

# **Will Social Security Privatization Return? It Depends on the Outcome of the 2006 Elections.**

Scorecard on the Large Number of Candidates Who Support Privatization of Social Security – and Prospects for a New Congressional Majority That Could Dismantle Social Security.

August, 2006

By Roger Hickey and Jeff Cruz

# Will Social Security Privatization Return? It Depends on the Outcome of the 2006 Elections.

Scorecard on the Large Number of Candidates Who Support Privatization of Social Security – and Prospects for a New Congressional Majority That Could Dismantle Social Security.

By Roger Hickey and Jeff Cruz

## Executive Summary

In 2005, President Bush promoted the privatization of Social Security as his top domestic priority. However, once the American people understood what he was proposing, they overwhelmingly rejected the idea. While open to modest reforms that would strengthen its finances, most Americans opposed his proposal to divert Social Security taxes to create private retirement accounts invested in the stock market – effectively slowly phasing out a program that has been hugely successful in helping Americans retire with dignity for over 70 years. They realized that such a scheme would reduce benefits for retirees, increase our national debt, and put Americans' retirement at risk by placing it at the mercy of a market that goes down as well as up. The Democrats united in opposition and many Republicans also ended up opposing the President's privatization plan.

But the administration has not given up. The president and the Republican leadership have vowed to push privatization again in 2007. Therefore, the 2006 elections will be pivotal – either by driving a stake through the heart of privatization or by creating the conditions for its revival from the dead. In the Senate, where 46 members already voted for privatization, only a handful of seats would need to switch to privatizers – or a small number of current officeholders could change their position – for a majority of senators to pass privatization legislation and begin the phase-out of Social Security. If most of the pro-privatization ideologues are able to maintain their seats in the Senate, they will claim to have demonstrated that there is little political penalty for promoting what are now widely regarded as unpopular privatization proposals. And if a handful of pro-privatization challengers are successful – or if the handful of Republican Senators who in 2005 voted to protect Social Security begin to flip-flop their positions because they no longer have the pressure of facing an election for another six years – the Senate could become a political organizing point for the phase-out of Social Security and its partial replacement by private accounts.

The situation in the House is more complicated. On the one hand, House Democrats, with the exception of Rep. Allen Boyd of Florida, have overwhelmingly opposed diverting Social Security payroll taxes to private accounts and some Republican members, under strong pressure from their constituents, suggested they had concerns as well. At the end of 2004, Rep. Tom Davis (R-VA), former chair of the House Republican Campaign Committee, told the Wall Street Journal that "roughly 30 House Republicans, including himself, are already inclined to oppose Mr. Bush" on Social Security.<sup>1</sup> That might appear to give Social Security protectors a small majority in a House vote. But on the other hand, the current House Republican leadership is

strongly committed to privatization, and House procedures give the leadership of the majority party substantial power to force through unpopular proposals by limiting debate and amendments, threatening retaliation against members on other priorities, and combining unpopular proposals with popular priorities. House Republican leaders have shown a willingness to use all these techniques, and an ability to persuade members like those described by Rep. Davis to change their votes under pressure. Faced with some nervous members, House Republicans also attempted to disguise their privatization plan so that those members could vote for it, rather than abandoning it, and they may try that tactic again. The narrower the margin is, the more likely it is that they'll be successful. During the 109<sup>th</sup> Congress, the House Republican leadership has only lost one floor vote in which the leadership recommended a yes vote.

Just as in the Senate, the numbers in the House for and against privatization are very closely balanced. Most Republicans embraced privatization, but, freed from having to take an actual vote on the issue, a large group of House members sought to take no public stance at all – or flip-flopped back and forth on their positions. Another large group of members maintain that they are still for private accounts, even though they may have opposed the specifics of the President's proposal. If the 2006 election were to see the victory of the large number of pro-privatization Republican challengers defeating their incumbent Democrats opponents, we could see a Republican House with a majority favoring privatization – and a vote to dismantle our traditional Social Security system could succeed. This report examines the contested House and Senate seats in the context of Social Security to show how crucial the 2006 elections will be in determining the upcoming battle to protect our popular and successful Social Security system.

