0%
Rep. Stump (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	No	9%
											State Average:	18%
											State Rank:	46

Arkansas

SENATE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>69</u>	<u>94</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>105</u>	<u>130</u>	<u>154</u>	<u>159</u>	<u>220</u>	<u>338</u>	<u>378</u>	Co-Sponsor	SCORE
CDF Action Council position:	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	S. 940/H.R. 1990	
Sen. Hutchinson, Tim (R)	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	No	27%
Sen. Lincoln (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
HOUSE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>70</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>117</u>	<u>118</u>	<u>143</u>	<u>282</u>	<u>284</u>	<u>329</u>	<u>404</u>	<u>504</u>		
CDF Action Council position:	Nay	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea		
Rep. Berry (D)	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	73%
Rep. Hutchinson, Asa (R)	-	-	-	-	?	-	-	-	n/a	n/a	No	
Rep. Ross (D)	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	73%
Rep. Snyder (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
											State Average:	71%
											State Rank:	8

California

SENATE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>69</u>	<u>94</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>105</u>	<u>130</u>	<u>154</u>	<u>159</u>	<u>220</u>	<u>338</u>	<u>378</u>	Co-Sponsor	SCORE
CDF Action Council position:	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	S. 940/H.R. 1990	
Sen. Boxer (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
Sen. Feinstein (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
HOUSE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>70</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>117</u>	<u>118</u>	<u>143</u>	<u>282</u>	<u>284</u>	<u>329</u>	<u>404</u>	<u>504</u>		
CDF Action Council position:	Nay	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea		
Rep. Baca (D)	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	82%
Rep. Becerra (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Yes	100%
Rep. Berman (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Yes	100%
Rep. Bono (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	No	9%
Rep. Calvert (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Capps (D)	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	82%
Rep. Condit (D)	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	No	45%
Rep. Cox (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	No	0%
Rep. Cunningham (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Davis, Susan (D)	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	Yes	82%
Rep. Dooley (D)	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	No	73%
Rep. Doolittle (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	No	9%
Rep. Dreier (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Eshoo (D)	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	Yes	91%
Rep. Farr (D)	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	82%
Rep. Filner (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Yes	100%
Rep. Gallegly (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Harman (D)	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	82%
Rep. Herger (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	No	9%
Rep. Horn (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	+	No	27%
Rep. Hunter (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	No	9%
Rep. Issa (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	No	9%
Rep. Lantos (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
Rep. Lee (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Yes	100%
Rep. Lewis, Jerry (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	No	9%

(Continued next page)

VOTE KEY

- “+” = Member voted with the CDF Action Council position.
- “-” = Member voted against the CDF Action Council position.
- “?” = Member did not vote. Missed votes are counted against a Member in the final score.
- “n/a” = Was a Member in 2001, but not at the time of this vote.
- “-” = Member served in the first session of the 107th Congress, but not for a full term. The Member is not scored.

California

continued

Rep. Lofgren (D)	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	Yes	91%
Rep. Matsui (D)	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	No	82%
Rep. McKeon (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Millender-McDonald (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Yes	100%
Rep. Miller, George (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Yes	100%
Rep. Miller, Gary G. (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	No	9%
Rep. Napolitano (D)	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	Yes	91%
Rep. Ose (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Pelosi (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Yes	100%
Rep. Pombo (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	No	9%
Rep. Radanovich (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	No	9%
Rep. Rohrabacher (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	No	0%
Rep. Roybal-Allard (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
Rep. Royce (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	No	0%
Rep. Sanchez (D)	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Yes	91%
Rep. Schiff (D)	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	82%
Rep. Sherman (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
Rep. Solis (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Yes	100%
Rep. Stark (D)	+	+	+	+	+	?	?	+	+	?	Yes	73%
Rep. Tauscher (D)	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	82%
Rep. Thomas (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Thompson, Mike (D)	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	73%
Rep. Waters (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Yes	100%
Rep. Watson (D)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-	+	+	+	+	Yes	~
Rep. Waxman (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Yes	100%
Rep. Woolsey (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Yes	100%
State Average:											60%	
State Rank:											18	

Colorado

SENATE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>69</u>	<u>94</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>105</u>	<u>130</u>	<u>154</u>	<u>159</u>	<u>220</u>	<u>338</u>	<u>378</u>	Co-Sponsor	
CDF Action Council position:	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	S. 940/H.R. 1990	SCORE
Sen. Allard (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	No	9%
Sen. Campbell (R)	-	+	-	+	-	-	+	?	-	+	No	36%
HOUSE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>70</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>117</u>	<u>118</u>	<u>143</u>	<u>282</u>	<u>284</u>	<u>329</u>	<u>404</u>	<u>504</u>		
CDF Action Council position:	Nay	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea		
Rep. DeGette (D)	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	No	82%
Rep. Hefley (R)	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	No	9%
Rep. McClinnis (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	No	0%
Rep. Schaffer (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	No	9%
Rep. Tancredo (R)	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	No	9%
Rep. Udall, Mark (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
State Average:											31%	
State Rank:											39	

Connecticut

SENATE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>69</u>	<u>94</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>105</u>	<u>130</u>	<u>154</u>	<u>159</u>	<u>220</u>	<u>338</u>	<u>378</u>	Co-Sponsor	SCORE
CDF Action Council position:	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	S. 940/H.R. 1990	
Sen. Dodd (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Yes	100%
Sen. Lieberman (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
HOUSE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>70</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>117</u>	<u>118</u>	<u>143</u>	<u>282</u>	<u>284</u>	<u>329</u>	<u>404</u>	<u>504</u>		
CDF Action Council position:	Nay	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea		
Rep. DeLauro (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Yes	100%
Rep. Johnson, Nancy (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Larson, John (D)	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	No	73%
Rep. Maloney, James (D)	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	Yes	73%
Rep. Shays (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Simmons (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
											State Average:	61%
											State Rank:	15

Delaware

SENATE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>69</u>	<u>94</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>105</u>	<u>130</u>	<u>154</u>	<u>159</u>	<u>220</u>	<u>338</u>	<u>378</u>	Co-Sponsor	SCORE
CDF Action Council position:	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	S. 940/H.R. 1990	
Sen. Biden (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
Sen. Carper (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
HOUSE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>70</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>117</u>	<u>118</u>	<u>143</u>	<u>282</u>	<u>284</u>	<u>329</u>	<u>404</u>	<u>504</u>		
CDF Action Council position:	Nay	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea		
Rep. Castle (R)	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	27%
											State Average:	70%
											State Rank:	9

Florida

SENATE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>69</u>	<u>94</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>105</u>	<u>130</u>	<u>154</u>	<u>159</u>	<u>220</u>	<u>338</u>	<u>378</u>	Co-Sponsor	SCORE
CDF Action Council position:	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	S. 940/H.R. 1990	
Sen. Graham, Bob (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
Sen. Nelson, Bill (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
HOUSE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>70</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>117</u>	<u>118</u>	<u>143</u>	<u>282</u>	<u>284</u>	<u>329</u>	<u>404</u>	<u>504</u>		
CDF Action Council position:	Nay	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea		
Rep. Bilirakis (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Boyd (D)	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	73%
Rep. Brown, Corrine (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Yes	100%
Rep. Crenshaw (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	No	9%
Rep. Davis, Jim (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
Rep. Deutsch (D)	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	No	82%
Rep. Diaz-Balart (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Foley (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	No	9%

(Continued next page)

VOTE KEY

- "+" = Member voted with the CDF Action Council position.
- "-" = Member voted against the CDF Action Council position.
- "?" = Member did not vote. Missed votes are counted against a Member in the final score.
- "n/a" = Was a Member in 2001, but not at the time of this vote.
- "~" = Member served in the first session of the 107th Congress, but not for a full term. The Member is not scored.

Florida

continued

Rep. Goss (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Hastings (D)	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	?	Yes	82%
Rep. Keller (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Meek, Carrie (D)	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	?	Yes	82%
Rep. Mica (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	No	9%
Rep. Miller, Jeff (R)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-	+	No	~
Rep. Miller, Dan (R)	-	-	-	-	-	?	?	-	-	+	No	9%
Rep. Putnam (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Ros-Lehtinen (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Scarborough (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	n/a	n/a	No	~
Rep. Shaw (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Stearns (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	No	9%
Rep. Thurman (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
Rep. Weldon, Dave (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	No	0%
Rep. Wexler (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	No	82%
Rep. Young, C.W. "Bill" (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
State Average:											44%	
State Rank:											30	

Georgia

SENATE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>69</u>	<u>94</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>105</u>	<u>130</u>	<u>154</u>	<u>159</u>	<u>220</u>	<u>338</u>	<u>378</u>	Co-Sponsor	SCORE
CDF Action Council position:	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	S. 940/H.R. 1990	
Sen. Cleland (D)	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	82%
Sen. Miller (D)	-	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	No	55%
HOUSE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>70</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>117</u>	<u>118</u>	<u>143</u>	<u>282</u>	<u>284</u>	<u>329</u>	<u>404</u>	<u>504</u>		
CDF Action Council position:	Nay	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea		
Rep. Barr (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	No	9%
Rep. Bishop (D)	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	No	64%
Rep. Chambliss (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Collins (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Deal (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	No	9%
Rep. Isakson (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Kingston (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	No	9%
Rep. Lewis, John (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Yes	100%
Rep. Linder (R)	-	-	-	-	-	?	?	-	-	+	No	9%
Rep. McKinney (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Yes	100%
Rep. Norwood (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	No	9%
State Average:											38%	
State Rank:											35	

