

# AFL-CIO News

Vol. XXV



August 30, 1980

No. 35

# 1980

## A REPORT ON CONGRESS

By Lane Kirkland

**I**F 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 pro-worker 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 labor's 1980 report card on Congress. This voting analysis includes 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 rolls.



# 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 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.

During House debate on legislation providing federal financial assistance to economically distressed states and cities, Rep. Robert Walker (R-Pa.) 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 worker-rights bill by a 167-227 vote on Nov. 28, 1979.

For—Right. Against—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 retiree benefits. This amendment would have generated confusion and uncertainty within the administration of pension plans while doing nothing to strengthen 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 retirees 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 result: 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 repeal of the pension offset. In the meantime, the federation in 1980 supported legislation by Rep. James Cornman (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 Cornman modifier. Conservative Rep. John Rousselot (R-Calif.) 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 recommitment—Wrong. Against recommitment—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 half-million workers in steel, glass, rubber, metal, leather and other supplier industries as well as Chrysler auto workers hung in the balance. 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 federal loan guarantee to Chrysler. 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 Chrysler 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 Snyder (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 recommitment—Wrong. Against recommitment—Right.

## 7. Food Stamps for Jobless Workers

Jobless workers trying to feed their families with food stamps became another target of the callous 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 "payback" 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 I

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 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 unemployment while deepening the recession.

During House consideration of the 1981 budget resolution, which sets spending targets for the upcoming 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 recommitment—Wrong. Against recommitment—Right.

## 12. Energy—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 tax bill that emerged from conference taxed away less than 25 percent of the \$1.1 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 recommitment—Wrong. Against recommitment—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 recommitment—Wrong. Against recommitment—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 (ALJ) 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 ALJ 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 ALJ system.

For—Right. Against—Wrong.

### 18. Election Financing Reform

In 1974, campaign costs for the average House election were about \$35,000. Barely four years later, the price tag had jumped to over \$90,000. Meanwhile, corporate political action committees (PACs) numbering 89 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 pro-business, 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 tide, 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 Trade 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-Ill.) 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 benefit 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—Wrong. Against—Right.

	Preceding Wage							Total Labor Value	Subsequent Budget I							Subsequent Budget II							Cumulative Voting Record	Cumulative Right Percentage								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21			22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29
<b>ALABAMA</b>																																
1. Edwards (R)																																
2. Dickson (R)																																
3. Nichols (D)																																
4. Smith (D)																																
5. Phipps (D)																																
6. Beckman (R)																																
7. Steffy (D)																																
<b>ALASKA</b>																																
AL Young (D) (R)																																
<b>ARIZONA</b>																																
1. Rhodes (R)																																
2. Uffell (D)																																
3. Stamps (D)																																
4. Rudd (D)																																
<b>ARKANSAS</b>																																
1. Alexander (D)																																
2. Bohannan (R)																																
3. Hammersteadt (R)																																
4. Anthony (D)																																
<b>CALIFORNIA</b>																																
1. Johnson (D)																																
2. Casson (R)																																
3. Mascal (D)																																
4. Fazio (D)																																
5. Burton J. (D)																																
6. Burton F. (D)																																
7. Miller G. (D)																																
8. DeLama (D)																																
9. Nicks (D)																																
10. Edwards D. (D)																																
11. Royer (R)																																
12. McCloskey (R)																																
13. Miana (D)																																
14. Shoenery (R)																																
15. Coelke (D)																																
16. Frazzetta (D)																																
17. Paakyan (R)																																
18. Thomas (R)																																
19. Lacomarino (R)																																
20. Goldwater (R)																																
21. Corson (D)																																
22. Moorhead C. (R)																																
23. Bellamee (D)																																
24. Waxman (D)																																
25. Raybel (D)																																
26. Kossatz (R)																																
27. Dorman (R)																																
28. Dixon (D)																																
29. Hawkins (D)																																
30. Dominey (D)																																
31. Wilson C. R. (D)																																
32. Anderson G. (D)																																
33. Crissman (R)																																
34. Langston (R)																																
35. Lloyd (D)																																
36. Brown G. (D)																																
37. Lewis (R)																																
38. Patterson (D)																																
39. Dancosky (R)																																
40. Ebdam (R)																																
41. Wilson B. (R)																																
42. Van Derbeek (D)																																
43. Arroyave (R)																																
<b>COLORADO</b>																																
1. Schroeder (D)																																
2. Wirth (D)																																
3. Rogovin (D)																																
4. Johnson J. (R)																																
5. Kramer (R)																																
<b>CONNECTICUT</b>																																
1. Carter (D)																																
2. Deady (D)																																
3. Glavin (D)																																
4. McKinley (R)																																
5. Ratchford (R)																																
6. Moffett (D)																																
<b>DELAWARE</b>																																
AL Evans T. (R)																																
<b>FLORIDA</b>																																
1. Hutto (D)																																
2. Foy (D)																																
3. Bennett (D)																																
4. Chappell (D)																																
5. Kelly (R)																																
6. Young C. W. (R)																																
7. Gibbons (D)																																
8. Leland (D)																																
9. Nelson (D)																																
10. Bahde (R)																																
11. Mica (D)																																
12. Stock (D)																																
13. Lehman (D)																																
14. Pepper (D)																																
15. Fawcett (D)																																
<b>GEORGIA</b>																																
1. Ginn (D)																																
2. Nichols (D)																																
3. Brinkley (D)																																
4. LeVitt (D)																																
5. Fowler (D)																																
6. Claggett (R)																																
7. McDonald (D)																																
8. Evans B. (D)																																
9. Jenkins (D)																																
10. Barnett (D)																																
<b>HAWAII</b>																																
1. Harrel (D)																																
2. Abake (D)																																
<b>IDAHO</b>																																
1. Syme (R)																																
2. Hanson (R)																																
<b>ILLINOIS</b>																																
1. Stewart (D)																																
2. Murphy M. (D)																																
3. Russo (D)																																
4. Duvall (R)																																
5. Fary (D)																																
6. Hilde (R)																																
7. Collins C. (D)																																
8. Rosenbloom (D)																																
9. Vales (D)																																
10. Forter (R)																																
11. Anagnost (D)																																
12. Grant P. (D)																																
13. McClary (R)																																
14. Brinkman (R)																																