## **Introduction:**

In December of 2004, immediately after his reelection, President Bush made privatizing Social Security his top domestic priority and set about traveling the country to promote his plan. But opponents of privatization also mobilized with the facts on the privatization's effects. Soon the American people realized that Bush's plan to cut benefits to finance private accounts would be a bad deal for them and rejected the idea before the year was done. However, the president and top Republican leaders haven't given up and have clearly indicated that they will renew their push for privatization once again in 2007. With Republicans, whose conservative ideology and funding base makes them much more likely to favor privatization, already in the majority of the House and Senate, the 2006 mid-term elections will be crucial in determining whether Social Security will be protected or dismantled.

## **The 2005 Republican Push:**

During the 2004 elections, Republicans campaigned largely on cultural values and national security. Candidate Bush only occasionally touched on his endorsement of private accounts, and the issue did not become a major focus of press coverage. The real reason behind Bush's occasional comments was an attempt to enable him to claim a mandate from the people for privatization – but without bringing widespread attention to a risky plan known to be unpopular with the electorate. Sure enough, after winning the election President Bush made pushing privatization his top domestic policy goal, and began crisscrossing the country to promote his risky scheme as actually protecting Social Security.

Of course, it didn't all go as he planned. A powerful citizens' coalition to defend Social Security, known as Americans United, found its voice and mobilized with facts about the impact of privatization in every community that Bush visited or targeted with surrogates. After a while, the more Bush traveled to make his case, the more the public turned against him. When he started, 55 percent of Americans thought privatization might be a solution to the problems facing Social Security. And 60 days later, with Bush still on the road, *USA Today* reported that **61 percent now thought privatizing Social Security was a bad idea.**

Some Democrats may have at first flirted with the possibility of privatization, but as they learned the details, House and Senate Democrats became almost completely united against a scheme that would have hurt hard working Americans. It certainly didn't take the American people long to realize that privatization would lead to an exploding national debt, reduced benefits and subjected their retirement security to the whims of the market. Bush's proposals would mean that they couldn't be sure if there would be enough money for them to live on when they had spent their entire lives working and were ready to enjoy retirement. Facing widespread public opposition, even Republican Congressional support for Bush's proposal waned, and eventually Bush announced that there was a "reduced appetite" for privatization. The Republican-controlled Congress never voted on serious legislation to carve out private accounts from the finances of Social Security.

## **The Renewed Republican Push in 2007:**

Even after the embarrassing and damaging political fallout following America's rejection of privatization became clear, the Republicans have not yet given up on their risky scheme. It is no

secret that they will push again to privatize Social Security in 2007. The president, his leading cabinet figures, and key Republican leaders in both the House and Senate have been bluntly clear about their intent to again push privatization in 2007. For example, in a June 27, 2006 speech at the Manhattan Institute think tank, Bush promised to reintroduce privatization, saying,

*“If we can't get it done this year, I'm going to try next year. And if we can't get it done next year, I'm going to try the year after that because it is the right thing to do. Now is the time to solve the problems of Medicare and Social Security.”*<sup>2</sup>

*-President Bush, June 2006*

He has backed this up with his actions, by including a request for \$721 billion over the next ten years to begin private accounts<sup>3</sup> (unintentionally demonstrating the tremendous costs to our government, estimated at \$2 trillion in total, that would result from privatizing the system)<sup>4</sup>. It is not only the president himself saying they will get behind Social Security privatization in 2007. His Chief of Staff Josh Bolten has said Bush will renew his push<sup>5</sup>, as did his new Secretary of Treasury, Henry Paulson.<sup>6</sup>

The House leadership has similarly promised to bring Social Security privatization up in 2007. In Jul, House Republican Majority Leader John Boehner (R-OH) pledged to resume the push to privatize Social Security, saying “If I'm around in a leadership role come January, we're going to get serious about this.”<sup>7</sup> In June, the current Ways and Means Social Security Subcommittee Chairman and likely future chair of the full House Ways and Means Committee, Congressman Jim McCrery (R-LA), told reporters that he intended to put Social Security back on the legislative agenda in 2007.<sup>8</sup>

When the President, his Chief of Staff, the Secretary of Treasury, the House Majority Leader, and the likely incoming Ways and Means Committee Chairman, all say they will push privatization in 2007, it seems quite likely they will do so. Whether or not they will be able to succeed will depend upon how the 2006 midterm elections change the political environment.

