# AFL-CIO News

Vol. XXV August 30, 1980 No. 35



# A REPORT ON CONGRESS

#### By Lane Kirkland

IF WE HAD ONLY their own speeches and press releases by which to judge the men and women who seek our votes, every election contest would seem a choice between saints.

Fortunately, we have a better, more accurate gauge—voting records. What did Sen. Jones or Rep. Smith do when the chips were down on important issues? What is their real record (as opposed to their self-rating)? How did they vote?

The following pages tell you. They tell you how 100 U.S. senators and 435 representatives—your own among them—cast their votes when issues that count for working people and their unions came before the Congress.

BUT THE RECORD inside divulges more than the "right" and "wrong" votes printed by the name of each member of Congress. It provides insight into the temper of an entire session of the Congress and records a large part of its history.

Reading the descriptions of the issues tells you that labor and other progressive groups were forced to fight numbers of defensive struggles to protect laws such as OSHA, Davis-Bacon, the mine safety act, even the eight-hour day.

Nevertheless, there were significant labor victories. Two labor-supported nominees for National Labor Relations Board positions were approved by the Senate after breaking conservative-led filibusters. Notwithstanding the all-out efforts of the rightists to torpedo them, OSHA and Davis-Bacon are still intact.

FINALLY, the record inside illustrates a valuable lesson in practical politics. In November we need to re-elect every single congressional friend we have and, if possible, strengthen their ranks.

The mathematics are clear: a measure concerning aid to disabled workers, described inside, was defeated by a 47-47 tie vote in the Senate. Three right-wing senators elected for the first time in 1978—Jepsen (Iowa), Armstrong (Colo.), Humphrey (N.H.)—voted against the AFL-CIO position. Had the senators they defeated two years ago still been in the Senate, three more votes would have been tallied for disabled workers, three fewer against.

AGAIN THIS year, ultra-conservatives are challenging large numbers of proworker incumbents. Corporate, trade group and right-wing political action committees will out-spend labor PACs by more than 5-1 and are lavishing tremendous sums on these challengers. Money is their strongest weapon. Ours is people.

Only with our votes can we beat back the right wing. If all union members vote —if you vote—for COPE-endorsed candidates who have earned our support, when the AFL-CIO publishes a voting record next year there will be no cause to explain that unions had gone through a "defensive" session in the Congress. And there will be no need—better yet, no examples—to illustrate the high cost of losing friends.

This special section carries inbor's 1980 report card on Cougress. This voting analysis lactudes votes from October 1979 through Aug. 6, 1980, Congressmen and Senators have been judged on 19 key issues—"R-right" or "W-wrong" on the basis of the position the AFL-CIO took on the legislation. The tables also include the cumulative voting record and cumulative "right" percentage of each member

since election to the House or Senate. With the voting records are brief descriptions of the issues—what the vote was about and its importance to the labor movement and the nation. Issues of prime importance to the labor movement are the first 7 votes in the House and the first 13 votes in the Senate. In the tabulations they are the votes listed to the left of the reiss.



## Labor's Stand on Major Issues in the House

#### 1. Protection of Prevailing Wages

Despite two lopsided defeats in 1979, House conservatives continued their unrelenting attack on the Davis-Bacon Act in 1980. The 48-year-old law requires payment of prevailing wages to workers on federally financed construction projects. That gives local contractors who uphold the labor standards of the community a fair chance to compute for government projects, rather than being underest by outside firms bringing in cut-rate labor.

The Davis-Bacon Act also assures stability in a notoriously austable industry, guarantees adequate wage rates to allow for the recruitment, training and maintenance of a skilled construction labor force within the local area, and helps protect the government against fly-by-night operators seeking to win government contracts by paying wages too low to attract competent craftsmen.

During House debate on legislation providing federal financial assistance to economically distressed states and cities, Rep. Robert Walker (R-Pn.) tried to strike the Davis-Bacon protections from the bill. Again this anti-worker amendment was overwhelmingly defeated by a 130-266 vote on Jan. 31, 1980.

For-Wrong. Against-Right.

## 2. Collective Bargaining Rights for Hospital Workers

In 1976 the National Labor Relations Board ruled that hospital interns and residents are "students" and therefore not entitled to the protections of federal labor law. These employees now routinely work 80 to 100 hour workweeks at low rates of pay. Yet, these workers are denied any voice in improving their oppressive working conditions. Such long hours can undermine adequate hospital health care and unnecessarily jeopardize the medical condition of patients.

In 1980, Rep. Frank Thompson (D-N.J.) sponsored legislation to restore labor law protections for these workers. However, the House, less than two weeks after shooting down a labor-backed bill to help fight inflation by controlling hospital costs, handed the medical lobbies still another success by rejecting this workerights bill by a 167-227 vote on Nov. 28, 1979.

CUC-KIESE ASSISS-Wrong.

#### 3. Workers' Pension Rights

To protect worker pension benefits, the 1974 pension protection law set up a reinsurance system funded by premiums from participating pension plans to pay benefits to retirees if a plan terminated. Although they have been required all along to pay nominal premiums, multi-employer plans were temporarily excluded from full pension benefit guarantee coverage in order to develop adequate experience on which to base the rates for the cost of reinsurance for such plans. The deadline for full inclusion of these plans in the reinsurance system was extended until 1978. However, by mid-1977, it had become clear that the 1974 law would require substantial change before full reinsurance coverage could be extended to the multi-employer plans.

In 1980, the AFL-CIO backed legislation to accomplish this objective, including provisions establishing a graduated premium rate schedule for multi-employer plans. During debate on the bill, Rep. John Erlenborn (R-III) tried to weaken the bill by conditioning slightly higher pension benefit guarantees on reducing from 30 to 20 years the period for which pension plans must have on account enough funds to pay retires benefits. This amendment would have generated confusion and uncertainty within the administration of pension plans whill doing nothing to strongthen their financial stability. By a 160-218 vote on May 22, 1980, the amendment was defeated.

For-Wrong, Against-Right.

## 4. Unemployment Benefits

A 1976 congressionally-approved revision, effective in 1980, cut unemployment benefits for retires who also receive pensions. This anti-worker provision allows states to offset, dollar for dollar, the unemployment compensation benefit payable to an individual receiving social security, pension, retirement pay, annuity or any other similar payment that is based on the individual's previous work. The results thousands of pensioners who had taken jobs to augment their pensions but were laid off in the current recession now found their unemployment compensation reduced by the amount of their pension benefits.

The AFL-CIO has backed repeat of the pension offset. In the meantime, the federation in 1986 supported legislation by Rep. James Corman (D-Calif.) limiting the offset to cases in which a worker's pension and unemployment benefits are attributable to the same employer. Further, the bill limited the offset only to the



amount of the employer contribution to the pension while postponing until Jan. 1, 1982, the effective date of the 1976 change and the Corman modifier. Conservative Rep. John Rousselot (R-Cailf.) attempted to undermine the measure by sending it back to committee with instructions to make the effective implementation date one year earlier. His motion to recommit was defeated 188-215 on Feb. 16, 1980.

For recommittal.....Wrong, Against recommittal......Right.

#### 5. Auto Industry Jobs

Massive retooling needs and the flood of imported cars helped put the nation's third largest auto manufacturer—Chrysler—on the brink of economic collapse in late 1979. The jobs of nearly a haif-million workers in steel, glass, rubber, metal, leather and other supplier industries as well as Chrysler auto workers hung in the halance. Several states and many communities were also threatened with economic disaster if Chrysler closed its doors.

To prevent that from happening, the AFL-CIO-backed legislation providing a \$1.5-billion (ederal loan guarantee to Chryster. The loan was dependent upon the company finding \$2 billion in matching funds from workers, dealers and creditors. The House version demanded \$400 million in wage concessions from Chryster union workers. By a 271-136 vote, on Dec. 18, 1979, the House approved the loan package.

For-Right, Against-Wrong.

#### 6. Public Works Jobs

In 1979 the House approved labor-backed legislation expanding funding for the Economic Development Administration, which was created in 1965 to offer financial aid to hard-hit communities to help them attract new investment or revive failing businesses. A key part of the new legislation was a standby \$2-billion public works jobs program providing funds for local construction or improvement of such facilities as water and sewer systems, schools, fire stations and court houses. The funds would become available when national unemployment exceeded 6.5 percent. An attempt by Rep. Gene Sayder (R-Ky.) to send this standby public works program back to committee was overwhelmingly defeated by a 148-250 vote on Nov. 14, 1979.

For recommittal—Wrong, Against recommittal—Right.

#### 7. Food Stamps for Jobiess Workers

Jobies workers trying to feed their families with food stamps became another target of the callons congressional drive to balance the federal budget and cut spending.

At a time when the recession was taking jobs from millions of Americans permanently and temporarily. House conservatives tried to force jobless workers to pay back the value of food stamps they received to help them get by. An amendment by Rep. James Jeffords (R-Vt.) would have required "psyback" if a worker earned more than 175 percent of the poverty-level income—or about \$13,000 for a family of four. Thus, a lower middle-income worker who had been temporarily laid off would be forced, just at a time of recovery from the shock of unemployment, to reimburse the government the costs of his or her food stamps, By a 241-147 vote on May 8, 1980, this provision was adopted.

For-Wrong, Against Right.

#### 8. Balanced Budget (

In a political panic to balance the federal budget, Congress in 1980 slashed \$16 billion in spending for such programs as education, health, transportation, jobs and energy development. An estimated half-million workers would lose their jobs as a direct result of thessymbolic cuts. Particularly hard-hit as the current recession deepened, were the very federal jobs programs used in the past to ease the shock of economic downturns. Ironically, no sooner had Congress balanced the budget than higher unemployment and continuing inflation unbalanced it once again.

The AFL-CIO had strongly opposed balancing the federal ledger at a time of economic decline, terming it an empty political gesture that would do nothing to address the root causes of inflation—skyrocketing energy costs, exorbitant interest rates and rising food and medical care costs. The AFL-CIO warned that the meat-axing of essential federal programs required by a balanced budget would increase unimployment while deepening the recession.

During House consideration of the 1981 hudger resolution, which sets spending targets for the incoming fiscal year. Rep. Richard Ottinger (D-N Y) led a labor-backed effort to restore the \$16 billion in spending cuts. The Ottinger amendment would have balanced the budget instead through various tax reforms and other revenue-raising devices. His package proposal was rejected by a 70-336 vote on Apr. 30, 1980.