Hawaii

SENATE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>69</u>	<u>94</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>105</u>	<u>130</u>	<u>154</u>	<u>159</u>	<u>220</u>	<u>338</u>	<u>378</u>	Co-Sponsor	SCORE
CDF Action Council position:	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	S. 940/H.R. 1990	
Sen. Akaka (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	No	82%
Sen. Inouye (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Yes	100%
HOUSE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>70</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>117</u>	<u>118</u>	<u>143</u>	<u>282</u>	<u>284</u>	<u>329</u>	<u>404</u>	<u>504</u>		
CDF Action Council position:	Nay	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea		
Rep. Abercrombie (D)	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	Yes	82%
Rep. Mink (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Yes	100%
State Average:											91%	
State Rank:											1	

Idaho

SENATE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>69</u>	<u>94</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>105</u>	<u>130</u>	<u>154</u>	<u>159</u>	<u>220</u>	<u>338</u>	<u>378</u>	Co-Sponsor	SCORE
CDF Action Council position:	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	S. 940/H.R. 1990	
Sen. Craig (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	No	18%
Sen. Crapo (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	No	18%
HOUSE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>70</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>117</u>	<u>118</u>	<u>143</u>	<u>282</u>	<u>284</u>	<u>329</u>	<u>404</u>	<u>504</u>		
CDF Action Council position:	Nay	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea		
Rep. Otter (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	No	0%
Rep. Simpson (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
											State Average:	14%
											State Rank:	49

Illinois

SENATE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>69</u>	<u>94</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>105</u>	<u>130</u>	<u>154</u>	<u>159</u>	<u>220</u>	<u>338</u>	<u>378</u>	Co-Sponsor	SCORE
CDF Action Council position:	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	S. 940/H.R. 1990	
Sen. Durbin (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
Sen. Fitzgerald (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	No	18%
HOUSE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>70</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>117</u>	<u>118</u>	<u>143</u>	<u>282</u>	<u>284</u>	<u>329</u>	<u>404</u>	<u>504</u>		
CDF Action Council position:	Nay	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea		
Rep. Biggert (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Blagojevich (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Yes	100%
Rep. Costello (D)	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	No	73%
Rep. Crane (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	No	0%
Rep. Davis, Danny (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Yes	100%
Rep. Evans (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
Rep. Gutierrez (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Yes	100%
Rep. Hastert (R)	-	?	?	-	?	?	-	-	-	?	No	0%
Rep. Hyde (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Jackson, Jesse, Jr. (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Yes	100%
Rep. Johnson, Timothy (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	+	No	36%
Rep. Kirk (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. LaHood (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	No	27%
Rep. Lipinski (D)	+	-	-	+	+	?	?	?	+	+	No	45%
Rep. Manzullo (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Phelps (D)	+	-	?	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	No	64%
Rep. Rush (D)	+	+	+	+	?	+	+	+	+	+	Yes	91%
Rep. Schakowsky (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Yes	100%
Rep. Shimkus (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	No	9%
Rep. Weller (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
											State Average:	52%
											State Rank:	22

VOTE KEY

- “+” = Member voted with the CDF Action Council position.
- “-” = Member voted against the CDF Action Council position.
- “?” = Member did not vote. Missed votes are counted against a Member in the final score.
- “n/a” = Was a Member in 2001, but not at the time of this vote.
- “-” = Member served in the first session of the 107th Congress, but not for a full term. The Member is not scored.

Indiana

SENATE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>69</u>	<u>94</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>105</u>	<u>130</u>	<u>154</u>	<u>159</u>	<u>220</u>	<u>338</u>	<u>378</u>	Co-Sponsor	SCORE
CDF Action Council position:	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	S. 940/H.R. 1990	
Sen. Bayh (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
Sen. Lugar (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	No	18%
HOUSE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>70</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>117</u>	<u>118</u>	<u>143</u>	<u>282</u>	<u>284</u>	<u>329</u>	<u>404</u>	<u>504</u>		
CDF Action Council position:	Nay	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea		
Rep. Burton (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	No	9%
Rep. Buyer (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Carson, Julia (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Yes	100%
Rep. Hill (D)	+	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	?	+	No	64%
Rep. Hostettler (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	No	0%
Rep. Kerns (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	No	0%
Rep. Pence (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	No	0%
Rep. Roemer (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
Rep. Souder (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	No	9%
Rep. Visclosky (D)	+	+	+	+	?	+	+	+	+	+	No	82%
											State Average:	40%
											State Rank:	33

Iowa

SENATE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>69</u>	<u>94</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>105</u>	<u>130</u>	<u>154</u>	<u>159</u>	<u>220</u>	<u>338</u>	<u>378</u>	Co-Sponsor	SCORE
CDF Action Council position:	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	S. 940/H.R. 1990	
Sen. Grassley (R)	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	No	27%
Sen. Harkin (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
HOUSE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>70</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>117</u>	<u>118</u>	<u>143</u>	<u>282</u>	<u>284</u>	<u>329</u>	<u>404</u>	<u>504</u>		
CDF Action Council position:	Nay	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea		
Rep. Boswell (D)	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	82%
Rep. Ganske (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	No	36%
Rep. Latham (R)	-	?	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Leach (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	No	45%
Rep. Nussle (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	No	9%
											State Average:	44%
											State Rank:	30

Kansas

SENATE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>69</u>	<u>94</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>105</u>	<u>130</u>	<u>154</u>	<u>159</u>	<u>220</u>	<u>338</u>	<u>378</u>	Co-Sponsor	SCORE
CDF Action Council position:	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	S. 940/H.R. 1990	
Sen. Brownback (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	No	18%
Sen. Roberts (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	No	18%
HOUSE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>70</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>117</u>	<u>118</u>	<u>143</u>	<u>282</u>	<u>284</u>	<u>329</u>	<u>404</u>	<u>504</u>		
CDF Action Council position:	Nay	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea		
Rep. Moore (D)	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	No	73%
Rep. Moran, Jerry (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	+	No	27%
Rep. Ryun, Jim (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	No	0%
Rep. Tiahrt (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	No	9%
											State Average:	24%
											State Rank:	43

Kentucky

SENATE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>69</u>	<u>94</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>105</u>	<u>130</u>	<u>154</u>	<u>159</u>	<u>220</u>	<u>338</u>	<u>378</u>	Co-Sponsor	SCORE
CDF Action Council position:	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	S. 940/H.R. 1990	
Sen. Bunning (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	No	18%
Sen. McConnell (R)	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	No	27%
HOUSE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>70</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>117</u>	<u>118</u>	<u>143</u>	<u>282</u>	<u>284</u>	<u>329</u>	<u>404</u>	<u>504</u>		
CDF Action Council position:	Nay	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea		
Rep. Fletcher (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Lewis, Ron (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	No	9%
Rep. Lucas, Ken (D)	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	No	45%
Rep. Northup (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Rogers, Harold (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Whitfield (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
											State Average:	22%
											State Rank:	44

Louisiana

SENATE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>69</u>	<u>94</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>105</u>	<u>130</u>	<u>154</u>	<u>159</u>	<u>220</u>	<u>338</u>	<u>378</u>	Co-Sponsor	SCORE
CDF Action Council position:	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	S. 940/H.R. 1990	
Sen. Breaux (D)	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	No	64%
Sen. Landrieu (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
HOUSE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>70</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>117</u>	<u>118</u>	<u>143</u>	<u>282</u>	<u>284</u>	<u>329</u>	<u>404</u>	<u>504</u>		
CDF Action Council position:	Nay	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea		
Rep. Baker (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	?	No	0%
Rep. Cooksey (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Jefferson (D)	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Yes	91%
Rep. John (D)	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	No	64%
Rep. McCrery (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	No	9%
Rep. Tauzin (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Vitter (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	No	9%
											State Average:	40%
											State Rank:	33

Maine

SENATE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>69</u>	<u>94</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>105</u>	<u>130</u>	<u>154</u>	<u>159</u>	<u>220</u>	<u>338</u>	<u>378</u>	Co-Sponsor	SCORE
CDF Action Council position:	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	S. 940/H.R. 1990	
Sen. Collins (R)	-	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	+	No	45%
Sen. Snowe (R)	-	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	+	No	45%
HOUSE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>70</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>117</u>	<u>118</u>	<u>143</u>	<u>282</u>	<u>284</u>	<u>329</u>	<u>404</u>	<u>504</u>		
CDF Action Council position:	Nay	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea		
Rep. Allen (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
Rep. Baldacci (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
											State Average:	68%
											State Rank:	11

VOTE KEY

- "+" = Member voted with the CDF Action Council position.
- "-" = Member voted against the CDF Action Council position.
- "?" = Member did not vote. Missed votes are counted against a Member in the final score.
- "n/a" = Was a Member in 2001, but not at the time of this vote.
- "~" = Member served in the first session of the 107th Congress, but not for a full term. The Member is not scored.