### **The Importance of the 2006 Elections:**

The number of vacant seats and current polls indicate that the 2006 election will bring many new members.<sup>9</sup> The question of whether these newly elected politicians will try to privatize or protect Social Security is not academic: it could be the most important vote of the 110<sup>th</sup> Congress. Although many believe the battle to save Social Security to be over, the Republicans are clearly planning on pushing for privatization again in 2007, especially if there are no electoral consequences for their hugely unpopular privatization efforts in 2005.

Both the House and Senate currently have Republican majorities and despite a lot of optimism on the Democratic side, the odds favor the GOP to keep a majority in at least one of the chambers. As a minority party, the Democrats have struggled to maintain unity on a host of issues. This has not been the case for Social Security, where they have displayed remarkable cohesiveness in their almost universal and unequivocal opposition to privatization. While there have been some exceptions, such as Democratic Rep. Allen Boyd, FL-2, it is reasonable to believe that the Democrats, the party that introduced Social Security in the 1930s, will by and large retain this unity. It should be pointed out that if any Democrats do flip-flop on their positions, then the danger posed by privatization will only increase.

The Republicans have been much more divided on this issue. There has been a large group of House Republicans who have seen the widespread opposition by their constituents and did not want to be forced to vote for a scheme that would cut retirees' guaranteed benefits and increase the national debt. Although many of these members were and are advocates of privatization, the growing opposition to Bush's plan and the realization it was not coming up for a vote allowed them to distance themselves from the specific privatization plan proposed by Bush in 2005.

Many of the Republican incumbents sought to avoid taking a stand. They have used some misleading language, like supporting personal accounts but being against privatization despite the inconvenient fact that creating personal accounts is privatization. Others have gone back and forth on the issue, depending on the circumstances. This large group of members may try and claim to their electorate to be against privatization when it suits them, but cannot be certain to vote against it when the chips are down, especially if they are fully whipped by a leadership bent on privatization. We have labeled these candidates as potential flip-floppers.

In analyzing how the 2006 elections will impact Social Security, we are only focusing on potential changes that will threaten or help save Social Security. Therefore, a candidate vowing to protect Social Security being elected to a seat vacated by a previous member who fought to save Social Security will not make a difference in the protection of Social Security and will not be mentioned in this paper. Nor will the outcome of the election of someone like Rhode Island Senator Lincoln Chaffee, a Republican who voted against privatization and has in general been pretty strong in indicating his opposition to privatization.<sup>10</sup> The impact of who wins this race against his Democratic opponent in regards to Social Security privatization will be minimal, although it should be noted if the Democrats gains the majority it makes it much less likely that privatization would even make it to the floor for a vote.

Instead, the focus of our analysis will be on three categories of competitive races: those involving pro-privatization challengers seeking to replace members who have fought for the preservation of traditional Social Security, those involving members who have flip-flopped in the past on the issue and would be likely candidates to receive intense pressure to vote for a privatization scheme, and finally, the races involving privatization ideologues who strongly favor privatization and have taken the lead in its promotion. If several of the privatization ideologues are defeated, it could truly drive a stake in the heart of privatization.

### **The Senate:**

In the Senate, the danger Social Security faces from privatizers is clear. The Senate currently stands at 55 Republicans, 44 Democrats and 1 Independent who caucuses with the Democrats. As previously mentioned, all Senate Democrats have united and rallied to the defense of Social Security. Furthermore, because there was an actual vote on a privatization proposal, we have a crystal clear barometer of where Senators stand on this issue (vote tally is shown in Appendix 1). From the DeMint Amendment, in which younger workers would have a portion of their Social Security funds diverted into private investment accounts, we see that the Senate currently stands at 46 for privatization, 53 against, and 1 member not voting.<sup>11</sup> The senator not voting was Republican George Voinovich of Ohio, who although his concerns about increasing the deficit have left him somewhat nuanced on the issue of privatization, is a supporter of private accounts and would be highly likely to vote for it.<sup>12</sup> With it being pretty safe to say that Vice President Cheney would cast any deciding vote towards privatization, a switch of only three Senators

would allow the conservatives the possibility of achieving their goal of gutting our Social Security system.