For-Right. Against-Wrong.

#### 9. Balanced Budget II

The rigid spending ceilings of the balanced budget enabled conservatives to put the House in the untenable position of having to slash funds for one national priority—fighting the recession—in order to increase monies for another—assuring a strong national defense.

Conservatives, sensing an opportunity to further mangle labor-backed domestic programs, joined ranks behind Rep. Majone Holt (R-Md.) in an effort to cut \$5 billion more from domestic spending and transfer those funds to the defense budget. The Holt amendment demanded a 20-percent across-the-board cutback in all federal regulatory agencies such as the Occupational Safety & Health Administration, the Federal Trade Commission and the Environmental Protection Agency.

The Holt amendment, a clear-cut conservative assault on the federal government, was rejected by the House on a 164-246 vote on May 1, 1980.

For-Wrong. Against-Right.

#### 10. Balanced Budget III

Despite opposition from labor, civil rights, education, environmental, consumer and other public-interest groups, the House passed the first budget resolution by a 225-193 vote on May 7, 1980. The bill cut \$16 billion in spending from key domestic programs and could throw over a half-million American workers onto the unemployment lines.

For-Wrong. Against-Right.

#### 11. Aid to Cities and States

In early 1980, the House cleared a \$1-billion bill to provide anti-recession financial help to economically distressed cities and states. The legislation was designed to help these jurisdictions maintain public services and thus avoid massive layoffs during the current recession. Leading the conservative effort to weaken the bill, Rep. Thomas Kindness (R-Ohio) tried to send the measure back to committee with instructions to slash funding nearly in half. His motion to recommit was beaten by a 178-215 vote on Jan. 31, 1980.

For recommittal—Wrong, Against recommittal—Right,

## 12. Energy I—Oil Industry Profits

Early in 1979, President Carter decontrolled the price of domestically produced crude oil, an action that the Treasury Dept. acknowledges will cost American consumers \$1.1 trillion over the next ten years. This action is already having a catastrophic inflationary effect on the economy and the pocketbook of American workers.

To recover billions of dollars in excess oil company profits for development of alternative energy sources, the President proposed a windfall profits tax. The AFL-CIO found the proposal inadequate and, facing a Congress unwilling to reinstate price controls, urged a tougher windfall tax.

The windfall profits iax bill that emerged from conference taxed away less than 25 percent of the \$i\;\;\ trillion in excess oil industry profits over the next dec-



ade. While this conference agreement fell far short of the AFL-CIO's proposals, it was a significant improvement over the Senate bill and the best package that was politically achievable. A last-ditch maneuver by oil state representatives to weaken the bill failed as a motion by Rep Bill Archer (R-Tex.) to return the bill to conference to add more tax exemptions for the oil industry was beaten by a 185-227 vote on Mar. 13, 1980.

For recommittal—Wrong. Against recommittal—Right.

#### 13. Energy II—Gas Price Regulation

Amid soaring oil industry profits resulting primarily from President Carter's decision to remove federal price controls on domestic oil, the oil lobby sought to gouge consumers even more by eliminating federal price controls on gasoline. Under current controls, the pump price can only be increased to reflect inflation and higher crude oil costs. Federal regulation also provides for an allocation system to assure an even distribution of supply throughout the country.

Despite price increases of some 52 percent over the prior twelve months, the House at first voted for an amendment by Rep. James Courter (R-N.J.) to scrap price controls as well as the allocation system. Then on a second vote on Oct. 24, 1979, the House rejected the Courter amendment 189-225.

For-Wrong. Against-Right.

## 14. Energy III—Energy Development

A key element in the drive for energy independence was legislation to establish a five-member Energy Mobilization Board with broad powers to expedite the decision-making process for national priority energy projects.

The bill was designed to eliminate delays, duplication and frivolous challenges to energy projects while preserving environmental values as well as state and local responsibilities. The board would be empowered to set project deadlines after consultation with state and local officials. Judicial review of its decisions would be expedited. Any waiver of federal statutes obstructing project development—excluding labor, civil rights and water rights laws—could only be made upon the recommendation of the board with the concurrence of Congress and the President.

During House debate, Rep. Morris Udall (D-Ariz.) tried to weaken the bill by deleting the waiver procedure. His substitute bill was killed on a 192-215 vote on Nov. 1, 1979.

For-Wrong. Against-Right.

## 15. Energy IV-Energy Development

A last-ditch effort by a coalition of House conservatives and liberals succeeded in recommitting to conference—and possibly killing—the labor-backed Energy Mobilization Board bill. This action was approved on June 27, 1980, when the House adopted 232-131 a motion to recommit by Rep. Sam Devine (R-Ohio). The delay resulting from this maneuver may have doomed the legislation in the 96th Congress.

For recommittal—Wrong. Against recommittal—Right.

## 16. Health Care Costs

In 1979, the average cost of one day's hospital care was an astronomical \$226. Rising hospital costs are a leading cause of inflation and a major part of the nation's whopping \$184.4 billion 1979 health-care bill. Translated for a family of four, over \$3,200 yearly is spent on medical services.

The Carter Administration and labor again pushed legislation in 1979 to hold down these spiraling hospital costs by implementing mandatory controls to go into effect only for those hospitals unable or unwilling to keep increased costs to no more than 11.6 percent. Hospitals in states that already have mandatory cost-containment programs would be exempt. This legislation was strongly opposed by the American Medical Association and the hospital industry. The labor-backed bill was torpedoed when the House on Nov. 15, 1979, voted 234-166 approval of a substitute bill offered by Rep. Richard Gephardt (D-Mo.) creating a commission to further study the problem.

For-Wrong. Against-Right.

## 17. Civil Rights-Housing

The 1968 Fair Housing Act was designed to outlaw discrimination in the sale or rental of housing. However, a weak enforcement mechanism based primarily on conciliation has permitted discrimination to persist.

The key civil rights fight of 1980 occurred over legislation by Rep. Don Edward (D-Calif.) to put teeth into the 1968 law by placing administrative law judges (ALI) in the Dept. of Justice to hear complaints and impose penalties subject to review by a district court. Rep. James Sensenbrenner (R-Wis.) led the conservative effort to sink the bill by wiping out the ALI system. His amendment was sidetracked as the House on June 11, 1980, narrowly adopted by a 205-204 vote a substitute proposal by Rep. Mike Synar (D-Okla.) preserving the ALI system.

For-Right. Against-Wrong

## 18. Election Financing Reform

In 1974 campairm coits for the average House election were about 355,000 but of the average House election were about 355,000 but of the average price tag had, jumped to over \$90,000. Meanwhile, corporate political action committees (PACs) numbering 39 in 1974 have grown to more than 1,100. In the 1978 congressional elections over 800 business PACs, 500 trade association PACs and several dozen probusiness, right-wing groups spent nearly \$25 million—two and one-half times as much as all labor union political contributions. This dollar deluge, coupled with skyrocketing campaign costs, threatens to undermine the integrity of our electoral system and the credibility of the legislative process.

To stem this ide, the AFL-CIO, a long-time proponent of public financing of federal elections, backed legislation to curb the amount of PAC contributions to House elections. The bill, offered as an amendment by Rep. David Obey (D-Wis.) to a funding bill for the Federal Election Commission, would have limited total contributions that a candidate could receive from all PACs to \$70,000—\$85,000 if a runoff election occurred—and would have limited individual PAC contributions to each candidate to a maximum of \$9,000. Backed by strong support from labor and other public-interest groups, the Obey amendment was approved 217-198 on Oct. 17, 1979.

For-Right. Against-Wrong.

## 19. Consumer Protection

On the heels of defeating legislation in the 95th Congress to establish a badly needed Consumer Protection Agency, the lobbies of big business in the 96th Congress aimed their guns at the consumer protection powers of the Federal Frade Commission. The FTC is charged with protecting the public from marketplace monopolies and fraudulent business practices.

During House debate on an FTC funding bill, Rep. Marty Russo (D-III.) tried to stop an FTC consumer rulemaking requiring the funeral industry to disclose the prices of its goods and services while prohibiting certain deceptive misrepresentations found to be rampant in the industry. For union members, the high cost of funerals has seriously eroded the survivor's henefit left to next of kin through fringe benefit life insurance or other coverages. The FTC price-disclosure rule was seen as a sure way to stimulate competition and lower funeral costs. But, the House sided with the funeral industry against bereaved consumers and approved the Russo amendment by a 223-147 vote on Nov. 14, 1979.