**Key to Symbols**

R - Voted Right, W - Voted Wrong, N - Did Not Vote

W - Voted Wrong, N - Did Not Vote





# 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 President 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-CIO strongly backed this well-qualified nominee while businessmen and the right wing attempted to block the nomination by a filibuster led 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 "swinging" 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 exempted 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 half of all fatalities in the metal and non-metal mining industry. Despite AFL-CIO opposition, 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 June 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 Jepsen (R-Iowa) 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. Moynihan (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 processors, 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 jobless American workers. In the panic to cut federal spending the Senate slashed jobless 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 several 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 minimum 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. Henry Bellmon (R-Okla.) led conservatives with an amendment to cut benefits available to jobless workers. The Bellmon amendment was ruled to be non-germane. His appeal of that ruling was laid aside when the Senate approved 65-24 a tabling motion by Sen. Daniel P. Moynihan (D-N.Y.) on June 27, 1980.

For tabling—Right. Against tabling—Wrong.

## 11. Retired Workers

Sen. 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 logjam 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 Glenn (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 Glenn 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 balance. 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 federal loan guarantee to Chrysler. The loan was dependent upon

the company finding \$2 billion in matching funds from workers, dealers and creditors. The Senate version demanded \$525 million in wage concessions by Chrysler union workers. By a 53-44 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.

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 Treasury 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 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. 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-CIO-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 children 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.

**PROTECT  
YOUR  
RIGHTS!  
READ MEMO FROM COPE  
LEGISLATIVE ALERT!**

### Order Blank For AFL-CIO LEGISLATIVE ALERT!

Enclosed is \$\_\_\_\_\_. Please send \_\_\_\_\_ subscriptions at \$1 a year (25 cents each a year for 10 or more subscriptions mailed to one address) of the AFL-CIO LEGISLATIVE ALERT! to:

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_ Zip \_\_\_\_\_

Signed \_\_\_\_\_ Union \_\_\_\_\_

Mail to: AFL-CIO LEGISLATIVE ALERT, Subscriptions, Room 208  
815 - 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20008

### ORDER BLANK FOR "MEMO FROM COPE"

Enclosed is \$\_\_\_\_\_. Please send \_\_\_\_\_ subscriptions at \$1 a year (25 cents each a year for 10 or more subscriptions mailed to one address) of the "MEMO FROM COPE" to:

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_ Zip \_\_\_\_\_

Signed \_\_\_\_\_ Union \_\_\_\_\_

New?  Renewal?   
Mail to: COMMITTEE ON POLITICAL EDUCATION  
815 - 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20008