Whether they can get the three member swing they need will depend on the crucial 2006 elections. The competitive Senate races that will determine to the future of Social Security are shown below in Table 1.<sup>13</sup>

Table 1 Senate Threats to Social Security	
<u>Potential Privatization Flip-Floppers</u>	
Jim Talent, Missouri	Toss up
Conrad Burns, Montana	Toss up
<u>Competitive Seat Privatization Ideologues:</u>	
Jon Kyle, Arizona	Leans Republican
Mike DeWine, Ohio	Toss up
Rick Santorum, Pennsylvania	Toss up
George Allen, Virginia	Likely Republican
Bob Corker, Tennessee (candidate for Bill Frist's vacant seat)	Toss up
<u>Privatization's Front Line Assault:</u>	
Washington: Mike McGavick (v. Maria Cantwell)	Leans Democrat
New Jersey: Tom Keane (NJ) (v. Robert Menendez)	Leans Democrat
Minnesota: Mark Kennedy (candidate for Mark Dayton's vacant seat)	Toss up
Nebraska: Pete Ricketts (v. Bill Nelson)	Leans Democrat
Maryland: Michael Steele (candidate for Paul Sarbane's vacant seat)	Leans Democrat
Michigan: primary to determine opponent to Senator Debbie Stabenow	Leans Democrat

Several of the Republicans facing serious threats, such as Talent (MO), Burns (MT) and Chaffee (RI) voted against the privatization amendment. This is not surprising, as privatization clearly was not popular with their constituents and they all faced tough reelection battles. But in the case of Senators Talent and Burns, their continued commitment to preserve and strengthen our current system is extremely tenuous.

Before casting his vote against privatization, Talent had been quoted saying, "We need to let younger people invest some of their own money in retirement accounts and not let the government invest it for them."<sup>14</sup> In 1993, he even co-sponsored legislation to move workers' Social Security contributions to private accounts.<sup>15</sup> Meanwhile, Burns's opposition to the specifics of the President's reckless privatization plan in the last Congress was one of the keys to its defeat. However, he has also remained open and receptive to the idea of privatization and as such retains some concern about potentially flip-flopping on this issue.<sup>16</sup>

It would not be surprising if either of them, having just won reelection and not facing another election until 2012, change their positions. This is especially likely if they were the deciding vote and faced the full weight of the Republican arm-twisting machine. Therefore, the Senate races in Missouri and Montana remain important to the long term protection of Social Security and have been labeled into the first category of potential privatization flip-floppers.

The privatization ideologues, those incumbents who lead the call for privatization, are absolutely vital to the conservative efforts to privatize and phase out traditional Social Security. Included in this category are Senators Santorum (PA), Kyl (AZ), DeWine (OH), and Allen (VA). Senator Santorum has not only been a strong advocate of privatization, but he has been one the Republican leaders pushing the Bush privatization plan. He has aggressively and publicly advocated Bush's call for privatizing Social Security and literally wrote the playbook on how conservatives should push privatization.<sup>17</sup>

His status as a staunch pro-privatizer is even more significant because he in the Republican leadership, currently serving as the conference chairman which makes him the third highest ranking Republican in the Senate. With Senate majority leader Bill Frist leaving his seat in 2006, Santorum – if he wins reelection and the Republicans keep the Senate – would likely be the favored candidate to move up the leadership ladder, perhaps even becoming majority leader. If elected to an even higher leadership position, he would almost be guaranteed to continue his push on privatization. In contrast, his defeat would send a clear message that aggressively pushing privatization is truly touching the third rail of American politics.