For Wann Alle , we c

			ļ				į										•					Ų,			*
	1 Prevailing Mage	1 Hougehold Workson	C Person Barbar	. thempisyment bearffs	- Acre Ledendry Arbs	. Public Morts John	4 food Stemps for Arbitra	I free Caber Venn	-	- seteral breaks -	· before broken it	III seeken prompts 2	11 Ald 12 Coles	I Alleren II	C Personal II	III decemb 14	N thursday 15	I New Con Con	2 Cred Rights - Honoling	E Martin Phrencing Estern	Consumer Protection	Committees Voting Bress	•	A Comologive Right Personnage	
ALABAMA  1. Edwards J. (R)  2. Dicklosom (R)	*	ï	**	*	*	R.W	4	1	5 7	*	*	*		*	*	R	**	**	*	*	*	18 18	173 163	14	
1. Dickinson (R) 3. Nichola (D) 4. Sevid (D) 5. Filpon (D) 4. Sechanni (R) 7. Shelly (D)		\$ 3 2 2 2 4 3	THE REST	*****	******	RWWRRRW	*****	1 3 4 3 1	5760346	111111	111111	*****	\$# 1 2 1 11 1	BREEKS R	** HERE'S	<b>电影电影电影</b>	*** ARWR	******	*****	****	*** **	18 18 51 95 97 12	17) 135 136 44 147	14 19 18 59 41 18 31	
ALASKA AL Young D. (R)	R	*	R	*	R	A	₩	3	د	*	*	R	*	*	-	R	*		-	*	٨	53	79		
ARIZONA  1. Rhoder (R)  2. Udull (D)  3. Stamp (D)  4. Rodd (R)	* # *	15.13	\$ \$ \$ \$	ARWW	***	AR W	* 4*	•	5 1 7 7	***	WWW.	***	WRAW	***	***	AWRR	AW RW	48.88	* * * *	***	ARW W	163	224 30 71 74	10 54 11 9	
ARKANSAS  1. Alexander (D)  2. Botheme (R)  3. Hammerschmidt (R)  4. Anthony (D)	E T T	R 4 * W	RWWR	RWWR	48.88	***	****	5 1 2	1564	***	RWWR	***	RWWR	**	***	RWWR	RWWR	****	#***	***	***	99 77 29 15	76 31 163 23	58 10 15 41	
CALIFORNIA  1. Johanes H. (D)  2. Clauses (R)  3. Missis (D)  4. Faste (D)  5. Barres J. (D)  5. Barres J. (D)  6. Berling (D)  6. Delimat (D)  6. September (B)  7. Fashiyan (R)  7. Fashiyan (R)  7. Fashiyan (R)  7. Lagonersee (B)  7. Lagonersee (B)	我就我就 人民人 人民政党民党 人名凯克特雷沙 克河民民民物的食人民民民人的食政党党协会 人民司	我人是是我是我们的 NO NO ANN NOT EN THE	食物養養 養養養食人養物 財政 日夜の物味物 意物食品食物物 人食食 人人物学 男人が養する マスト	_		我是我们也是我们我们的一个一个一个一个一个一个一个一个一个一个一个一个一个一个一个一个一个一个一个	我必须是我就是我在我中的在中我的公司的特殊的,我们就是我的心理是人类的可以不是可可以人可可	737767656327063380107157780664558094140	#30000010550604576606100770000167205177317	克沙沙市 克克克克克 医沙沙沙 安安安 安安安安安安安安安安安安安 人名英特 人名英特 有人的变形	教学教育 党政党党党 教教学 教育学学学 食い 重常品が 人名意克 が見入がり 食や食が 下の食や	外投が分 党党党党党党 対外 ア 政 ア ア 会	民民党員 人人人党党党が政策人党党党が1999 人党の党党党党が1200 大学・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・	我心是常見是是自然的好 我心 自然的女心 女心 女人表示的 美克耳 法可以的 自我可以可 可以表示	WV. 我們們是我們們們做你們們們們們們們們們們們們們們們們們們們們們們們們們們們們們們			我们是是是我就是我们的我们的人是多数的心理的我们是我们的我就是我们是多少的是可以会会的我们	我心竟是 是投资股票 医心炎炎心 心脏的坏坏的 食物医足囊心的美国教育或现代的 阿里阿敦阿 医人类节	我必要是 医克里氏虫 医乳球 医乳球状皮肤 人名英贝克斯特 人名贝尔贝尔 计数据数据 计记录	食物食果食食食食食人人がWing食食物人食物食食食物物食食食食食物 食食物人物物人食物	115 47 33 36 1 19 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	13 166 6 9 9 13 12 12 13 16 16 17 17 18 19 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12	10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1	
COLORADO  1. Schroeder (D) 2. Wirth (D) 3. Kogerenk (D) 4. Johnson J. (R) 5. Kramer (R)	RRR S S	教が発すが		RRRR	明明民党教	人間開催以	WR AA	4 5 6 3 1	1 0 3 4	TT RAA	世代世代	*	A 44	RV BAW	N M M M	****	****	ARRYA	教育が有名	教育学院が	A R W	106 29 29 31	41 33 106 12	72 73 74 23	
CONNECTICUT  1. Cottor sD2  2. Dodd (D1  3. Giarma (D)  4. McKinnier (R)  5. Ratchford (D)  6. Modfett (D)	世界党 民民教		東京人人田田	日本 日	教育人民民党	教人人教育教	WRW AND	643467	1 1 1	744444		7				*****	世人民刊物物	<b>教教教育教育</b>	世界人人教育	FREER	W 4 4 4 R R	137 183 188 92 31 116	36 38 62 7	- 52	
DELAWARE AL Erone T. (R)	w	, .	, .	7 4		. 4		1	3	*	7 A	. 1	t <b>Y</b>	v =		, w	•	-	•	, ,	, ,	16	59	21	
FLORIDA  1. Heates (D)  2. Fourmet(D)  3. Exempt(D)  5. Exist (B)  6. Yearng C. W. (B)  7. Gibbons (D)  8. Irvinad (D)  9. Nelson (D)  10. Barbale (B)  11. Mem (D)  12. Stock (D)  12. Fourmet (D)  15. Fourcell (D)	人間関サマママママの日間日日	***************************************	**************************************		アンソンマン しマンツ とししに		WWW WWW WWW WREER	333333333333333333333333333333333333333	33 4 5 7 7 6 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9	***************************************	**************************************	*************	**************************************		北京市のマック・マーマー はまり 日本	我可能 党党党 化可管器 2017年第1	放牧主义でで、東京党が人が発見す	化有可有可可 人名可可 主義資金等			WE WWW RWW ARREST	16 71 116 53 10 122 14 13 124 124 124 126	134 134 145 147 148 148 148 148 148 148 148 148 148 148	43, 36, 43, 30, 8, 17, 19, 10, 33, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10	
GEORGIA  1. Gims (D1  2. Vistins (D)  3. Beintskey (D)  4. Levitus (D)  5. Fowler (D)  6. Clagaries (R)  7. Victorials (D)  6. Evant (D)  6. Evant (D)  6. Levitus (D)  6. Levitus (D)  6. Levitus (D)		*********	******		******		**********	7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	3		********		******	********	HE VERVERY		AARRYNVEAR	NY WY RY WY	*******	*********	12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 1	F1 4 4 4 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	100 120 120 111 111 111 111 111 111	7 46 7 19 7 14 50 61 8 8 17 33 16	
HAWAII 1. Hoftel (D) 2. Alaka (D)	1		<b>.</b> :		1	. !			; ;	;	7 :		W 1	W 1		; ;		. :	, i	1	: :	5 5	11	; #	
IDAHO 1. Symme (R) 2. Hanne (R)	;	<b>.</b> ;	. ;	<b>.</b> ;	~ ;	7 ;	P	,	1 1	: ;	<b>.</b>	~ :		Z ;	~ ;		7 4	. ;	. (	<b>.</b> ;	~ *	,	i ij	; ;	
ILLINOIS  1. Stewart (D)  1. Morehof M. (D)  1. Rome (D)  4. Deverted (D)  4. Deverted (D)  7. Collin C. (D)  8. Reaction world (D)  9. Yasis (D)  14. Perfor (B)  15. Perfor (B)  16. Action F. (B)  17. Collin C. (D)  18. Extension (B)  19. McCorp (B)  14. Extension (E)		I LEER ELWAN	ELEWRYRAW WWW	AARWRWARRWRWW	RARPER BRENN	RARRER RRAIN RPROP	を見るがなが、自由者が ロマイヤ	***************************************	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	150000000000000000000000000000000000000	LANGE BURNING	RECEIVED RECEIVED	世帯の現代の世界の世界の世界の世界の世界の世界の世界の世界の世界の世界の世界の世界の世界の	E-WRW RREW E-WW	AARWER ARREWWY	TERNEW TERL ENWY	# E E # E 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1	LEWY THE LANGE	RRWWWRRRWWWRW		3 10 13 10 12 12 13 14 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15	5 19 5 19 6 19 8 10 6 2 7 2 7 2 14 14 17	1 94 98 97 76 93 12 12 99 97 18 97 18 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12	