Maryland

SENATE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>69</u>	<u>94</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>105</u>	<u>130</u>	<u>154</u>	<u>159</u>	<u>220</u>	<u>338</u>	<u>378</u>	Co-Sponsor	SCORE
CDF Action Council position:	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	S. 940/H.R. 1990	
Sen. Mikulski (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Yes	100%
Sen. Sarbanes (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Yes	100%
HOUSE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>70</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>117</u>	<u>118</u>	<u>143</u>	<u>282</u>	<u>284</u>	<u>329</u>	<u>404</u>	<u>504</u>		
CDF Action Council position:	Nay	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea		
Rep. Bartlett (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	No	0%
Rep. Cardin (D)	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	No	82%
Rep. Cummings (D)	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	Yes	91%
Rep. Ehrlich (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	No	9%
Rep. Gilchrest (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Hoyer (D)	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	No	73%
Rep. Morella (R)	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	Yes	55%
Rep. Wynn (D)	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	Yes	73%
											State Average:	60%
											State Rank:	18

Massachusetts

SENATE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>69</u>	<u>94</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>105</u>	<u>130</u>	<u>154</u>	<u>159</u>	<u>220</u>	<u>338</u>	<u>378</u>	Co-Sponsor	SCORE
CDF Action Council position:	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	S. 940/H.R. 1990	
Sen. Kennedy (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Yes	100%
Sen. Kerry (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
HOUSE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>70</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>117</u>	<u>118</u>	<u>143</u>	<u>282</u>	<u>284</u>	<u>329</u>	<u>404</u>	<u>504</u>		
CDF Action Council position:	Nay	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea		
Rep. Capuano (D)	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	No	82%
Rep. Delahunt (D)	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	No	82%
Rep. Frank (D)	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	Yes	91%
Rep. Lynch (D)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	+	+	No	~
Rep. Markey (D)	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	No	82%
Rep. McGovern (D)	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	No	82%
Rep. Meehan (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
Rep. Moakley (D)	+	+	+	+	?	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	No	~
Rep. Neal (D)	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	No	82%
Rep. Oliver (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
Rep. Tierney (D)	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	Yes	91%
											State Average:	88%
											State Rank:	3

Michigan

SENATE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>69</u>	<u>94</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>105</u>	<u>130</u>	<u>154</u>	<u>159</u>	<u>220</u>	<u>338</u>	<u>378</u>	Co-Sponsor	SCORE
CDF Action Council position:	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	S. 940/H.R. 1990	
Sen. Levin (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
Sen. Stabenow (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
HOUSE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>70</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>117</u>	<u>118</u>	<u>143</u>	<u>282</u>	<u>284</u>	<u>329</u>	<u>404</u>	<u>504</u>		
CDF Action Council position:	Nay	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea		
Rep. Barcia (D)	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	No	73%
Rep. Bonior (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Yes	100%
Rep. Camp (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	No	9%
Rep. Conyers (D)	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	Yes	91%
Rep. Dingell (D)	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	No	82%
Rep. Ehlers (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Hoekstra (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	No	9%
Rep. Kildee (D)	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	Yes	91%
Rep. Kilpatrick (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Yes	100%
Rep. Knollenberg (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	No	9%
Rep. Levin (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
Rep. Rivers (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
Rep. Rogers, Michael (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	No	9%
Rep. Smith, Nick (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	No	18%
Rep. Stupak (D)	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	No	82%
Rep. Upton (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
											State Average:	60%
											State Rank:	18

Minnesota

SENATE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>69</u>	<u>94</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>105</u>	<u>130</u>	<u>154</u>	<u>159</u>	<u>220</u>	<u>338</u>	<u>378</u>	Co-Sponsor	SCORE
CDF Action Council position:	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	S. 940/H.R. 1990	
Sen. Dayton (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Yes	100%
Sen. Wellstone (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Yes	100%
HOUSE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>70</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>117</u>	<u>118</u>	<u>143</u>	<u>282</u>	<u>284</u>	<u>329</u>	<u>404</u>	<u>504</u>		
CDF Action Council position:	Nay	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea		
Rep. Gutknecht (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	No	9%
Rep. Kennedy, Mark (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	No	9%
Rep. Luther (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	No	82%
Rep. McCollum (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
Rep. Oberstar (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
Rep. Peterson, Collin (D)	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	No	73%
Rep. Ramstad (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Sabo (D)	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	No	82%
											State Average:	65%
											State Rank:	14

VOTE KEY

- "+" = Member voted with the CDF Action Council position.
- "-" = Member voted against the CDF Action Council position.
- "?" = Member did not vote. Missed votes are counted against a Member in the final score.
- "n/a" = Was a Member in 2001, but not at the time of this vote.
- "~" = Member served in the first session of the 107th Congress, but not for a full term. The Member is not scored.

Mississippi

SENATE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>69</u>	<u>94</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>105</u>	<u>130</u>	<u>154</u>	<u>159</u>	<u>220</u>	<u>338</u>	<u>378</u>	Co-Sponsor	SCORE
CDF Action Council position:	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	S. 940/H.R. 1990	
Sen. Cochran (R)	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	No	27%
Sen. Lott (R)	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	?	-	+	No	27%
HOUSE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>70</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>117</u>	<u>118</u>	<u>143</u>	<u>282</u>	<u>284</u>	<u>329</u>	<u>404</u>	<u>504</u>		
CDF Action Council position:	Nay	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea		
Rep. Pickering (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Shows (D)	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	64%
Rep. Taylor, Gene (D)	+	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	No	73%
Rep. Thompson, Bennie (D)	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	Yes	91%
Rep. Wicker (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
											State Average:	45%
											State Rank:	27

Missouri

SENATE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>69</u>	<u>94</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>105</u>	<u>130</u>	<u>154</u>	<u>159</u>	<u>220</u>	<u>338</u>	<u>378</u>	Co-Sponsor	SCORE
CDF Action Council position:	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	S. 940/H.R. 1990	
Sen. Bond (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	No	18%
Sen. Carnahan (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
HOUSE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>70</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>117</u>	<u>118</u>	<u>143</u>	<u>282</u>	<u>284</u>	<u>329</u>	<u>404</u>	<u>504</u>		
CDF Action Council position:	Nay	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea		
Rep. Akin (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	No	0%
Rep. Blunt (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	No	9%
Rep. Clay (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Yes	100%
Rep. Emerson (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	+	No	27%
Rep. Gephardt (D)	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	No	82%
Rep. Graves (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Hulshof (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	No	9%
Rep. McCarthy, Karen (D)	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	No	82%
Rep. Skelton (D)	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	82%
											State Average:	47%
											State Rank:	25

Montana

SENATE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>69</u>	<u>94</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>105</u>	<u>130</u>	<u>154</u>	<u>159</u>	<u>220</u>	<u>338</u>	<u>378</u>	Co-Sponsor	SCORE
CDF Action Council position:	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	S. 940/H.R. 1990	
Sen. Baucus (D)	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	No	64%
Sen. Burns (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	No	18%
HOUSE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>70</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>117</u>	<u>118</u>	<u>143</u>	<u>282</u>	<u>284</u>	<u>329</u>	<u>404</u>	<u>504</u>		
CDF Action Council position:	Nay	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea		
Rep. Rehberg (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
											State Average:	33%
											State Rank:	38

Nebraska

SENATE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>69</u>	<u>94</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>105</u>	<u>130</u>	<u>154</u>	<u>159</u>	<u>220</u>	<u>338</u>	<u>378</u>	Co-Sponsor	SCORE
CDF Action Council position:	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	S. 940/H.R. 1990	
Sen. Hagel (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	No	18%
Sen. Nelson, Ben (D)	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	No	64%
HOUSE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>70</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>117</u>	<u>118</u>	<u>143</u>	<u>282</u>	<u>284</u>	<u>329</u>	<u>404</u>	<u>504</u>		
CDF Action Council position:	Nay	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea		
Rep. Bereuter (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	+	No	27%
Rep. Osborne (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	+	No	27%
Rep. Terry (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
											State Average:	31%
											State Rank:	39

Nevada

SENATE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>69</u>	<u>94</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>105</u>	<u>130</u>	<u>154</u>	<u>159</u>	<u>220</u>	<u>338</u>	<u>378</u>	Co-Sponsor	SCORE
CDF Action Council position:	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	S. 940/H.R. 1990	
Sen. Ensign (R)	-	+	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	?	No	27%
Sen. Reid, Harry (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
HOUSE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>70</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>117</u>	<u>118</u>	<u>143</u>	<u>282</u>	<u>284</u>	<u>329</u>	<u>404</u>	<u>504</u>		
CDF Action Council position:	Nay	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea		
Rep. Berkley (D)	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	82%
Rep. Gibbons (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
											State Average:	55%
											State Rank:	21

New Hampshire

SENATE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>69</u>	<u>94</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>105</u>	<u>130</u>	<u>154</u>	<u>159</u>	<u>220</u>	<u>338</u>	<u>378</u>	Co-Sponsor	SCORE
CDF Action Council position:	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	S. 940/H.R. 1990	
Sen. Gregg (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	No	18%
Sen. Smith, Robert (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	No	9%
HOUSE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>70</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>117</u>	<u>118</u>	<u>143</u>	<u>282</u>	<u>284</u>	<u>329</u>	<u>404</u>	<u>504</u>		
CDF Action Council position:	Nay	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea		
Rep. Bass (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Sununu (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
											State Average:	16%
											State Rank:	47

VOTE KEY

- “+” = Member voted with the CDF Action Council position.
- “-” = Member voted against the CDF Action Council position.
- “?” = Member did not vote. Missed votes are counted against a Member in the final score.
- “n/a” = Was a Member in 2001, but not at the time of this vote.
- “-” = Member served in the first session of the 107th Congress, but not for a full term. The Member is not scored.