Senator Kyl is another privatization ideologue. Not only did he vote for the DeMint Amendment, he has also stated that he would not support a Social Security reform bill without individual accounts carved from Social Security's payroll tax<sup>18</sup> and has made public appearances with Bush in Arizona at events designed to drum up support for privatization.<sup>19</sup> Mike DeWine of Ohio has been much less public with his support for privatization than either Santorum or Kyl, but like George Allen of Virginia, who was listed as a supporter of privatization by a 2000 Cato Institute survey<sup>20</sup>, he voted for the DeMint Amendment that would privatize Social Security. In the Tennessee Senate race to replace Bill Frist, GOP candidate Bob Corker has said he will support private accounts.<sup>21</sup>

Social Security also faces a direct threat from what we have termed as the "Privatization's Front Line Assault," where pro-privatization challengers threaten Democratic Senate incumbents who have vowed to defend Social Security. In Washington, Senator Cantwell voted against privatization and has been a strong advocate for protecting our Social Security system. But she is facing a strong challenge from Mike McGavick, who is known to be a die-hard supporter of privatization in private conversations.<sup>22</sup> After earlier attempts to play the contradictory word game of remaining against privatization while supporting private accounts, he came out in support of privatization in recent interviews in July, saying he "wants a phased-in system of individually controlled, privately managed retirement accounts."<sup>23</sup>

In New Jersey, the threat to Social Security has been intentionally downplayed by the GOP candidate, but it is nevertheless still there. Democratic Senator Menendez (a strong opponent of privatization -- as was his predecessor, current New Jersey Governor John Corzine) was only recently appointed to the seat, and despite his overwhelming popularity in his old congressional district, he is still a new face to the majority of New Jersey voters. Against this backdrop, the Republican candidate Tom Kean has offered Republicans one of their best pick-up opportunities of this cycle. Kean's record on Social Security, while not well-known, has indicated he supports privatization. In 2000 he came out in favor of diverting Social Security taxes to create private accounts during his unsuccessful run in a Republican primary for a US Congressional seat.<sup>24</sup> More recently, in 2005 Kean voted against a NJ State Senate resolution calling on the U.S. Congress to reject President Bush's plans to privatize Social Security.<sup>25</sup>

Minnesota's open Senate seat, held by retiring Democrat Mark Dayton, represents another close Senate race which could potentially become a vote for privatization. Republican Rep. Mark Kennedy has so far been a textbook flip-flopper on this issue. He was listed as a supporter of privatization in a 2000 survey and in fact campaigned in part on the issue of partial privatization.<sup>26</sup> In 2001, he even co-signed a letter to the Commission to Strengthen Social Security urging support for privatization.<sup>27</sup> Yet, as a candidate for the open Minnesota Senate seat he is now saying he is against privatization. There is a lot of reason to believe that freed from the pressures of an election until 2012, he would revert back to his original position of supporting private accounts that will increase our deficit and lower benefits.

In Nebraska, GOP candidate Pete Ricketts has openly advocated for private accounts.<sup>28</sup> He is a former Chief Executive Officer of Ameritrade, a financial services company that could gain a windfall from a privatized Social Security System.<sup>29</sup> In Maryland, GOP candidate Michael Steele had appeared with Bush as the president was advocating for private accounts. While Michael Steele has avoided taking a strong stance on this key issue in his campaign, he called private accounts "the key to the American dream" at an event in 2005.<sup>30</sup> In Michigan, a crowded primary will determine who challenges Senator Debbie Stabenow, who has been a strong supporter of Social Security. It is very possible that her eventual challenger could be sympathetic to privatization.

### **The House of Representatives:**

Unlike in the Senate, House members were never forced to vote and clearly declare their Social Security positions. This fact, combined with the deceptive language employed by many Republicans, makes it much more difficult to gauge many Republicans' stances on Social Security. Nevertheless, it is apparent that the 2006 mid-term elections will have a clear effect on the ability of privatizers in this chamber to successfully work with the Bush administration to revive the push for privatization in 2007.