	-	Humpston Workers		Vermetryment beselft	-	Public Warfes Juda	Food Stemps for Arbitras	Total Labor Votes	And the second of the second o			belowerd bedger !!!	•	Leevily.		•	A1 18-14	Realth Cars Cours	Cred Sugar - Housing	Lincoln frameting Referen	Communer Protection	Commission Voting Resert		
15. Corcorns (B) 16. Anderson J. (R) 17. O'Brien (B) 18. Vilchal (R) 18. (R) 19. Linishneth (R) 19. Crane D. (R) 19. Price (D) 14. Simon (D)	1 WARPERRYRE	1 WANNANDE	3 WARRENDE	4 FARRARES	S WWRWRWRWRR	6 WANNERSTRE	7 WANTED	R 8 8 2 4 3 2 1 8 7 7	7 1573 457 88	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	* WAAWASSWEE	· 我人民民民党政党民党学	11 WASSWEATER	1 WAASSEE		14 WWEREWARRY	5 WARREST STREET	16 W 43333333 MR	T WARRENSTREE	15 男人安特民学及学院最		7 12 17 32 76 43 44 3 159	73 (38 117 116 (82 (83 (83 (83 (83 (83 (83 (83 (83 (83 (83	5 9 27 19 13 41 (9 31 8 56 79
INDIANA  1. Sespannin i D)  2. Filbium (D)  3. Studenmu (D)  4. Quayle (R)  5. Hillin (R)  6. Hillin (R)  6. Hillin (R)  7. Hillin (R)  9. Hamilton (R)  9. Hamilton (R)  10. Sharp (D)  11. Jacobs (D)	<b>使免疫等人民食等食用</b>	<b>党政党等公司等等等</b>	<b>我就民学学民学学民党</b> 教	*********	使混乱反抗化 化硫烷烷	我是我中心我 PP 只食中	*********	5 5 7 1 2 5 2 1 4 4 3	1 2 9 5 4 2 5 6 3 3 9 0	*********	<b>党党建学员学学学党员</b>	● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●	*******	R. 宋 宋 宋 宋 宋 宋 宋 宋 宋 宋 宋 宋 宋 宋 宋 宋 宋 宋 宋	我就以*********	医克雷特尼学 克学及克学	<b>医学院子学院学学学院学</b>	*********	<b>医安全性 医克拉氏 医克拉氏 医克拉氏 医克拉氏性 医皮肤炎 医皮肤炎 医皮肤炎 医皮肤炎 医皮肤炎 医皮肤炎 医皮肤炎 医皮肤炎</b>	我我说'学学学会会说	<b>用程程→分子子子</b>	47 84 222 9 75 31 7 136 88 128	15 39 15 16 16 16 16 13 46 59	22 4 1 1 1 7 4 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6
IOWA 1. Lench J. (R) 2. Tunka (R) 3. Graziley (R) 4. Smith N., (D) 5. Harkin (D) 6. Bedell (D)	***************************************	京田 小田 小田	*****	***	RWRRWR	野野野田人野	*****	1 1 5 3 3	676134	***	<b>教徒学 观赏</b> 观	222××	***	女学学 尺尺変	*****	*****	W 44 4 W 4	*****	<b>使民学 夜灾食</b>	元元学 変元日	#\$\$ \$ 4\$	25 8 21 187 84 70	57 28 185 42 35 48	30 11 17 18 11 11 11
KANSAS  i. Sebeltus (R)  2. Jeffrica (R)  3. Wron (R)  4. Gilcinnus (D)  5. Wintenhar (R)	***	***	WWWRW	****	AWRW	15551	11544		6 7 5 7	****	* * * *	教育なが教	****	****	**	<b>東京人民党</b>	****	** **	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$	***	WWARW	23 4 33 44	153 34 159 36	13 11 10 56
KENTUCKY 1. Hubbard (D) 2. Na(cher (D) 3. Mazmil (D) 4. Suyder (R) 5. Carter (R) 6. Hopkins (R) 7. Peridss (D)	观察R R W W R	素学科学教育	発表等等等人	大学学習学問題	<b>党党党以党司</b> 党	明見人明皇明皇	# \$ \$ \$ \$ # #	4411386	3 4 6 4 7 0	*****	<b>聚聚人物学研究</b>	RWW報度股股	*****	******	現實 医 聚聚聚	民意政策党政策	E# 4 * * * E	E\$ 4588E	******	我民等の発養	*****	113 41 41 44	54 82 52 52 145 136 136 19	***
LOUISIANA  1. Livingates (R)  2. Hoggs (D)  3. Tauzin (D)  4. Lancii (C, D)  5. Hackaby (D)  6. Moore (R)  7. Brennex (D)  8. Long G, (D)	有人。 民等诉讼	*******	明人配人明明教育	· 我们,我没有许是	明我。 政党研究党	明度。 東京明人東	* . * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	04141016	7 1 6 7 4 1	38.38333	WR. WWER	#3.8333k	WA. RRWER	**.****	** ***	WR ARVER	<b>学究民人民学教育</b>	** ****	******	WW 48888	** ****	10 20 12 14	が 41 21 66 (1) 数数	13 71 67 33 19 36 58
MAINE 1. Emery (R)									7				*		•	*	*	. w			-	. 572 1 100	74 20	41 67
E Seewe (R)	×	, ,	, 4	, ,	, ,	, ;	7 =	٠	7	~	R	R	*		R	*	*	*	***	*	•	10	28	47
1. Saumn (R) 2. Long C. (D) 3. Mikulati (D) 4. Holt (R) 5. Spellman (D) 6. Spron S. (D) 7. Mitchell P. (D) 8. Sarnes (D)	<b>有效服务 医坏疽人</b>	********	*****	東発度民衆が発音	京 5 世 5 元 5 元 5 元 5 元 5 元 5 元 5 元 5 元 5 元		WRITE REEL	1 6 3 7 5	7 3 6 1 4 6 1	*******	明是我特別以及此	RWR RWWR R	**********	WRRWRRR	WWRW RWRR	*********	*****	明教教育 東河東東	<b>研究が発が発覚</b>	WERW RYRE	WR 4W RW OR	140 71 23 90 161 33	127 66 9 126 17 24 18	12 69 16 16 18 18
MASSACHUSETTS  1. Coste (R) 1. Boland (D) 2. Early (D) 4. Common (D) 4. Common (D) 6. Marcha (D) 7. Markey (D) 7. Markey (D) 9. Monkley (D) 9. Monkley (D) 10. Heckley (R) 11. Donnelly (D) 12. Streads (D)	民党党员党党员 化黄黄素									YYY N			化异烷酸铵化汞 医尿酸性		民民民政党民党 足電視電	SESS 25555						151 236 98 151 34 32 69 133 136 135		•
MICHIGAN  1. Casyer (D) 2. Persell (R) 3. Woige (D) 4. Sectame (R) 5. Sevyer (R) 6. Sectame (R) 7. Kildes (D) 9. Vander Jugt (R) 11. Davis (R) 16. Albesta (D) 16. Albesta (D) 16. Albesta (D) 16. Notati (D) 16. Notati (D) 17. Secdend (D) 18. Silacehard (D) 18. Silacehard (D) 19. Secuentials (R)	网络风琴 中央共享中 建氯化 人名巴克拉尼尔			は 日本 ・ ・ ・ ・ ・ ・ ・ ・ ・ ・ ・ ・ ・ ・ ・ ・ ・ ・			とこしず マーニング しまえしままたしまが 化物化物 外外党員所 化外党員所 化外党員所 化水池党員 化二十二十二十二十二十二十二十二十二十二十二十二十二十二十二十二十二十二十二十	7670167717675777771	010661000000000000000000000000000000000	是人外別的可見V可 WV 是是什么可是可人	の変数可能の変数 投資委員の支援を指す	民意 化复数分分 化氯 化金属氯化 不知 的第三人称	党党党が研究党が、政党組入党党人党党等	班內提內 內門 建银矿 阿美国建筑建筑建筑	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	的时间 建氯甲甲基甲基甲基甲甲基甲甲基甲甲基甲甲基甲甲基甲甲基甲甲基甲甲基甲甲基甲甲基甲甲	物学的特殊的现在分词 医多种 医多种	医特别特人 建美甲甲甲酰人民 医医克莱耳	発表的な対象の数ななない。 こことの 大変の 大変の はない ないのの ないかい かいかい かいかい かいかい かいかい かいかい かい	一日 はおいま 日本	現人民学 人民党党等 見人民人民党人民党	171 453 111 117 117 117 117 117 117 119 119 119	17 31 66 60 24 11 153 10 11 11 12 11 12 13 14 14 14 14	10 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15
MINNESOTA					•	Y :				-		. 5		, ,	: :		, 18		: :	. :			. (10)	19