New Jersey

SENATE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>69</u>	<u>94</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>105</u>	<u>130</u>	<u>154</u>	<u>159</u>	<u>220</u>	<u>338</u>	<u>378</u>	Co-Sponsor	SCORE
CDF Action Council position:	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	S. 940/H.R. 1990	
Sen. Corzine (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
Sen. Torricelli (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
HOUSE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>70</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>117</u>	<u>118</u>	<u>143</u>	<u>282</u>	<u>284</u>	<u>329</u>	<u>404</u>	<u>504</u>		
CDF Action Council position:	Nay	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea		
Rep. Andrews (D)	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	Yes	82%
Rep. Ferguson (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Frelinghuysen (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Holt (D)	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	No	73%
Rep. LoBiondo (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Menendez (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
Rep. Pallone (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
Rep. Pascrell (D)	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	Yes	91%
Rep. Payne (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Yes	100%
Rep. Rothman (D)	?	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	82%
Rep. Roukema (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	+	No	27%
Rep. Saxton (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Smith, Christopher (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	No	18%
											State Average:	61%
											State Rank:	15

New Mexico

SENATE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>69</u>	<u>94</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>105</u>	<u>130</u>	<u>154</u>	<u>159</u>	<u>220</u>	<u>338</u>	<u>378</u>	Co-Sponsor	SCORE
CDF Action Council position:	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	S. 940/H.R. 1990	
Sen. Bingaman (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
Sen. Domenici (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	?	-	+	No	18%
HOUSE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>70</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>117</u>	<u>118</u>	<u>143</u>	<u>282</u>	<u>284</u>	<u>329</u>	<u>404</u>	<u>504</u>		
CDF Action Council position:	Nay	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea		
Rep. Skeen (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Udall, Tom (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
Rep. Wilson (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	+	No	27%
											State Average:	49%
											State Rank:	23

New York

SENATE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>69</u>	<u>94</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>105</u>	<u>130</u>	<u>154</u>	<u>159</u>	<u>220</u>	<u>338</u>	<u>378</u>	Co-Sponsor	SCORE
CDF Action Council position:	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	S. 940/H.R. 1990	
Sen. Clinton (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Yes	100%
Sen. Schumer (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Yes	100%
HOUSE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>70</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>117</u>	<u>118</u>	<u>143</u>	<u>282</u>	<u>284</u>	<u>329</u>	<u>404</u>	<u>504</u>		
CDF Action Council position:	Nay	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea		
Rep. Ackerman (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
Rep. Boehlert (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Crowley (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Yes	100%
Rep. Engel (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Yes	100%
Rep. Fossella (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	+	No	27%
Rep. Gilman (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Grucci (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%

New York

continued

Rep. Hinchey (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
Rep. Houghton (R)	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	27%
Rep. Israel (D)	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	No	73%
Rep. Kelly (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. King (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. LaFalce (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Yes	100%
Rep. Lowey (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
Rep. Maloney, Carolyn (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
Rep. McCarthy, Carolyn (D)	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	82%
Rep. McHugh (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. McNulty (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
Rep. Meeks, Gregory (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Yes	100%
Rep. Nadler (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Yes	100%
Rep. Owens (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Yes	100%
Rep. Quinn (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	No	27%
Rep. Rangel (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Yes	100%
Rep. Reynolds (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Serrano (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Yes	100%
Rep. Slaughter (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Yes	100%
Rep. Sweeney (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Towns (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Yes	100%
Rep. Velazquez (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Yes	100%
Rep. Walsh (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Weiner (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
											State Average:	68%
											State Rank:	11

North Carolina

SENATE Roll Call Vote #:	69	94	98	105	130	154	159	220	338	378	Co-Sponsor	SCORE
CDF Action Council position:	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	S. 940/H.R. 1990	
Sen. Edwards (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
Sen. Helms (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	?	-	-	?	No	0%
HOUSE Roll Call Vote #:	70	84	117	118	143	282	284	329	404	504		
CDF Action Council position:	Nay	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea		
Rep. Ballenger (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Burr (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	+	No	27%
Rep. Clayton (D)	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	Yes	91%
Rep. Coble (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	No	9%
Rep. Etheridge (D)	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	82%
Rep. Hayes (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Jones, Walter (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	No	9%
Rep. McIntyre (D)	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	73%
Rep. Myrick (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	No	9%
Rep. Price, David (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
Rep. Taylor, Charles (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	No	9%
Rep. Watt, Mel (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Yes	100%
											State Average:	45%
											State Rank:	27

VOTE KEY

- “+” = Member voted with the CDF Action Council position.
- “-” = Member voted against the CDF Action Council position.
- “?” = Member did not vote. Missed votes are counted against a Member in the final score.
- “n/a” = Was a Member in 2001, but not at the time of this vote.
- “~” = Member served in the first session of the 107th Congress, but not for a full term. The Member is not scored.

North Dakota

SENATE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>69</u>	<u>94</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>105</u>	<u>130</u>	<u>154</u>	<u>159</u>	<u>220</u>	<u>338</u>	<u>378</u>	Co-Sponsor	SCORE
CDF Action Council position:	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	S. 940/H.R. 1990	
Sen. Conrad (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
Sen. Dorgan (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
HOUSE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>70</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>117</u>	<u>118</u>	<u>143</u>	<u>282</u>	<u>284</u>	<u>329</u>	<u>404</u>	<u>504</u>		
CDF Action Council position:	Nay	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea		
Rep. Pomeroy (D)	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	No	82%
											State Average:	88%
											State Rank:	3

Ohio

SENATE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>69</u>	<u>94</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>105</u>	<u>130</u>	<u>154</u>	<u>159</u>	<u>220</u>	<u>338</u>	<u>378</u>	Co-Sponsor	SCORE
CDF Action Council position:	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	S. 940/H.R. 1990	
Sen. DeWine (R)	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	+	No	36%
Sen. Voinovich (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	No	9%
HOUSE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>70</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>117</u>	<u>118</u>	<u>143</u>	<u>282</u>	<u>284</u>	<u>329</u>	<u>404</u>	<u>504</u>		
CDF Action Council position:	Nay	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea		
Rep. Boehner (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Brown, Sherrod (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
Rep. Chabot (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	No	9%
Rep. Gillmor (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Hall, Tony (D)	+	+	+	+	+	?	?	+	+	?	No	64%
Rep. Hobson (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Jones, Stephanie Tubbs (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Yes	100%
Rep. Kaptur (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Yes	100%
Rep. Kucinich (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Yes	100%
Rep. LaTourette (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Ney (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Oxley (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Portman (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	No	9%
Rep. Pryce, Deborah (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Regula (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Sawyer (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
Rep. Strickland (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
Rep. Tiberi (R)	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Traficant (D)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
											State Average:	42%
											State Rank:	32

Oklahoma

SENATE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>69</u>	<u>94</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>105</u>	<u>130</u>	<u>154</u>	<u>159</u>	<u>220</u>	<u>338</u>	<u>378</u>	Co-Sponsor	SCORE
CDF Action Council position:	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	S. 940/H.R. 1990	
Sen. Inhofe (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	No	18%
Sen. Nickles (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	No	0%
HOUSE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>70</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>117</u>	<u>118</u>	<u>143</u>	<u>282</u>	<u>284</u>	<u>329</u>	<u>404</u>	<u>504</u>		
CDF Action Council position:	Nay	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea		
Rep. Carson, Brad (D)	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	No	73%
Rep. Istook (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	No	9%
Rep. Largent (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	No	9%
Rep. Lucas, Frank (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Watkins (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Watts, J.C. (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
											State Average:	20%
											State Rank:	45

Oregon

SENATE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>69</u>	<u>94</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>105</u>	<u>130</u>	<u>154</u>	<u>159</u>	<u>220</u>	<u>338</u>	<u>378</u>	Co-Sponsor	SCORE
CDF Action Council position:	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	S. 940/H.R. 1990	
Sen. Smith, Gordon (R)	-	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	+	No	45%
Sen. Wyden (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
HOUSE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>70</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>117</u>	<u>118</u>	<u>143</u>	<u>282</u>	<u>284</u>	<u>329</u>	<u>404</u>	<u>504</u>		
CDF Action Council position:	Nay	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea		
Rep. Blumenauer (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
Rep. DeFazio (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Yes	100%
Rep. Hooley (D)	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	82%
Rep. Walden (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Wu (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
											State Average:	74%
											State Rank:	7

Pennsylvania

SENATE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>69</u>	<u>94</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>105</u>	<u>130</u>	<u>154</u>	<u>159</u>	<u>220</u>	<u>338</u>	<u>378</u>	Co-Sponsor	SCORE
CDF Action Council position:	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	S. 940/H.R. 1990	
Sen. Santorum (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	No	18%
Sen. Specter (R)	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	+	No	55%
HOUSE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>70</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>117</u>	<u>118</u>	<u>143</u>	<u>282</u>	<u>284</u>	<u>329</u>	<u>404</u>	<u>504</u>		
CDF Action Council position:	Nay	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea		
Rep. Borski (D)	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	No	82%
Rep. Brady, Robert (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
Rep. Coyne (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
Rep. Doyle (D)	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	No	73%
Rep. English (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Fattah (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Yes	100%
Rep. Gekas (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Greenwood (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Hart (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Hoeffel (D)	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	No	82%
Rep. Holden (D)	+	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	No	73%
Rep. Kanjorski (D)	+	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	No	73%
Rep. Mascara (D)	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	No	73%
Rep. Murtha (D)	+	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	No	73%
Rep. Peterson, John (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Pitts (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	No	0%
Rep. Platts (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Sherwood (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Shuster, Bill (R)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	~
Rep. Toomey (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	No	0%
Rep. Weldon, Curt (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
											State Average:	47%
											State Rank:	25

VOTE KEY

- "+" = Member voted with the CDF Action Council position.
- "-" = Member voted against the CDF Action Council position.
- "?" = Member did not vote. Missed votes are counted against a Member in the final score.
- "n/a" = Was a Member in 2001, but not at the time of this vote.
- "~" = Member served in the first session of the 107th Congress, but not for a full term. The Member is not scored.