Currently, in the House there are 232 Republicans and 202 Democrats and 1 Independent who caucuses with the Democrats. The 203 Democratic members are almost unanimous in their opposition to privatization. So, clearly a net Republican gain in November would strengthen the possibility of a new privatization push. What has kept privatization from moving in the House this year was this Democratic unity combined with a handful of Republicans who were willing to buck their party's leadership on this issue. Many of such Republican members who might oppose privatization, such as Rep. Taylor (NC-11) or Rep. Jim Gerlach (PA-06), represent competitive districts. Therefore, it is completely possible that the Democrats could win a net gain of several seats in the House without fundamentally changing the Social Security dynamics in the House to prevent the Republican leadership from ramming through a privatization proposal. To drive a stake in the heart of privatization, key pro-privatization Republican members will need to be defeated while supporters of Social Security successfully ward off challenges from would be privatizers.

Clearly, the really bad news for those hoping for privatization action in the new Congress would be a Democratic sweep in November that wins majority control of the House, a gain of at least 15 seats. And, given the public unpopularity of privatization, grass-roots educational activities by activists to inform voters about which candidates support privatization and which candidates want to strengthen Social Security will make that dramatic outcome more likely.

Table 2  
House threats to Social Security

Privatization's Front Line Assault

IO-03	Jeff Lamberti (v. Rep. Leonard Boswell)	Leans Democrat
GA-08	Mac Collins (v. Rep. Jim Marshall)	Leans Democrat
GA-12	Max Burns (v. Rep. John Barrow)	Leans Democrat

Challengers whose Social Security Position is Unclear/Unknown

IL-08	David McSweeney (v. Rep. Melissa Bean)	Leans Democrat
OH-06	open seat candidate Chuck Blasdel	Leans Democrat
TX-17	Van Taylor (v. Rep. Chet Edwards)	Leans Democrat
LA-03	Craig Romero (v. Rep. Charlie Melancon)	Leans Democrat
SC-05	Ralph Norman (v. John Spratt)	Leans Democrat
WV-01	Chris Wakin (v. Rep. Alan Mollohan)	Leans Democrat
VT-AL	Primary to determine challenger	Leans Democrat
AZ-08	Primary to determine challenger	Leans Democrat
OH-18	Primary to determine challenger	Toss up
TX-22	Rep. Delay to resign.	Leans Republican
NY-24	open seat candidate Ray Meier	Leans Republican
WI-08	open Seat Candidate John Gard	Leans Republican

Privatization Ideologues

*Candidates:*

CO-07	open seat candidate Rick O'Donnell	Toss up
IA-01	open seat candidate Mike Whalen	Toss up
MN-06	open seat candidate Michele Bachmann	Leans Republican

*Incumbents:*

FL-22	Clay Shaw	Toss up
IN-08	John Hostettler	Toss up
OH-15	Deborah Pryce	Leans Republican
VA-02	Thelma Drake	Toss up
AZ-05	J.D. Hayworth	Leans Republican
KY-03	Anne Northup	Leans Republican
NH-02	Charlie Bass	Leans Republican
PA-07	Curt Weldon	Leans Republican

Privatization Flip-Floppers

IL-06	open seat candidate Peter Roskam	Toss up
FL-16	Mark Foley	Likely Republican
CT-02	Rob Simmons	Toss up
CT-04	Chris Shays	Toss up
IN-06	Mike Sodrel	Toss up
KY-04	Geoff Davis	Toss up
IN-02	Chris Chocola	Leans Republican
CT-05	Nancy Johnson	Leans Republican
KY-03	Anne Northup	Leans Republican
NV-03	Jon Porter	Leans Republican
NH-01	Jeb Bradley	Leans Republican
NJ-07	Mike Ferguson	Leans Republican
NY-20	John Sweeney	Leans Republican
NY-29	Randy Kuhl	Leans Republican
OH-01	Steve Chabot	Leans Republican
CA-11	Richard Pombo	Leans Republican
PA-08	Mike Fitzpatrick	Leans Republican
PA-10	Don Sherwood	Leans Republican
WA-08	Dave Reichert	Leans Republican
NM-01	Heather Wilson	Toss up