MISSION  MIS			11	#** It	-	-	= = =	1			- C		,			· B. P. Press.		<b>.</b>	Warhans Lights		Marts Jahr	1 to 1 to 1 to 1	r Vales	}	=	1			•	b Novelles serving Lobers	Protection	Voters Beauty	
APPLICATION  APPLI	•			1]	1	]		3 4 4	İ		1	•			•			fresh in	Į		-	]			1		Î.	Ì	1	j [	Central	- L	-
ACMITION AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AN	Whitten (DI   Bowes (DI   3. Mostgomery (D)   4. Histon (R)	***	77 77 77 77 77 77 77 77 77 77 77 77 77	****	1 1 0 8	43.5	# # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # #			2442	18881	***			190 167 34 117	33 11	1. Jones J. (D) 2. Synar (D) 3. Watking (D) 4. Steed (D) 5. Edwards M. (R)	RI			Ī			•							1 11	45855 X	09802.1
ACOUTH AND ACTION OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPE	1. Clay (D) 2. Young R. (D) 3. Gentard (D)		<b>双</b>		7 5 5	R W	R R R R W	RRRR	R	W 76 W 76 R 78	RWW	4.₩₩₩		59 47	10 18 22 29	77 73	1. AuCoin (D) 2. Ullman (D) 3. Descan R, (D)	# 1 # 1	W A R W R	<b>电影</b>	RRAD	W 3	3 1		* :	*	W R R	**	* * * *	*	183	44 58 46	1771
AGOLT AND	7. YOURSHOT (27)	R WW A R R WW A R R	R****	# W W A W W	5	***	R W R R W W W R R W W W R R W W W R R W W W R R W W W R R R W W W R R R W W W R R R W W W R R R W W W R R R W W W R R R W W W W R R R W W W W R R R W W W W R R R W W W W R R R W W W W W R R R W	RWWRE	R W W R	W 景景	R****	R****	*****	126 10 17 77 50 138	14 71 129 139 18 47	94 12 13 64 75	i. Myeri M. (D)	RARRA		2 R R R			9 1					RRR	æ R		¥ 67	•	
AND CONTROL	i. Williams P. (Di Z. Martenes (R)	# # R # # W	R R W R	₹ ₩	5	*	R W W R	# %	R	<b>:</b> ::	R	A R	R	28 21	18 57	76 27		RAR	****	TREES .	RRRW	W S	1 8	*****	*****	****	(現民分析民	(A A A W )	********	RR	- 67	15	10 M 17 M 14
AND CONTROL	i. Berouter (R) 2. Cavanaugh (D) 3. Smith V, (R)	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	W R R W W	* *	3 9	*		* * *	R	* *	W R W	e w	R	11 54 16	28 25 112	29 68 11	11. Visite (D) 12. Visite (D) 13. Coughlin (R) 14. Visite (W, (D) 15. Pillon (R)	RER		. AWRW		2 2 6 W 1 7 W 1	0 0 0 0		現 単 男 学 男 ウ	K. 83 88	K, RWAR!	R R V AR	** ***		111	123	S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S
AND CONTROL	AL Section (D)		. *	₩ ₩	3 3	*	<b>*</b> ₩	۸ ۳	· 🕶 :		*	4 8	₩	94	67	45	17. Ertel   Dt   18. Waigree (D)   19. Goodling   18)   20. Gaydes (D)   2). Relief (D)   27. Marches	最後を発展を発展している。	R W	RR	REVER	W 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	6 7	RRRR	WWRAW		" 化学学 尼 聚二		*******	R 8	54 66 154 154	14 14 91 16 7	# # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # #
A.   A.   A.   A.   A.   A.   A.   A.	1. Cleveland (R) New Jersey			₹.₩				≅ \$					R.	7	123 163	74 13	23. Affiliases (D)	RY	* *	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	RRR	7 2 3 8 9	4 7	* *	* *	**	# # # # # #	***	***	***	16	15	74 4 9 3
A.   A.   A.   A.   A.   A.   A.   A.	1, Floris (D) 2, Haghes (D) 3, Heward (D) 4, Thompson (D) 5, Feawich (R) 6, Forsythe (R)	R R R R R R R R W W		*****	7 0 1 7 0 1 7 0 1 1 5	2 × 2 × 4	****	RWERRY	発表を開発する		RWRRWW	RRRRRW	****	110 29 181 229 58 42	15 13 15 68	71 93 94 44	SOUTH CAROLIN	A					1				-				Ì		
A.   A.   A.   A.   A.   A.   A.   A.	7. Hollenback (R) 18. Rodies (D) 11. Minute (D) 12. Rinaido (R)	発 表 表 表 表 表 表 表 表	****	R R R R R R R	7 0 7 0 7 7 0 7 7 6	*****	*****	*****	民民職権人民	*****	RR W 跟着景		党人 鹿克里里	194 191 50 148 100 118	28 19 23 13 17 28	84 89 73 92 81	2. Sponce (R1 3. Derrick (D) 4. Campbell (R) 5. Holland (D) 6. Jenrotta (D)	W R R R R	R	W R W R A R R	¥ R¥ AR	****	1 V	¥ # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # #	日本の日本の日本の日本の日本の日本の日本の日本の日本の日本の日本の日本の日本の日	R	W R R R	W A	W # W W A	RWA	17 44 58	13 13 14 14 14	16 57 8 55 76
Community   Comm	14. Genrial (D) 15. Patter (D) NEW MEXICO	111			7 •					R A	Ĩ	ĀĀ	***	13 263	16	***	1. Darchie (D) 2. Abdaor (R)	* *		: :	*	2 3	*	; ‡	₩ # # ^	*	. ;	×	w g w %		, 13 13	117	18
TEXAS   19   19   19   19   19   19   19   1	NEW YORK		~ ₩									~ *	Ā				i, Quillen IR)  2. Duncan J. (R)  3. Resquiré (D)  4. Gore (D)  5. Reser (D)	R W W R R R	W W R	***************************************	WWRRR	2 1 2 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	9 6 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	***	****	***		-	***	***	10 14 14 15 17	130 176 87 19	16 17 58 77
1. Start 10	1. Carsey (R) 2. Dewsey (D) 3. Ambre (D) 4. Lant (R) 5. Wydiar (R) 6. Wolff (D)	VERW AR		### ### #############################	7 0 6 1 3 3 1 9		***		M	****				106 97 47 69 175	36 15 14 117 143 26	11 88 78 39 33 87	7. Jones E. ID) E. Ford H. (D) TEXAS	RR															
13. From (15) 13. From (15) 14. From (15) 15. From (15) 15	7. 7	2 A R R R R A R R R R		K R R R R R R	5 1 6 0 7		R** # ##		X 在 章 民 人 联	ARREN			三人宗人 民意	151	14 12 6 27 16	11. E 2 1 1	2. Wilson C. (D) 3. Collins J. (R) 4. Roberts (D) 5. Martes (D)	RWRW	7 A W R R W		1 4 4 4 PM	1	7 4 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	*****	WR 4 W	1 2 5 2 2 2		EN SHAM		64 M 4 & 8 1	8.234	50 170 146 33	12 * X 5 13 4
13. From (15) 13. From (15) 14. From (15) 15. From (15) 15	17 Maraba I (D)	R R R R R R R R R R R R R R R R R R R			5 0 7 4 3	2 2 2 7 2 7 2 7 2 7 2 7 2 7 2 7 2 7 2 7	**		****			RRRR	IAW WWW	114 106 131 173	13 14 14 24	57 P R 855	S. Erichardt (D) 9. Broods (D) 10. Pickle (D) 11. Leach (D) 12. Wright (D) 13. Hightoner (D)	· 果 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ARW		我 明 明 明 明 明		0 2 2 4 5 W W W	RAWRE	RRR AAR	55 2 5 5 B	**************************************	WRR AND	# W W W W W	228 7 28	179 186 186	17 69 183 18 18	1173 50 1174 11
NORTH CAROUNA  1. I case W. (D)  A W R W R R R 4 3 W R W W R R R W W W R R R W W W W R R R W W W W R R R W W W W R R R W W W W R R R W W W W R R R W W W W R R R W W W R R R W W W R R R W W W R R R W W W R R R W W W R R R W W W R R R W W W R R R W W W W R R R W W W W W R R R W W W R R R W W W R R R W W W R R R W W W R R R W W W W W R R R W W W W W R R R W W W R R R W W W R R R W W W R R R W W W R R R W W W R R R W W W R R R W W W R R R W W W W R R R W W W W W R R R W W W R R R W W W W R R R W W W W W R R R W W W W R R R W W W W W W R R R W W W W W W W R R R W W W W W W R R R W W W W W W R R R W W W W W W R R R W W W W W W W R R R W W W W W W W W W R R R W					7 0 7 0 7 0 7		RRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRRR							76 49 185 144 144 144 144 144 144 144 144 144 14	- 4		(5. de ta Carm (D) (6. White (D) (7. Steuhelm (D) (8. Leinnet (D)	W 19	W 1	. *	W ARWRW					*****	2 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	* .***		34	36 130 131 131 131 131 131 131 131 131 131	
NORTH CAROUNA  1. I case W. (D)  A W R W R R R 4 3 W R W W R R R W W W R R R W W W W R R R W W W W R R R W W W W R R R W W W W R R R W W W W R R R W W W W R R R W W W R R R W W W R R R W W W R R R W W W R R R W W W R R R W W W R R R W W W R R R W W W W R R R W W W W W R R R W W W R R R W W W R R R W W W R R R W W W R R R W W W W W R R R W W W W W R R R W W W R R R W W W R R R W W W R R R W W W R R R W W W R R R W W W R R R W W W R R R W W W W R R R W W W W W R R R W W W R R R W W W W R R R W W W W W R R R W W W W R R R W W W W W W R R R W W W W W W W R R R W W W W W W R R R W W W W W W R R R W W W W W W R R R W W W W W W W R R R W W W W W W W W W R R R W	14. Gliman (R) 17. McHugh (D) 28. Stratton (D) 19. Solomon (R) 10. McEvon (R) 11. McEvon (R)	RRRR			7 0 1 7 0 6	*****	**		NAW RW		RRRAW		(# * * * *	107	39 21 47 28 156	73 27 14 17 14	26. Gonzalez (D) 21. Loeffer (R) 22. Panel (R) 23. Kasen (D) 24. Front (D)	RWW	RW	R R W W	R W 7	7	9 7 7 7 A	R ** A R	***		RWR	RWY	1	****	100 4 101 14	11 36 57 16 18	10 7 51
NORTH CAROUNA  1. Icane W. (D)	31, Hanley (D) 33, Lee (R) 34, Horton (R) 35, Counble (R) 36, LaFales (D) 37, Newsk (D)				5 1 5 6 1 7 8	****	W		****		WARWER WAR	***************************************	AARAAR	179 9 144 36 98 115	197 72 166 17 13	15 15 17 78	1. McKay (D) 2. Marriett (R)	R W	<b>:</b> ;	<b>~</b>	∵;	1	5 W	4	* *	¥ ;	7.7	<b>.</b> ,	7 #	₩.	71	2	57 13
11. Godger (D)	NORTH CAROLI	NA									-	_	-				AL Jefferds (R) VIRGINIA	A W												* *			14
11.   Godger (D)	1. Femalism (D)	A W H H			4 1 2 4 2 4 4 1	*****	***			****	4 T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T	****	47 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	76 42 42 46 53 76	121 193 47 78 78	77 18 41 40 40 55	2. Whitehurst (R) 3. Serterfield (D) 4. Drasist R, W (R) 5. Drasist D, (D) 6. Botler (R) 7. Robinson (R)	*****	***		***		6 W	****	14111	*****		48888 X	*****	1 6 6 2 2 2 2 3 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	19 16 17 15 16	147 136 131 146 146	16.
1. Cristians (B)	7. Rose (D) 9. Hofser (D) 9. Martin (R) (6. Secytall (R) 11. Godger (D)	W A R R W A R W A R			1 4	****	A		RAW R	**		RW	****	53 13 18 31	17 67 133 178 58	58 43 18	WASHINGTON		-						_								
1. Cristians (B)	AL Andrews M. (R)		1	• •	1 6	* *		~ ~	<b>*</b> R	*	₩ #	*	-	•	150	29	1. Pritchard (R) 2. Swift (D) 3. Sentor (D) 4. McCommot (D) 5. Folay (D) 6. Delsa (D)	*****	WH A H A H	**	*******	5 6	****	祖 見 見 見 見 見 見 見	*****	<b>联联股股股股股股股股股股股股股股股股</b>	43 N H R W	***************************************	<b>開発 人間間</b>		14	11 21 20 34 13	ないない
	1. Grading (R) 2. Unker (D)			***	÷ 1	****	****		W W W	R 3 8 8	***	***	W	14 69 11 14	13 7 13 13	19 76 83 17	WEST VIRGINIA									-							
11. 10 **mon (B)	o. Praysim (R) 7 Recurs C. (R) 8. Kindmoss (R) 9. Askiey (D) 10. Miller C. (R) 11. Stanton (R)	X A R R			3 4 8 6 1 5 8 1 9 7	*****	日日日本の日本	A	******	ARW RW	**	***	TAN EN	# M 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 1	171 153 10 33 175 141	22 18 11 87 12 38	WISCONSIN	RR	A =														
IL-Appende (D) RWRWRR B 5 1 WWRRRRWWW W 23 17 54 18. Williams LRD RRRWWS W 51 17 54 26. Osher (D) RRRRRR 7 6 RRRR WWRRRWWRRRW 73 17 54 21. Solater (D) RRRRRR 7 6 RRRR WWRRRWWRRR WWRWWWW 4 33 16 22. Voslat (D) RRRRRR 7 6 RRRRRWWRRRWWRRR 134 19 22. Voslat (D) RRRRRR 7 7 6 RRRRRWWRRRWWRRRR 135 19 23. Voslat (D) RRRRRR 7 6 RRWWRRRWWRRRR 136 19 24. World (D) RRRRRR WWRRRWWRRRR 136 19 25. Voslat (D) RRRRRR WWRRRWWRRRR 136 19 26. World (D) RRRRR WWRRRWWRRRR 136 19 27. Voslat (D) RRRRR WWRRRWWRRRR 136 19 28. WORLD (D) RRRRR WWRRWRR 136 17 29. WORLD (D) RRRRR WWRRWWRRR 136 17 20. WORLD (D) WWWWRRRWWRR 136 17 20. WORLD (D) WWWWWWWWWWWWWWWWWWWWWWWWWWWWWWWWWW	12. Doving (R) 13. Pense (D) 14. Selberling (D) 15. Wysie (R) 16. Regula (R) 17. Asidrook (R)	# # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # #		***	6 1 6 1 2 5	*****	## \$ \$ # # X X X	*****	*****	***	*****	****		15 44 45 13	15 18 19 40 86	19 78 89 23 30	4. Zablocki (D) 5. Reust (D) 6. Potri (R) 7. Obey (D)	*********	· 東京東京等 ·	RR		7 7 7 3	***	東京開発を	RRRR		****	******	<b>展展及学</b>		152 254 136	16 11 11 19 12 10	B 1771 4
	18. Applopais (D) 19. Williams L. (R) 28. Oaker (D) 21. Stoker (D) 22. Vacit (D) 23. Monti (D)			-	5 1 7 0 6 0 7 8	¥ 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	MAN MAN	RRR	REEWWE	REW AWA	***************************************		W   1	92377 SA 18 M	14 17 8 18 23	71 54 10 10 10	E. Radi (R)  7. Seminatronour (R)  WYOMING																