Rhode Island

SENATE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>69</u>	<u>94</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>105</u>	<u>130</u>	<u>154</u>	<u>159</u>	<u>220</u>	<u>338</u>	<u>378</u>	Co-Sponsor	SCORE
CDF Action Council position:	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	S. 940/H.R. 1990	
Sen. Chafee (R)	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	+	No	73%
Sen. Reed, Jack (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Yes	100%
HOUSE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>70</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>117</u>	<u>118</u>	<u>143</u>	<u>282</u>	<u>284</u>	<u>329</u>	<u>404</u>	<u>504</u>		
CDF Action Council position:	Nay	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea		
Rep. Kennedy, Patrick (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Yes	100%
Rep. Langevin (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
											State Average:	91%
											State Rank:	1

South Carolina

SENATE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>69</u>	<u>94</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>105</u>	<u>130</u>	<u>154</u>	<u>159</u>	<u>220</u>	<u>338</u>	<u>378</u>	Co-Sponsor	SCORE
CDF Action Council position:	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	S. 940/H.R. 1990	
Sen. Hollings (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
Sen. Thurmond (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	No	18%
HOUSE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>70</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>117</u>	<u>118</u>	<u>143</u>	<u>282</u>	<u>284</u>	<u>329</u>	<u>404</u>	<u>504</u>		
CDF Action Council position:	Nay	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea		
Rep. Brown, Henry (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Clyburn (D)	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	Yes	82%
Rep. DeMint (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	No	9%
Rep. Graham (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	No	9%
Rep. Spence (R)	-	-	-	-	-	?	?	?	n/a	n/a	No	~
Rep. Spratt (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
											State Average:	45%
											State Rank:	27

South Dakota

SENATE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>69</u>	<u>94</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>105</u>	<u>130</u>	<u>154</u>	<u>159</u>	<u>220</u>	<u>338</u>	<u>378</u>	Co-Sponsor	SCORE
CDF Action Council position:	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	S. 940/H.R. 1990	
Sen. Daschle (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
Sen. Johnson (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
HOUSE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>70</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>117</u>	<u>118</u>	<u>143</u>	<u>282</u>	<u>284</u>	<u>329</u>	<u>404</u>	<u>504</u>		
CDF Action Council position:	Nay	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea		
Rep. Thune (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	No	27%
											State Average:	70%
											State Rank:	9

Tennessee

SENATE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>69</u>	<u>94</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>105</u>	<u>130</u>	<u>154</u>	<u>159</u>	<u>220</u>	<u>338</u>	<u>378</u>	Co-Sponsor	SCORE
CDF Action Council position:	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	S. 940/H.R. 1990	
Sen. Frist (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	No	18%
Sen. Thompson (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	No	18%
HOUSE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>70</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>117</u>	<u>118</u>	<u>143</u>	<u>282</u>	<u>284</u>	<u>329</u>	<u>404</u>	<u>504</u>		
CDF Action Council position:	Nay	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea		
Rep. Bryant (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	No	9%
Rep. Clement (D)	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	?	No	55%
Rep. Duncan (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	No	0%

Tennessee

continued

Rep. Ford (D)	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Yes	91%
Rep. Gordon (D)	?	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	No	45%
Rep. Hilleary (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Jenkins (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Tanner (D)	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	82%
Rep. Wamp (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
											State Average:	34%
											State Rank:	37

Texas

SENATE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>69</u>	<u>94</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>105</u>	<u>130</u>	<u>154</u>	<u>159</u>	<u>220</u>	<u>338</u>	<u>378</u>	Co-Sponsor	SCORE
CDF Action Council position:	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	S. 940/H.R. 1990	
Sen. Gramm, Phil (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	?	?	+	No	9%
Sen. Hutchison, K. (R)	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	No	27%
HOUSE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>70</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>117</u>	<u>118</u>	<u>143</u>	<u>282</u>	<u>284</u>	<u>329</u>	<u>404</u>	<u>504</u>		
CDF Action Council position:	Nay	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea		
Rep. Armev (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	No	9%
Rep. Barton (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	No	9%
Rep. Bentsen (D)	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	No	82%
Rep. Bonilla (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Brady, Kevin (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	No	9%
Rep. Combest (R)	-	-	-	-	-	?	-	-	-	+	No	9%
Rep. Culberson (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	No	9%
Rep. DeLay (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	No	9%
Rep. Doggett (D)	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	82%
Rep. Edwards (D)	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	No	82%
Rep. Frost (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
Rep. Gonzalez (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
Rep. Granger (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	No	9%
Rep. Green, Gene (D)	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	No	82%
Rep. Hall, Ralph (D)	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	+	No	36%
Rep. Hinojosa (D)	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Yes	91%
Rep. Jackson-Lee, S. (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Yes	100%
Rep. Johnson, Sam (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	No	9%
Rep. Johnson, E. (D)	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	Yes	91%
Rep. Lampson (D)	?	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	No	64%
Rep. Ortiz (D)	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	82%
Rep. Paul (R)	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	?	-	-	No	9%
Rep. Reyes (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	No	82%
Rep. Rodriguez (D)	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	Yes	91%
Rep. Sandlin (D)	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	82%
Rep. Sessions (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	No	0%
Rep. Smith, Lamar (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	No	9%
Rep. Stenholm (D)	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	73%
Rep. Thornberry (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	No	9%
Rep. Turner (D)	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	No	82%
											State Average:	48%
											State Rank:	24

VOTE KEY

- "+" = Member voted with the CDF Action Council position.
- "-" = Member voted against the CDF Action Council position.
- "?" = Member did not vote. Missed votes are counted against a Member in the final score.
- "n/a" = Was a Member in 2001, but not at the time of this vote.
- "-" = Member served in the first session of the 107th Congress, but not for a full term. The Member is not scored.

Utah

SENATE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>69</u>	<u>94</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>105</u>	<u>130</u>	<u>154</u>	<u>159</u>	<u>220</u>	<u>338</u>	<u>378</u>	Co-Sponsor	SCORE
CDF Action Council position:	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	S. 940/H.R. 1990	
Sen. Bennett (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	No	18%
Sen. Hatch (R)	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	No	27%
HOUSE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>70</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>117</u>	<u>118</u>	<u>143</u>	<u>282</u>	<u>284</u>	<u>329</u>	<u>404</u>	<u>504</u>		
CDF Action Council position:	Nay	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea		
Rep. Cannon (R)	-	-	-	?	-	-	-	-	-	+	No	9%
Rep. Hansen (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	No	9%
Rep. Matheson (D)	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	No	73%
											State Average:	27%
											State Rank:	42

Vermont

SENATE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>69</u>	<u>94</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>105</u>	<u>130</u>	<u>154</u>	<u>159</u>	<u>220</u>	<u>338</u>	<u>378</u>	Co-Sponsor	SCORE
CDF Action Council position:	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	S. 940/H.R. 1990	
Sen. Jeffords (I)	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	No	73%
Sen. Leahy (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
HOUSE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>70</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>117</u>	<u>118</u>	<u>143</u>	<u>282</u>	<u>284</u>	<u>329</u>	<u>404</u>	<u>504</u>		
CDF Action Council position:	Nay	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea		
Sanders (I)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Yes	100%
											State Average:	88%
											State Rank:	3

Virginia

SENATE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>69</u>	<u>94</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>105</u>	<u>130</u>	<u>154</u>	<u>159</u>	<u>220</u>	<u>338</u>	<u>378</u>	Co-Sponsor	SCORE
CDF Action Council position:	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	S. 940/H.R. 1990	
Sen. Allen (R)	-	+	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	+	No	36%
Sen. Warner (R)	-	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	+	No	45%
HOUSE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>70</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>117</u>	<u>118</u>	<u>143</u>	<u>282</u>	<u>284</u>	<u>329</u>	<u>404</u>	<u>504</u>		
CDF Action Council position:	Nay	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea		
Rep. Boucher (D)	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	82%
Rep. Cantor (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	No	0%
Rep. Davis, Jo Ann (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	No	9%
Rep. Davis, Thomas (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Forbes (R)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-	-	-	-	+	No	~
Rep. Goode (I)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	No	9%
Rep. Goodlatte (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	No	0%
Rep. Moran, James (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	Yes	91%
Rep. Schrock (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Scott (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Yes	100%
Rep. Sisisky (D)	?	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	No	~
Rep. Wolf (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
											State Average:	36%
											State Rank:	36