																		112-																												
	Abbers Nominantes	American Nomination	d balany i	& Sadony II	Sale Moure Day			in which the same		Arred Workers	ment Workers	de ladentry labo			A fee the Heart Steer Steer Steer			1 1	H 18-	-		Saide Valing Beard	1	melakes tight raccomage		bers Nomisution		Ĭ	= 1	Land Day	vani form Washers	mpleyment Beauths !	mpleyment Benefits !!	bynes beet		and Workers				and being	with laurance	-	= }	The state of the s	element Verlang Exceed	
	1	1	3	4	5 1	6 1		,	16	11	ŭ,	IJ			1	4 1	5 10		. 3 7 18	19	R	3 **	•	L		1	4	Į,	1.	•		5	•	(*	4 .			. <u>.</u> . w	1	1 1	. j	17	<u> </u>		]_	3
ALABAMA Hedin (D)				* :		. ,			, ,						-						240	1			NEVADA																.•	1, ,	19		•	•
Hamer (D)	R	=	R	w	* 1	R /	. ,	٠.		=	Ř		٠	•	*	• •	٠ i		Ř	Ř	5	i	ī	57 68	Cannon (D) Laxait (R)		₹	*	₩.		. :	*	¥	*	* :	L #	=	5 7 1 (3		* *	*		£ 4	145	**	
Gracel (ID) Stavens (IR)	*	R	R	<del></del>	1	: ;				R	Ā		*	3	3	. 4	. 4		À	R	100	15 71		81 54	NEW HAMPSH Durkin (D) Humphrey (R)	IIRE 1	3	2	R.	R I					B. 1		١,		b : A	. *		<b>R</b> 1	RR	* *1	:(	
ARIZONA DeCondal (D)	_	_	_																						NEW JERSEY	~	-	~	-	•	•		-	~	₩,	, 74	1	1 13	) PA	, w	*	** 1	* 4	,	14	
Goldwater (R)  ARKANSAS	7	*	Ä	₩ :	. 7	: ;	7 7			Ä	R	X	1	5		, ,	, A			*	10	171		58 10	Bradley : D) Williams (D)	R	Ř	2	R			=	R	聚聚	RI		12	:	R	R	R	RE	* 4	36 213	16	*1
Sempore (D) Pryor (D)	2	=	<del></del>	~ ;	7	. :	, 4 , 4	, <u>.</u>	/ R	:	R	*	6	,	4	. :	, .	R		R	63 19	<b>4</b> 1	: :	54 50	NEW MEXICO	<b>~</b>	_	w	<b>.</b>	~ .	. 19		*		. ,	* W		. (8			_			٠		
CALIFORNIA									_	_	_		•	•			_	_		_	17	.,		•	Schwitt (R)	*	~	₩	₩ .	•	•	<b>A</b>	w	*	i i	i	3			, <del>%</del>	*	₩;	v Ř	) is	18	11
Creation (D) Hayshave (R)	W	W	W	* ;	•	,	, R		R	R	Ř	R	11	1	2	, ,		R	×	4	148	61	1	16	Moyethan (D) Javita (R)	2	R	=	R I		R	R	R.	2	R I		(3			R	R			70	, g	17
COLORADO Hart (D)		<b>=</b>		R 1	<b>.</b>				R	R		*	•	512	7 7	, .	, ,	, ,	-	R	*	24	. 7	76 3	NORTH CARO	UNA														_	_		_		_	_
CONNECTICUT	~	~	~	~ `	•	• •	•		•	~	R	~	1	1.3	*	′ ¬	*	*	*	*	1	36		,	Morgan (E) Helms (R)	*	~	*	* I		; ;	=	¥	R		7 77	1	12	*	. :	R	~ *		43 (4	113	38 10
Ribleoff (D) Welchor (E)	2	R	R I		1	R	Â	Ř	À	Ř	*	=	7	1	R	R	1	R	*	4	168 93	25		17 15	NORTH DAKO Burdick (D) Young (B)	TA B	=				R	R		=		. =	i u	1		v 18				183	13	24
DELAWARE Bldon (D) Roth (R)										_				1		_		_	_	_	_				он <b>ю</b>	-	~	•	• '	• •		•	•	~	<b>.</b> .	1 2	1	٠			Α '	w =	. **	14	)) (14	r)
Reib (R) FLORIDA	-	*	*	* 1	, ,	7 %	, W	- 74	Ē	W		Ř	3	19	7	*	-	-	Ř	*	18	130	1	i	Glenn (D) Metzenhoum (D)	=	R	R	2 1	7 :	R	Å	W R	R	,	R	12	3			R S	2 T	7 R	97 78	16	77 91
Chifes (D) Stone (D)	R	*	₩ .	¥ ;	: ;	, W	, <del></del>	-	R		R	R	7	:	**	, 15 16		R	R	*	71 55	17	:	<b>e</b> 17	OKLAHOMA Berre (D)		_	_				_	_	_		_		_			_					
GEORGIA	_	_				_																			Bores (D) Bollmon (E) OREGON	*	*	₩.	* ;	•	×	Ä	÷	₩ .		7	1	10	7	#	#	₩ 5		12 34	16 128	11
None (D) Telescope (D)	Ř	Ŧ.	¥ ;	~ ;	Ä	Ä	7	#	A	¥	¥	R	3	11	7		*	R	A	2	20	LTE	3	i	Harfield (R) Packwood (R)	R	R	* :	~ ;		/ **	W	*	¥ ,		: :	3	10		2	R		R	97 74	74	57
HAWAII Incayo (D) Matamaga (D)	R			: :		4	~	*			<b>*</b>		9 10	3	4			*	E	â	មា	ņ	•	2	PENNSYLVANI	A						٠							-				-	•	_	••
IDAHO		_				-		-	-	_	-	1	10	•		•	-	_	-	-		. 11	•	•	Floins (R) Schweiker (R)	R	R	# !	* 1		*	*	~	2 1	* 2	=	5	•	R	*	* 1	# R	, B	113	14 47	73
Cherete (D) McChere (E)	Ä	\$	<b>*</b>	, ;	4	4	*	~	*	R	R	-	í	1 10	=	R	*	R W	R	*	171 14	118	i i	į	Pett (D) Chales (B)		2	<u> </u>					R.		t R	*	11	1	R	R	R I		; ; . <b>A</b> :	191	(7	72
ILLINOIS Steronge (D)		R			. 74	, =	*		*		₩ .		5			R					110	w	-	,	SOUTH CAROL	INA		• '			=	R	₩ :	•	7 7	•		5			* '	~ 2		43	31	58
Percy (R)	R	R	w :		-	* **	**	~	•	R	*	R	5 6	6	*	₩	₩	Ř	₩	*	119 97	36 62	41	t	Hollings (D) Thurmond (R)	₩.	~	* ;	* ;	R	=	¥	¥ :	~ ;	, E	4	3	( <b>0</b> 11	*	7	* ;	! ! <b>?</b> !		84 19	72 116	48
Bark (D) Lugar (R)	R	*	R 1		4		R	R W	R	R	R I		11	10	1			*	R		173	11 70	7	:	SOUTH DAKOT	A	. ,	<b>*</b> :														. *				_
IOWA Culver (D)	_					_	_	_		_															McGovern (D) Pression (R) TENNESSEE	ŵ	₩ ;	* 1	7 7	*	*	2	₩ ;	2	Ē	w	i	ė	*	Ā 1		v w	R	150	28 28	35
KANSAS	₩.	*	. :		, û		*	ŵ	#	*	R	-	1	12	~	*	*	Ř	ř	2	"	18 33	*1	į	Seeser (D) Baker (R)	R I		W 1	Y R	, R	*	w	w		. R	R		5	W	R	RR	t R	2	52 41	2)	71 26
Dois (R) Kassebaum (R)	w	w :	~ ;	7 R	*	*	=	ï	Ā	R		R	:	:		-	Ţ	<u>.</u>	=	2	30	136 26	19	·	TEXAS						_	_											i			
KENTUCKY								_		_	-				-	-		-		1	٠	~			Beatsea (D) Tower (R)	R I	, ,			, 3	*	*	₩ ;		R	R	1	5		*			~	73 18	182	1
Ford (D) Hoddlesten (D)	R			, :	R	R	R	*	R	*	* ;		7	3	*	*	R	R	R		91	13 17	71	i	UTAH Gara (R) Hateb (R)	<del></del>	~ ;	7 ;	, x	***		~	× ;	: :	R	7	1	11	7	<u>.</u>	w =	: ::		13	(a)	i t
LOUISIANA Johnston (D) Long (D)	<b>,</b>					*	<u></u>	*		R	w 1		•	5	*		*	₩	R	_	49 21.5	76 113	39	,	VERMONT												Ī							,	-	
MAINE	•	• .	٠. ٨	. =	Ā	*	*	^		<b>A</b>	Ř		•	1	**	*	*	*	2	•	115	113	39 54	1	Lenky (D) Stafford (混)	2 1	: :				R	<del></del>	R ;			R	11	5	*	A I	RR	7 7	2	93 (83	14 46	79 68
Milebell (D) Cohon (R)	:	1			B	R	*		R	¥ ;			7	1	*				*		7	1	70 31	,	VIRGINIA Bre H. (f)	R. T	· •	• •	, <del>-</del>	*		₩ 1	<b>~</b> =		R	**	4	•	-	₩,	<b></b> 1	, <u>.</u>	-	15	(67	13
MARYLAND	_			_	_	_	_	_	_						_	_	_	_							Warshington	•	• •	•	•	•	~	*	~ •	•	R	*	,	(1	•	~ `	* *	R		•	×	16
Serbanes (D) Methins (R)	- R i	i		ī	ī	Ē	R	Ē	Ä				13	•	Ē	Ā	Ē	R	W 1		71 128	37	78		Jackson (D) Maganasa (D)	:		R	1	R	R	R Y	~ :	R	W	R	11	1	R	₩ ;			R	134 130	(4 i\$	**
MASSACHUSETTS Kennedy (D) Trengen (D)	, 1	1	4	â	Â	Å	4	4	Á :	•	: 1	١,	3		A	â	â.	R	<b>≙</b> i		167	15	72		WEST VIRGINIA						*	<del>-</del> 1	<b>7</b> 2					-	-			_		155		
MICHIGAN	- '			-	-	~				•	•	1	-		-	_	_	-		-		•	-4		Randolph (D) WISCONSIN	R Î	. 1	R	Ř	Ě	*		ř		Ř	R	1	1	ű.	Ri	í		R !	173	<b>17</b>	#
Lorin (D) Riogin (D)	R	: :	R	R	R	R	R	R	R		7		3	1	1	i		R			×	4	15 16		Yelson (D) Pressnire (D)	2 X		R	R	R	R	R (	, R	=	R	-	13	*	R	<b>.</b> :			2	177	27 61	87 78
MINNESOTA	<b>.</b>		, 4	, <b>w</b>	*	•	-	_	=	<b>~</b> .		•	2		*	~	*	₩.	<b>,</b>		4	<b>12</b>	15		WYOMING	_	_			_	_															
MISSISSIPPI	₩ /	, ,	· •	*		*	~	*	2			*	1	11	*	*	*	₩ 1	R I		ıě	12 10	16 50		Simpore (R) Wailop (R)	* *	4		*	*	₩	~ ;	7 7	=	R	#	1	10	*	::	: :		=	•	% "	13
Stennis (D) Cocteun (R)	R (	. 4	. 7	*	*	*	*	=		7	" ;	;	4	17	Ţ,	<del>.</del>	<b>4</b>	R !	<u>.</u>	7	٠,	1 MF 300	24 17			-	-	-	Ų.			19	P			7	2	F	A	***						
MISSOURI			_	_	,	_	_	_	_			-						_								*	9	6.1		į	9	Š		4		ж,			25	N.						
Engineen (D) Dansforth (ED	R			R	Â	*	R W	*	2	; ;	7 2	1	ŝ	7	*	*	*	R	1	•	37 27	#	×				3			7	Š		*	3	3	-	_	-	4	4						