Washington

SENATE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>69</u>	<u>94</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>105</u>	<u>130</u>	<u>154</u>	<u>159</u>	<u>220</u>	<u>338</u>	<u>378</u>	Co-Sponsor	SCORE
CDF Action Council position:	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	S. 940/H.R. 1990	
Sen. Cantwell (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
Sen. Murray (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
HOUSE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>70</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>117</u>	<u>118</u>	<u>143</u>	<u>282</u>	<u>284</u>	<u>329</u>	<u>404</u>	<u>504</u>		
CDF Action Council position:	Nay	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea		
Rep. Baird (D)	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	No	73%
Rep. Dicks (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
Rep. Dunn (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	+	No	27%
Rep. Hastings, Doc (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	No	9%
Rep. Inslee (R)	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	No	82%
Rep. Larsen, Richard (R)	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	82%
Rep. McDermott (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
Rep. Nethercutt (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Smith, Adam (D)	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	82%
											State Average:	67%
											State Rank:	13

West Virginia

SENATE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>69</u>	<u>94</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>105</u>	<u>130</u>	<u>154</u>	<u>159</u>	<u>220</u>	<u>338</u>	<u>378</u>	Co-Sponsor	SCORE
CDF Action Council position:	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	S. 940/H.R. 1990	
Sen. Byrd (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
Sen. Rockefeller (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
HOUSE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>70</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>117</u>	<u>118</u>	<u>143</u>	<u>282</u>	<u>284</u>	<u>329</u>	<u>404</u>	<u>504</u>		
CDF Action Council position:	Nay	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea		
Rep. Capito (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	+	No	27%
Rep. Mollohan (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
Rep. Rahall (D)	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	73%
											State Average:	75%
											State Rank:	6

VOTE KEY

- “+” = Member voted with the CDF Action Council position.
- “-” = Member voted against the CDF Action Council position.
- “?” = Member did not vote. Missed votes are counted against a Member in the final score.
- “n/a” = Was a Member in 2001, but not at the time of this vote.
- “-” = Member served in the first session of the 107th Congress, but not for a full term. The Member is not scored.

Wisconsin

SENATE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>69</u>	<u>94</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>105</u>	<u>130</u>	<u>154</u>	<u>159</u>	<u>220</u>	<u>338</u>	<u>378</u>	Co-Sponsor	SCORE
CDF Action Council position:	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	S. 940/H.R. 1990	
Sen. Feingold (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	No	82%
Sen. Kohl (D)	+	+	+	+	+	?	+	+	+	+	No	82%
HOUSE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>70</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>117</u>	<u>118</u>	<u>143</u>	<u>282</u>	<u>284</u>	<u>329</u>	<u>404</u>	<u>504</u>		
CDF Action Council position:	Nay	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea		
Rep. Baldwin (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Yes	100%
Rep. Barrett (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
Rep. Green, Mark (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Kind (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
Rep. Kleczka (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
Rep. Obey (D)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No	91%
Rep. Petri (R)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	No	18%
Rep. Ryan, Paul (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	No	9%
Rep. Sensenbrenner (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	No	0%
											State Average:	61%
											State Rank:	15

Wyoming

SENATE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>69</u>	<u>94</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>105</u>	<u>130</u>	<u>154</u>	<u>159</u>	<u>220</u>	<u>338</u>	<u>378</u>	Co-Sponsor	SCORE
CDF Action Council position:	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	S. 940/H.R. 1990	
Sen. Enzi (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	No	9%
Sen. Thomas (R)	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	No	18%
HOUSE Roll Call Vote #:	<u>70</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>117</u>	<u>118</u>	<u>143</u>	<u>282</u>	<u>284</u>	<u>329</u>	<u>404</u>	<u>504</u>		
CDF Action Council position:	Nay	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea		
Rep. Cubin (R)	-	-	?	?	?	?	?	-	?	?	No	0%
											State Average:	9%
											State Rank:	50

VOTE KEY

- "+" = Member voted with the CDF Action Council position.
- "-" = Member voted against the CDF Action Council position.
- "?" = Member did not vote. Missed votes are counted against a Member in the final score.
- "n/a" = Was a Member in 2001, but not at the time of this vote.
- "~" = Member served in the first session of the 107th Congress, but not for a full term. The Member is not scored.

Key Children's Votes in the Senate 2001

1. Budget Resolution (Taxes & Education) – Harkin Amendment (H. Con. Res. 83, Roll Call Vote 69)

Adopted by a vote of 53-47 (R 4-46; D 49-1) on April 4, 2001

Vote description: Amendment on education spending to the substitute amendment. This amendment would reduce the size of the tax cut by \$448 billion and would increase education spending by \$224 billion over 10 years. The substitute (underlying) amendment would cap discretionary spending at \$660.7 billion in fiscal year 2002 and includes an \$845.7 billion contingency fund—including the Medicare Trust Fund surplus—that could be used for debt reduction, tax cuts, or unforeseen spending. It also calls for \$1.6 trillion in tax cuts over Fiscal Years 2002-2011 and \$60 billion in tax cuts in FY 2001.

CDF Action Council Position: Yes. A vote for the Harkin amendment was a vote for children. This vote clearly demonstrated Senators' priorities, as the amendment shifted some of the funds that the substitute amendment had set aside for tax cuts into new investments in Head Start and education programs. Many of these investments are proposed in the Act to Leave No Child Behind (S. 940/H.R. 1990), including investments to expand Head Start and after-school child care, allow schools to hire additional teachers and reduce class size, and repair and modernize classrooms.

2. Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Reauthorization (Title II Funding) – Kennedy Amendment (S. 1, Roll Call Vote 94)

Adopted by a vote of 69-31 (R 19-31; D 50-0) on May 8, 2001

Vote description: Amendment to the substitute amendment. The amendment would authorize increased Title II funding for ESEA between Fiscal Years 2003 and 2008 and express the sense of the Senate that Congress should appropriate \$3 billion for FY 2002 to provide for more teachers in classrooms, teacher training, and mentors and year-long internships for 125,000 teachers.

CDF Action Council Position: Yes. A vote for the Kennedy amendment was a vote for children. More than 2 million newly trained and qualified teachers are needed over the next decade to reduce class size, replace retiring teachers, and accommodate the growing numbers of public school students. Similar to proposals in the Act to Leave No Child Behind (S.940/H.R.1990), this amendment would improve school quality through teacher recruitment, training and class size reduction.

3. Budget Resolution – Final Passage (H. Con. Res. 83, Roll Call Vote 98)

Adopted by a vote of 53-47 (R 48-2; D 5-45) on May 10, 2001

Vote description: Adoption of the conference report on the concurrent resolution to adopt a 10-year budget plan that calls for approximately \$1.35 trillion in tax cuts through FY 2011, including a \$100 billion stimulus package. The agreement would cap discretionary spending at \$661.3 billion. Discretionary spending allocations would total \$325.1 billion for defense and \$336.2 billion for non-defense.

CDF Action Council Position: No. A vote for H. Con. Res. 83 was a vote against children. This was a crucial vote to approve the final Congressional budget plan for FY 2002 through FY 2011, which allowed \$1.35 trillion in federal funds for tax cuts over the next 10 years, while setting severe limits on new spending for children. The final plan overturned the earlier Senate amendment to target more new funds for education and Head Start programs (see CDF Action Council Senate Vote #1).

4. Elementary and Secondary Education Act Reauthorization (After-School Programs) – Boxer Amendment (S. 1, Roll Call Vote 105)

Adopted by a vote of 60-39 (R 11-39; D 49-0) on May 16, 2001

Vote description: Amendment to the substitute amendment. The amendment would express the sense of the Senate that the Congress should appropriate the authorized level of \$1.5 billion in FY 2002 for after-school programs. It also would authorize a total of \$19.5 billion between Fiscal Years 2003 through 2008 for after-school programs.

CDF Action Council Position: Yes. A vote for the Boxer amendment was a vote for children. Nearly 7 million children are home alone after school each week without adult supervision or structured activities. Without supervision, young people are more likely to be at risk of dangerous behavior such as smoking, drinking, sex, or crime. The Act to Leave No Child Behind (S. 940/ H.R.1990) would significantly improve and expand after-school programs. This vote put the Senate on record in support of additional funding for after-school care.

5. Tax Cut Reconciliation (Education Spending) – Kennedy Motion (H.R. 1836, Roll Call Vote 130)

Rejected by a vote of 48-51 (R 2-47; D 46-4) on May 21, 2001

Vote description: Motion to waive the Budget Act with respect to the point of order against the amendment. The amendment would provide that the top marginal rate reductions would not take effect unless funding is provided at levels authorized in amendments adopted by the Senate on legislation to overhaul education policy.

CDF Action Council Position: Yes. A vote for the motion was a vote for children. The tax bill under consideration targeted major new tax cuts to the wealthiest Americans, even though substantial new investments are required to improve the nation's education system. This vote clearly displayed the Senators' choices between tax cuts and education investments.

6. Tax Cut Reconciliation (Head Start Program) – Kennedy Motion (H.R. 1836, Roll Call Vote 154)

Rejected by a vote of 45-54 (R 0-50; D 45-4) on May 22, 2001

Vote description: Motion to waive the Budget Act with respect to the point of order against the amendment. The amendment would require the Health and Human Services secretary to certify to the Treasury secretary that adequate funding to enable all eligible children to have access to Head Start programs has been appropriated before the bill's reductions in the top marginal income tax rate bracket in Fiscal Years 2005 and 2007 would occur.

CDF Action Council Position: Yes. A vote for the motion was a vote for children. The first years of a child's life are particularly critical to children's early development and learning. Yet only three out of every five eligible low-income preschoolers are enrolled in Head Start, and only a fraction of eligible infants and toddlers are enrolled in the Early Head Start program. This vote reflects Senators' choices between investments in Head Start and tax cuts for the wealthy.