MONTANA

NEBRASKA

RRWWRZWWWZWZWZW 4 : WWWRZZ 12 23 31

# Labor's Stand on Major Issues in the Senate

#### 1. Lubbers Nomination

Few positions in the federal government have as far reaching an effect on union organizing and collective bargaining activities as the office of general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board. Under the National Labor Relations Act, the general counsel is charged with setting the agenda of the NLRB by deciding which unfair labor practice complaints should be issued and how the resulting cases should be litigated. The general counsel also is in charge of NLRB regional offices and the board's cases in court. Because of these considerable responsibilities the general counsel is nominated by the Precident and then must be confirmed by the Senate.

In 1979 President Carter nominated William A. Lubbers, a 27-year veteran of the NLRB, to be its next general counsel. The AFL-ClO strongly backed this well-qualified nominee while businessmen and the right wing attempted to hlock the nomination by a filibuster lead by Sen. Orrin Hatch (R-Utah). The filibuster was short-lived as the Senate by a 62-34 vote on Apr. 22, 1980, obtained the three-fifths vote necessary to invoke cloture and end debate. The nomination was later approved.

For cloture-Right. Against cloture-Wrong.

#### 2. Zimmerman Nomination

The business-conservative alliance in the Senate, stung by its earlier defeat on the nomination of Lubbers as general counsel of the NLRB, sought to even the score by torpedoing Donald A. Zimmerman's nomination to be a member of the board. Again Sen. Hatch led a filibuster to block confirmation. The Chamber of Commerce fell into lockstep with a telephone-telegram campaign against Zimmerman aimed at "swing" Senators. The filibuster was broken on the third try as the Senate by a 63-31 vote on Aug. 5, 1980, obtained the 60-plus vote margin necessary to invoke cloture and end debate. The nomination was later confirmed 68-27.

Zimmerman had been a long-time Republican minority counsel for the Senate Labor Committee and served as a principle adviser to Sen. Jacob Javits (R-N.Y.). His nomination had the full support of the AFL-CIO.

For cloture-Right. Against cloture-Wrong.

#### 3. Job Safety I

Since its enactment in 1970, the Occupational Safety & Health Act, which guarantees workers in the private sector a safe working environment, has been significantly weakened as a result of congressional approval of a succession of amendments. One such amendment. added by Sen. Richard Schweiker (R-Pa.) last year to the fiscal year 1980 Labor Dept. appropriations bill, exempts from routine federal job safety inspection businesses with ten or fewer employees which qualify as so-called "non-hazardous" worksites. As a result, 37 percent of all businesses and more than 5.2 million workers are unprotected. Even worse, penalties cannot be assessed for serious, non-serious, or repeated safety violations found as a result of an investigation of a worker's complaint about a safety hazard in an exempted establishment. Based on 1978 data, 120 fatalities and 190,000 injuries occurred at jobsites now exemoted by this amendment.

With this provision scheduled to expire at the end of the current appropriation, Sen. David Boren (D-Okla.) led the conservative, big business drive to keep it alive. On July 29, 1980, Boren succeeded as the Senate agreed by a 48-36 vote to add his anti-worker amendment, retaining the Schweiker proviso, to an un-

related pension reform bill.

For-Wrong, Against-Right.

#### 4. Job Safety II-Mine Safety

The 1977 Mine Safety & Health Act transferred to the Labor Dept. job safety jurisdiction over the mining industry. Given the hazardous nature of mining operations, MSHA has developed more stringent safety standards and employs tougher enforcement procedures than those for worksites covered by OSHA.

The conservative assault against MSHA came during Senate debate on an unrelated pension reform bill. Sen. Malcolm Wallop (R-Wyo.) proposed to weaken MSHA job safety authority by moving responsibility over stone, sand, gravel and clay from MSHA to OSHA. These classifications of mining account for hold of all fatalities in the metal and non-metal mining industry. Despite AFL-CIO apposition, the Wallop amendment was approved by a 52-37 vote on July 29, 1980.

For-Wrong. Against-Right.

#### 5. Eight-Hour Day

Even the longstanding guarantee of the eight-hour day did not escape the conservative assault. During debate on a coal-related energy bill, Sen. Henry Bellmon (R-Okla.) tried to eliminate the requirement of the Contract Work Hours Standards Act and the Walsh-Healey Act that employers with federal contracts pay overtime rates for work in excess of eight hours per day. Without such overtime pay protections, the eight-hour standard would be seriously undermined by employers demanding a longer workday from their employees without having to pay just compensation. This anti-worker amendment was killed when the Senate approved 58-36 a tabling motion by Sen. Bennett Johnston (D-La.) on Jame 24, 1980.

For tabling-Right. Against tabling-Wrong.

#### 6. Protection of Prevailing Wages

The unrelenting conservative attack on the nation's basic labor laws continued in 1980 as once again the Davis-Bacon Act became a target for destruction. The 48-year-old law requires the payment of prevailing wages to workers on federally financed construction projects. That gives local contractors who uphold the labor standards of the community a fair chance to compete for government projects, rather than being undercut by outside firms bringing in cut-rate labor.

The Davis-Bacon Act also assures stability in a notoriously unstable industry, guarantees adequate wage rates to allow for the recruitment, training and maintenance of a skilled construction labor force within the local area, and helps protect the government against fly-by-night operators seeking to win government contracts by paying wages too low to attract competent craftsmen.

Leading the attack against Davis-Bacon, Sen. Roger Jepses (R-Iows) tried to cripple its application to construction of federal buildings by exempting application of the law to at least ten percent of these construction projects. On a tabling motion by Sen. Daniel P. Moynihas (D-N.Y.) the Jepsen amendment was defeated by a 48-34 vote on June 20, 1980.

For tabling-Right. Against tabling-Wrong.

## 7. Protecting Migrant Farm Workers

In 1963, Congress enacted the Farm Labor Contractor Registration Act to safeguard migrant farm workers from a well-documented pattern of exploitation and abuse at the hands of contractors who act as hiring agents for these workers. The law also imposes safe housing and transportation requirements on labor contractors.

During debate on an unrelated child nutrition bill, Sen. David Boren (D-Okla.) successfully added an amendment that all but repealed the 1963 law and its protections primarily by exempting all farmers, farm cooperatives, food processers, canners and other agricultural operations. Despite strong AFL-CIO objections, the Boren amendment was approved by a 57-37 vote on July 24, 1980.

For-Wrong. Against-Right.

#### 8. Unemployment Compensation I

One of the first programs victimized by the balanced budget panic was extended federal unemployment compensation benefits for jubless American workers. In the panic to cut federal spending the Senate slashed jubless aid funds at the same time the recession was putting more Americans out of work.

The cuts in unemployment benefits came on a "reconciliation" bill forcing a wide range of spending cuts in response to Senate approval of the first "balanced" budget resolution. One of weveral anti-worker, unemployment compensation reductions would require jobless workers to take any "reasonable" job offered or risk losing their unemployment benefits. In other words, a laid-off, \$10 per hour skilled worker could be forced to take a job at the ni-nimum wage or less or risk losing unemployment benefits. An effort by Sen. Jacob Javits (R-N.Y.) to knock out this regressive provision was defeated by a 27-60 vote on June 30, 1980.

For-Right. Against-Wrong.

#### 9. Unemployment Benefits II

A 1976 congressionally-approved revision, effective in 1980, cut unemployment benefits for retirees who also receive pensions. This regressive provision allows states to offset, dollar for dollar, the unemployment compensation benefits payable to an individual receiving social security, pension, retirement pay, annuity or any other similar payment based on the individual's previous work. The result: thousands of pensioners, who had taken jobs to augment their pensions but were laid off in the current recession, now find their unemployment compensation reduced by the amount of their pension benefits.