7. Tax Cut Reconciliation (Child Tax Credit) – Snowe Amendment (H.R. 1836, Roll Call Vote 159)

Adopted by a vote of 94-4 (R 44-4; D 50-0) on May 23, 2001

Vote description: Amendment that would express the sense of the Senate that the Refundable Child Tax Credit provisions included in the bill should be maintained as a part of the final legislative package.

CDF Action Council Position: Yes. A vote for the Snowe amendment was a vote for children. The Act to Leave No Child Behind (S. 940/H.R. 1990) proposed to improve the Child Tax Credit (CTC) and make it fully refundable in order to extend its valuable assistance to all low-income children. The Senate tax bill would have made the CTC partially refundable to extend its assistance to millions of low-income children. While some strongly opposed these provisions, this vote put the Senate firmly on record for including the partial refundability for the CTC in the final tax bill.

8. Patients' Bill of Rights – Final Passage (S. 1052, Roll Call Vote 220)

Adopted by a vote of 59-36 (R 9-35; D 50-0; I 0-1) on June 29, 2001

Vote description: Passage of the bill would provide federal protections, such as access to specialty and emergency room care, and allow patients to appeal a health plan organization's decision on coverage and treatment. It also would allow patients to sue health insurers in state courts over quality-of-care claims and at the federal level over administrative or non-medical coverage disputes.

CDF Action Council Position: Yes. A vote for S. 1052 was a vote for children. This bill would give patients, including children, enrolled in HMOs new legal remedies to ensure access to necessary medical care and to hold HMOs responsible for improper denials of care. It would provide new protections for children enrolled in HMOs that allows parents to designate a pediatrician as their child's primary care doctor and require HMOs to include pediatric specialists in their networks. The pediatric provisions are similar to those included in the Act to Leave No Child Behind (S. 940/H.R. 1990).

9. Economic Stimulus (Democratic Substitute) – Baucus Motion (H.R. 3090, Roll Call Vote 338)

Rejected by a vote of 51-47 (R 0-47; D 50-0; I 1-0) on November 14, 2001

Vote description: Motion to waive the Budget Act with respect to point of order against the substitute amendment. The amendment would provide approximately \$73 billion in FY 2002 for economic stimulus measures, including \$14 billion for refund checks to taxpayers who did not receive refunds during the summer of 2001. It also would provide \$31 billion for unemployment benefits and health care benefits for displaced workers and agriculture assistance. It also would provide \$8 billion in FY 2002, and \$15 billion over 10 years for homeland security, including bioterrorism, food safety, law enforcement, and postal programs.

CDF Action Council Position: Yes. A vote for the Baucus motion was a vote for children. The stimulus bill sponsored by Senator Baucus (D-MT) targeted assistance to low-income working families and newly unemployed workers through new tax rebates, health care support, and Unemployment Insurance improvements, similar to those proposed in the Act to Leave No Child Behind (S. 940/H.R. 1990). The actual vote was on a motion to waive the Budget Act in order to allow the substance of the bill to be considered. Because 60 votes were required to pass the motion, it failed and the vote precluded the Senate from further consideration of the bill.

10. Labor, Health & Human Services and Education Appropriations – Final Passage (H.R. 3061, Roll Call Vote 378)

Adopted by a vote of 90-7 (R-41-6; D-48-1; I 1-0) on December 20, 2001

Vote Description: Adoption of the conference report on the bill that would appropriate \$123.4 billion in discretionary spending for the Labor, Health & Human Services and Education departments and related agencies. The agreement would include \$12.3 billion for the disadvantaged children's Title I program. It also would fund the education overhaul bill (H.R. 1), including money for teacher improvement, annual state testing, and the Reading First program.

CDF Action Council Position: Yes. A vote for the Labor, Health & Human Services and Education Conference Report was a vote for children. The final conference report increased funding for important children's programs contained in the Act to Leave No Child Behind. The final bill provided sufficient new funds to enroll 15,000 additional infants, toddlers, and preschoolers in Head Start. It also added \$70 million for the Promoting Safe and Stable Families program to protect abused and neglected children and promote adoption. Congress rejected cutbacks proposed by the Administration and added modest new funding for other early childhood, child care, and child health programs.

11. THE ACT TO LEAVE NO CHILD BEHIND (S. 940), Introduced by Senator Christopher Dodd (D-CT) on May 23, 2001

Bill description: The Act to Leave No Child Behind (S. 940) is comprehensive legislation incorporating a national policy vision for America's children. The Act contains 12 titles drawn from proven and effective policies and programs, many in other bills introduced by Republicans and Democrats. It would, among other things, provide health coverage to all uninsured children in America; provide full funding for child care and Head Start, so that all eligible children who need these benefits could participate; ensure that working parents have the supports they need to remain employed and help lift themselves and their children out of poverty; ensure that more children are in safe, nurturing, and permanent families; and strengthen youth development, juvenile justice, and violence prevention efforts.

CDF Action Council position: Yes. Co-sponsorship of S. 940 is an important action that Senators can take to demonstrate their commitment to children.

Key Children's Votes in the House of Representatives 2001

1. Budget Resolution – Final Passage (H. Con. Res. 83, Roll Call Vote 70)

Adopted by a vote of 222-205 (R 218-2; D 3-202; I 1-1) on March 28, 2001

Vote description: Adoption of the concurrent resolution that would set broad spending and revenue targets. The resolution calls for cutting taxes by \$1.6 trillion over 10 years and allowing for a 3.5 percent increase in non-defense discretionary spending.

CDF Action Council Position: No. A vote for H. Con. Res. 83 was a vote against children. This was a critical vote about the Members' and the nation's priorities. The vote put the House on record in support of a congressional budget plan that used the bulk of the budget surplus for massive new tax cuts over the next 10 years while at the same time placing severe limits on new spending for programs for children, including education, child care, Head Start, and the many others contained in the Act to Leave No Child Behind (H.R. 1990/S. 940).

2. Estate Tax Relief – Final Passage (H.R. 8, Roll Call Vote 84)

Adopted by a vote of 274-154 (R 215-3; D 58-150; I 1-1) on April 4, 2001

Vote description: Passage of the bill would lower revenue by \$185.5 billion over 10 years by reducing the estate, gift, and generation-skipping taxes annually, cutting the top rate on assets over \$3 million from 55 percent to 39 percent, with a complete repeal by 2011.

CDF Action Council Position: No. A vote for H.R. 8 was a vote against children. This vote set the stage for the final tax bill by putting the House on record in support of shifting \$185 billion out of the federal treasury over the next 10 years to provide estate tax relief to the very wealthiest Americans. With such funds, the nation could provide Head Start for all eligible three- and four-year olds in need of services *and* provide child care for all children eligible for and in need of assistance under the Child Care and Development Block Grant, as proposed in the Act to Leave No Child Behind (S. 940/H.R. 1990).

3. Tax Cut Reconciliation – Rangel Amendment (H.R. 1836, Roll Call Vote 117)

Rejected by a vote of 188-239 (R 0-218; D 187-20; I 1-1) on May 16, 2001

Vote description: A substitute amendment that would provide a one-time, retroactive rebate and reduce the smallest income tax bracket to 12 percent. The amendment would increase the amount of income that one can earn and still qualify for the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC).

CDF Action Council Position: Yes. A vote for the Rangel amendment was a vote for children and families. This amendment targeted tax cuts to low- and moderate-income working families and improved the EITC in ways proposed in the Act to Leave No Child Behind (S. 940/H.R. 1990).

4. Tax Cut Reconciliation – Final Passage (H.R. 1836, Roll Call Vote 118)

Adopted by a vote of 230-197 (R 216-0; D 13-196; I 1-1) on May 16, 2001

Vote description: Passage of the bill would cut all income tax rates and make other tax cuts totaling \$958.3 billion over 11 years. The bill would convert the five existing tax rate brackets, which range from 15 percent to 39.6 percent, to a system of four brackets with rates of 10 percent, 15 percent, 25 percent, and 33 percent.

CDF Action Council Position: No. A vote for H.R. 1836 was a vote against children. This bill provided massive new tax cuts over the next 10 years, with the majority of the cuts targeted to the wealthiest Americans. When fully phased in, the annual cost of the House tax bill could pay the annual total cost of the comprehensive array of essential new services and benefits for children included in the Act to Leave No Child Behind (H.R. 1990/S. 940).

5. Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Funding Reduction – Cox Amendment (H.R. 1, Roll Call Vote 143)

Rejected by a vote of 101-326 (R 98-120; D 2-205; I 1-1) on May 23, 2001

Vote description: Amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Reauthorization bill that would reduce the overall funding level in the bill from \$22.8 billion to \$20.5 billion for FY 2002. Maximum funding levels in each subsequent year would not be allowed to exceed a 3.5 percent increase over the previous year's funding.

CDF Action Council Position: No. A vote for the Cox amendment was a vote against children. This amendment would have reduced funding for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), the primary source of federal support for education. Currently, only 32 percent of fourth graders read at or above the proficient level, more than 2 million new trained and qualified teachers are needed over the next decade, and three-quarters of our nation's public schools need new construction and modernization. Nevertheless, this amendment sought to limit the growth in federal funding for ESEA programs in FY 2002 and future years.