During debate on a bill that slashed extended federal unemployment benefits for jobless workers, the Senate approved a labor-backed modifier of the 1976 law limiting the pension offset to cases in which a worker's pension and unemployment benefits are attributable to the same employer. Sen. Jacob Javits (R-N.Y.) tried to improve upon that and further ease the 1976 restriction by requiring states to exclude employees' contributions to their pension in deducting the amount of pension payments from unemployment benefits. His amendment failed by a 23-69 vote on Mar. 4, 1980.

For-Right. Against-Wrong.

## 10. Unemployment Benefits III

A key federal unemployment benefits program is Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA). Created in 1962, the program is specifically designed to assist U.S. workers and firms hurt by foreign trade, Over the last decade these injuries—loss of jobs and loss of business—have occurred at an ever-increasing rate because of explicit

(Continued on next page)



# Labor's Stand on Major Issues in the Senate

(Continued from preceding page)

government trade policies adopted in full knowledge that some industrial sectors would suffer import-related economic declines.

With thousands of workers and many firms newly qualifying for TAA benefits in 1980, the AFL-CIO succeeded in adding \$1.1 billion in new funds for the program to a supplemental appropriations bill. Sen. Heary Bellmon (R-Okla.) led conservatives with an amendment to cut benefits available to jobless workers. The Bellmon amendment was ruled to be non-germanne. His appeal of that ruling was faid aside when the Senate approved 65-24 a tabling motion by Sen. Daniel P. Moyniban (D-N.Y.) on June 27, 1980.

For tabling-Right. \quad \quad \text{gainst tabling-Wrong.}

#### 11. Retired Workers

Sea. Ernest Hollings (D-S.C.), the leader of the balanced-budget pack, tried to permanently victimize retired federal workers. Under his chairmanship, the Budget Committee had voted to reduce from twice a year to once a year the cost-of-living adjustment for the pensions of federal workers in fiscal year 1981 only. Seeing an opportunity to inflict still more damage on federal retirees, Hollings tried to make this temporary reduction permanent during Senate debate on a "reconciliation" bill forcing a number of spending reductions in response to Senate adoption of the first "balanced" budget resolution. His amendment was rejected by a 30-59 vote on June 30, 1980.

For-Wrong, Against-Right.

#### 12. Postal Workers' Jobs

The U.S. mail was one of the major federal programs targeted for huge budget reductions in the congressional stampede to balance the federal budget. The Senate Budget Committee proposed in the first budget resolution, which sets spending targets for the coming fiscal year, a massive \$16 billion reduction in federal spending. (See vote #15) This included a \$588 million reduction in funds for the Postal Service.

This spending cut alone would have eliminated Saturday mail delivery and cost 40,000 postal workers their jobs. However, elimination of Saturday service would not be cost-efficient because of the logiam of mail weekends would produce. Therefore, termination of one day of mid-week mail delivery was a likely alternative if the postal budget cuts were enacted. During floor debate Sen, John Glena (D-Ohio) successfully restored \$300 million to the budget bill to save Saturday service and postal jobs. A tabling motion by Sen, Ernest Hollings (D-S.C.) to sidetrack the Glena amendment was defeated 27-69 on May 12, 1980.

For tabling-Wrong. Against tabling-Right.

#### 13. Auto Industry Jobs

Massive retooling needs and the flood of imported cars helped put the nation's third largest auto manufacturer—Chrysler—on the brink of economic collapse in late 1979. The jobs of nearly a half-million workers in steel, glass, rubber, metal, leather and other supplier industries as well as Chrysler auto workers hung in the belance. Several states and many communities were also threstened with economic disaster if Chrysler closed its doors.

To prevent that from happenine, the AFL-CIO backed legislation providing a \$1.5 billion federal loan guarantee to Chrysler. The loan was dependent upon

the company finding \$2 billion in matching funds from workers, dealers and creditors. The Sensile version demanded \$525 million in wage concessions by Chrysler union workers. By a \$3-44 vote on Dec. 19, 1979, the Senate approved the loan package.

For-Right. Against-Wrong.

#### 14. Jobs for the Unemployed

During debate on a Defense Dept, appropriations bill, Sen. Daniel P. Moynihan (D-N'Y.) tried to assist areas experiencing economic distress and high unemployment by setting aside a limited amount of funding for defense supply contracts for these areas. His amendment was backed by the AFL-CIO as a means of targeting federal spending to areas most in need. Although the Jobless rate was increasing, the Senate rejected the Moynihan amendment by a 29-59 vote on Nov. 6, 1979.

For-Right. Against-Wrong.

#### 15. Balanced Budget

In a political panic to balance the federal budget, Congress in 1980 slashed \$16 billion in spending for such programs as education, health, transportation, jobs and energy development. An estimated half-million workers would lose their jobs as a direct result of these symbolic cuts. Particularly hard hit as the recession deepened were the very federal jobs programs used in the past to ease the shock of economic downturns. Ironically, no sooner had Congress balanced the budget, than higher unemployment and continuing inflation unbalanced it once again.

The AFL-CIO had strongly opposed balancing the federal budget at a time of economic decline as an empty political gesture that would do nothing to address the root causes of inflation—skyrocketing energy costs, exorbitant interest rates and rising food and medical care costs. The AFL-CIO warned that the meat-axing of essential federal programs would increase unemployment while deepening the current recession.

During consideration of the 1981 budget resolution, which sets spending targets for the coming fiscal year, the Budget Committee slashed domestic spending, including anti-recession programs, in order to increase defense outlays even beyond the higher level sought by the Administration. Thus, the inflexibility of the balanced budget had resulted in the committee sacrificing one national priority—fighting the recession—for another—increasing national defense. On the floor, Sen. Gaylord Nelson (D-Wis.) tried to cut the defense budget by \$2 billion and restore the funds to anti-recession and other domestic programs. On a tabling motion by Sen. Ernest Hollings (D-S.C.), the Senate rejected the Nelson motion by a 64-30 vote on May 7, 1980.

For tabling-Wrong. Against tabling-Right.

#### 16. Assisting Disabled Workers

Another victim of the balanced-budget drive was the federal social security system's benefits to permanently disabled workers unable to be re-employed. In 1979, the Carter Administration proposed sharp cutbacks in disability insurance benefits at a time when participation rates were at a 20-year low and the disability fund was running a surplus. In 1980, the Senate Finance Committee reported legislation to lower benefits for future disabled workers by an average of 15 percent and to sharply restrict the right of young disabled workers to exclude low-earnings years in computing benefits. The AFL-CIO strongly opposed these cutbacks.

AFL-CIO strongly opposed these cutbacks.

During Senate debate, labor backed an amendment

by Sen. Howard Metzenbaum (D-Ohio) to largely restore provisions of existing law that would maintain the present disability benefit formula. The Senate rejected the Metzenbaum amendment by a 47-47 tie vote on Jan. 30, 1980.

For-Right. Against-Wrong.

## 17. Energy I-Oil Industry Profits

Early in 1979, President Carter decontrolled the price of domestically produced crude oil, an action the Freasury Dept, acknowledges will cost consumers \$1.1 trillion over the next 10 years. This action is already having a catastrophic inflationary effect on the economy and the pocketbooks of workers.

To recover billions of dollars in excess oil company profits for development of alternative energy worces, the President proposed a windfall profits fax. The APL-CTO found the proposal inadequate and, facing a Congress unwilling to reinstate price controls, urged a tougher windfall tax. However, the Senate Finance Committee cut the meager Carter proposal in half, thus allowing a windfall giveaway of over \$800 billion to the oil company giants.

During floor debate, the AFL-CIO backed several amendments to increase the windfall profits tax on the big oil companies. One such proposal was offered by Sen. Bill Bradley (D-N.J.) and Majority Leader Robert Byrd (D-W. Va.). By taxing certain categories of oil exempted by the Finance Committee bill, it would add \$30.8 billion in higher oil company taxes. In a parliamentary maneuver, Sen. Russell Long (D-La.) tried to table the first amendment to which the Bradley-Byrd amendment was offered. That tabling effort failed by a 44-63 vote on Dec. 12, 1979. The Bradley-Byrd amendment was later approved.

For tabling-Wrong. Against tabling-Right.

#### 18. Energy II—Energy Development

One of the major bills of the 96th Congress, designed to secure energy independence for the United States, was a \$20-billion proposal to provide financial incentives to private industry to develop synthetic fuels. Once underway this new energy industry would also create thousands of new job opportunities for American workers.

During debate, Sen. Paul Tsongas (D-Mass.) tried to slash in half the funds for this energy program. His amendment also knocked out a key AFL-ClO-backed provision to allow government ownership of synthetic fuel corporations if there proved to be insufficient interest in the private sector. On a tabling motion by Sen. Bennett Johnston (D-La.), the Tsongas proposal was defeated 55-37 on Nov. 7, 1979.

For tabling-Right. Against tabling-Wrong.

#### 19. Food Stamps

Senate conservatives went on a rampage in 1980 in an effort to slash spending for several key federal programs. One such program—food stamps for the poor—provides about \$1.05 a day per person to help feed millions of impoverished Americans. Sen. James McClure (R-Ida.) offered an amendment to a food stamp funding bill to reduce benefits for poor families whose childrea are eligible to receive a meal through the federal school lunch program. That program provides free or reduced-price lunches to hungry school children. His amendment was crushed by a 30-58 vote on May 14, 1980.

For-Wrong. Against-Right.

<b>PRO</b>	<b>TECT</b>
YO	UR
RIG	HTS!
READ	MEMO FROM COPE LEGISLATIVE ALERT!

Actorese	
Cary	State Z.p
Signed	Union
815 - 16th Street, N	i.W., Washington, D.C. 20006
Enclosed is \$ Please some sects each year for 10 or more :	ROSE COPE" subscriptions at \$1 a year 125 subscriptions mailed to one address) of the
cents each year for 10 or more : "MEMO FROM COPE" to:	end subscriptions at \$1 a year (25 subscriptions mailed to one address) of the
Enclosed is \$Please solents each year for 10 or more : "MEMO FROM COPE" to:  Name	end subscriptions at \$1 a year (25
Enclosed is \$	end subscriptions at \$1 a year (25 subscriptions mailed to one address) of the

Contra Street Son ASI COO I SOUSI ATIVE AL SSTI