6. VA-HUD Appropriations Bill – Nadler Amendment (H.R. 2620, Roll Call Vote 282)

Rejected by a vote of 139-284 (R 2-213; D 136-70; I 1-1) on July 26, 2001

Vote description: Amendment that would increase by \$195 million Section 8 assistance to fund 34,000 more incremental housing vouchers and by \$5 million VA state grants for additional extended-care facilities construction. It would reduce by \$200 million the Downpayment Assistance Initiative.

CDF Action Council Position: Yes. A vote for the Nadler amendment was a vote for children. This amendment would increase the number of housing vouchers available to low-income families with children, who face serious difficulties finding affordable housing. More than 3.5 million children live in households with "worst case" housing needs. The Section 8 program provides vouchers to help low-income families pay their rent. The Act to Leave No Child Behind (H.R. 1990/S. 940) would provide one million new Section 8 vouchers for low-income families over the next 10 years, and this amendment would have added 34,000 vouchers for FY 2002.

7. VA-HUD Appropriations Bill (YouthBuild) – Velazquez Amendment (H.R. 2620, Roll Call Vote 284)

Adopted by a vote of 216-209 (R 17-200; D 198-8; I 1-1) on July 26, 2001

Vote description: Amendment would increase by \$10 million Housing and Urban Development (HUD) funding for the YouthBuild program and reduce by \$10 million funding for HUD salaries and expenses.

CDF Action Council Position: Yes. A vote for the Velazquez amendment was a vote for children. The YouthBuild program helps at-risk youths learn housing construction job skills and complete their high school education, while constructing or rehabilitating affordable housing for low- and moderate-income families. The Act to Leave No Child Behind (H.R. 1990/S. 940) proposes increased funding for YouthBuild over the next 10 years, and this amendment increased funding for the program for FY 2002.

8. Patients' Rights (HMO Liability) – Norwood Amendment (H.R. 2563, Roll Call Vote 329)

Adopted by a vote of 218-213 (R 214-6; D 3-206; I 1-1) on August 2, 2001

Vote description: Amendment that would limit liability and damage awards when a patient is harmed by a denial of health care. It would allow a patient to sue a health maintenance organization in state court but federal, not state, law would govern. An employer could move certain cases to federal court. It would limit non-economic damages and punitive damages to \$1.5 million and make other changes to the bill.

CDF Action Council Position: No. A vote for the Norwood amendment was a vote against children. This amendment weakened the underlying bill on patients' rights by restricting the legal remedies available to all those enrolled in HMOs, including children. These remedies are important to ensuring access to necessary medical care and holding HMOs responsible for the improper denial of care.

9. Economic Stimulus – Passage (H.R. 3090, Roll Call Vote 404)

Adopted by a vote of 216-214 (R 212-7; D 3-206; I 1-1) on October 24, 2001

Vote description: Passage of the bill would grant \$99.5 billion in federal tax cuts in FY 2002, and a total \$159.4 billion in reductions over 10 years, for businesses and individuals. The bill would allow more individuals to receive immediate \$300 and \$600 refunds, accelerate a reduction of the 27 percent tax bracket to 25 percent, and lower the capital gains tax rate. It also would eliminate the alternative minimum tax for businesses, allow them to offset income over the last five years with current losses, and allow them to deduct more in depreciation costs. The bill would provide \$3 billion to states for health insurance for the unemployed.

CDF Action Council Position: No. This was a vote against children. The deteriorating economic conditions in 2001 were particularly harsh on low-income workers as unemployment increased and families struggled to support their children and meet food, housing, health care, and other expenses. Further, many laid-off low-wage workers were ineligible for Unemployment Insurance (UI). Rather than helping low-income working families with children by extending UI to additional laid-off workers, as proposed in the Act to Leave No Child Behind (H.R. 1990/S. 940), this bill would provide another round of major tax cuts for wealthy individuals and for large corporations.

10. Labor, Health & Human Services and Education Appropriations – Final Passage (H.R. 3061, Roll Call Vote 504)

Adopted by a vote of 393-30 (R 188-30; D 203-0) on December 19, 2001

Vote Description: Adoption of the conference report on the bill that would appropriate \$124.3 billion in discretionary spending for the Labor, Health & Human Services and Education departments and related agencies. The agreement would include \$12.3 billion for the disadvantaged children's Title I program. It also would fund the education overhaul bill (H.R. 1), including money for teacher improvement, annual state testing, and the Reading First program.

CDF Action Council Position: Yes. A vote for H.R. 3061 was a vote for children. The final conference report to the annual Labor, Health & Human Services and Education appropriations bill increased funding for important children's programs contained in the Act to Leave No Child Behind (S. 940/H.R. 1990). The final bill provided sufficient new funds to enroll 15,000 additional infants, toddlers, and preschoolers in Head Start, and added \$70 million for the Promoting Safe and Stable Families program to protect abused and neglected children and promote adoption. Congress rejected cutbacks proposed by the Administration and approved a final bill that also adds modest new funding for other early childhood, child care, and child health programs.

11. THE ACT TO LEAVE NO CHILD BEHIND (H.R. 1990), Introduced by Representative George Miller (D-CA) on May 23, 2001

Bill description: The Act to Leave No Child Behind (H.R. 1990) is comprehensive legislation incorporating a national policy vision for America's children. The Act contains 12 titles drawn from proven and effective policies and programs, many in other bills introduced by Republicans and Democrats. It would, among other things, provide health coverage to all uninsured children in America; provide full funding for child care and Head Start, so that all eligible children who need these benefits could participate; ensure that working parents have the supports they need to remain employed and help lift themselves and their children out of poverty; ensure that more children are in safe, nurturing, and permanent families; and strengthen youth development, juvenile justice, and violence prevention efforts.

CDF Action Council position: Yes. Co-sponsorship of H. R. 1990 is a crucial action that Members can take to demonstrate their commitment to children.

Action Agenda for 2002:

Help Parents Work and Care for their Children

Parents all around the country are struggling harder and harder each day to be productive workers and good parents. But parents cannot do it all alone. Our national leaders must give priority to actions that help parents work, support their families, and help ensure that their children are safe, healthy, and prepared for productive futures.

Together, parents and grandparents, women, people of faith, child advocates, educators, child care and health providers, and concerned citizens all across the country can provide a powerful and effective voice for children. We can send a strong message to our national leaders urging them to support an agenda that helps parents work and care for their children. This year, Members of Congress—both Republicans and Democrats—will have many opportunities to stand up for children and families and help Leave No Child Behind®. Here are key actions—all of them part of the Act to Leave No Child Behind (S. 940/H.R. 1990)—that the U.S. Congress must take in 2002 to help children and families.

Help Parents Work and Children Learn: Quality child care is essential to help parents work and help children get ready for school. Yet so little federal funding has been provided that only one in seven children eligible for federal child care block grant assistance receives help. Without help, most working parents cannot afford child care that costs more than college tuition at most public universities. Children who lack good quality child care and early education experiences are unprepared when they enter school.

The Act to Leave No Child Behind would improve federal child care programs so that all eligible children receive assistance and have access to high quality care. In 2002, Congress will take up legislation to reauthorize the Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG). We are urging Congress to invest an additional \$20 billion in the CCDBG over the next five years to provide child care help to 2 million more children by 2007 and improve the quality of child care. Contact your Senators and Representatives and urge them to help America's children and families by supporting major new investments in child care.

Reduce Child Poverty: Reducing poverty can help children succeed and contribute to society. Yet even before the economy weakened in 2000, more than 11 million children lived in poverty, and 77 percent of poor children lived in families where someone worked. Parents working full-time in low-wage jobs are unable to support their families. Only about half of low-income workers who get laid off are eligible for unemployment benefits. Many needy children and families do not get the health care, nutrition, and other benefits for which they are eligible.

The Act to Leave No Child Behind would help to lift all children out of poverty through tax credits, minimum wage increases and improvements to the welfare program (the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Program or TANF), food stamps, and Unemployment Insurance. In 2002, Congress must reauthorize the TANF program. Urge your Members of Congress to support legislation to improve TANF so that it helps families leave welfare and escape poverty.

Provide Health Care for More Uninsured Children: More than nine million children in America do not have health insurance, and nine out of 10 of them have parents who work. Uninsured children generally cannot see a doctor when they are sick or get the preventive treatments they need to keep them well. Many of these uninsured children have mental or physical disabilities, some are legal immigrants, most are from low- and moderate-income working families whose employers do not provide health coverage or families who cannot otherwise afford it.

The Act to Leave No Child Behind would ensure health coverage for all uninsured children and their parents and improve the quality and access to health care. In 2002, Congress may consider legislation to expand eligibility and funding for the Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP) and Medicaid so that more children and families have access to health care. Let your Senators and Representatives know that every child in America must have access to health care.

Congressional Schedule

107th Congress Second Session, 2002

Congress Reconvenes	Wednesday, January 23
State of the Union	Tuesday, January 29
February/President's Day District Work Period	February 18 – 22
Spring Recess District Work Period	March 25 – April 5
Memorial Day District Work Period	May 27 – May 31
Independence Day District Work Period	July 1 – July 5
August/Labor Day District Work Period	July 29 – September 3
Target Adjournment	Friday, October 4



**WHEN IT'S BUDGET CUTTING TIME,
CHILDREN CAN'T STAND UP FOR THEMSELVES.
MAKE SURE THOSE WHO REPRESENT YOU
STAND UP FOR THEM.**



CDF Action Council®

25 E Street, NW
Washington, DC 20001
202-662-3576
www.cdfactioncouncil.org