### Privatization's Front Line Assault:

The dismantling of traditional Social Security could begin if pro-privatization challengers are successfully able to win seats previously held by Democrats who supported Social Security. Ten of the twenty vulnerable Democrat seats are thought likely to remain Democrat, but the ten seats that currently have a slight Democrat lean (they are listed in Appendix 1) include some noteworthy contests. For example, Republican Jeff Lamberti is challenging Rep. Leonard Boswell in Iowa's third Congressional seat. Jeff is a staunch supporter of privatizing social security<sup>31</sup> and brags on his website that he has "been active in the effort to reform Social Security."<sup>32</sup>

There is also a pair of former pro-privatization Reps in Georgia who are challenging to get their seats back. Mac Collins, who is challenging Rep. Marshall in GA-8, used to sit on the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Social Security. He signed onto the 2001 DeMint letter encouraging privatization and has long supported privatization efforts. Max Burns, who is challenging Rep. John Barrow in GA-12, also is an unabashed supporter of privatization, clearly stating his position in a 2004 campaign survey.<sup>33</sup>

Several of the other candidates have tried to avoid taking a stance and/or are downplaying their position on Social Security. While challengers like Van Taylor (v. Rep. Edwards, TX-17), David McSweeney (v. Rep. Bean, IL-8), Chuck Blasdel (open seat, OH-6) seem likely to support privatization based on their conservative ideologies, we nevertheless have labeled them challengers whose privatization stance is uncertain.

### Privatization Ideologues:

Besides knocking off pro-Social Security Democrats, the threat of privatization is also increased by the replacement of pro-Social Security Republican members with hard-line privatizers. There are three notable competitive toss up seats where Republican members who at least tried to portray themselves as moderate have left their seats to run for Governor and in which staunch Social Security dismantlers are the leading candidates to take over their seats. For example, Rick O'Donnell, who is running in the Colorado's 7<sup>th</sup> district for Bob Beauprez's former seat, not only is in favor of private accounts, he has previously advocated for the abolition of the entire system, saying Social Security is un-American.<sup>34</sup>

Another privatization ideologue in the Iowa-1 open seat race to replace moderate Republican and Social Security supporter Jim Nussle is Mike Whalen, a staunch privatizer who campaigned for and advocated Bush's privatization scheme publicly with articles in the Sioux City Journal and Quad-City Times.<sup>35</sup> He was the policy chair of the National Center for Policy Analysis, a conservative, free-market think tank that has a large focus on privatizing Social Security.<sup>36</sup> In Minnesota-6, Michele Bachmann is a staunch privatizer who favors reforming Social Security along the lines suggested by the Cato Institute and is fighting for that open Republican seat.<sup>37</sup> The possibilities of such privatization ideologues replacing moderate Republicans is a scary thought indeed, but it need not happen. All three are in toss up races against strong Democratic candidates who have vowed to protect Social Security and are seeking to make their electorate aware of their opponent's unpopular Social Security positions.

There are several incumbent privatization ideologues whose defeat could put a stake in the heart of privatization. Notable among them is Rep. Clay Shaw of Florida, who actually introduced a bill, commonly referred to as the McCrery-Shaw bill (HR 3304), that would privatize Social Security. While Shaw continues to play the Republican word game on this issue and denies

being a privatizer in his Fort Lauderdale-based district, which has one of the largest percentages of seniors in the country, the fact is he has consistently advocated for policies of privatization. He is facing State Sen. Ron Klein (D) in what is expected to be an extremely competitive race.

Another notable privatization ideologue in a competitive seat is Deborah Pryce (OH-15). With a key leadership position as the Chairwoman of the Republican Conference, which makes her the 4<sup>th</sup> ranking House Republican, she hailed the president's privatization plan and used her leadership position to put pressure on wavering Republicans. In fact, she used her leadership office as the messaging headquarters for the privatization push, literally writing the book on how Republicans should sell privatization.<sup>38</sup>

Incumbent John Hostettler in the Indiana district known as the "bloody eighth" is another vulnerable privatization ideologue who not only supports privatization, but has gone on record to say he would oppose common sense solutions to increase the solvency of Social Security, such as raising the \$90,000 income cap on Social Security taxes.<sup>39</sup>

Anne Northup (KY-03) cosponsored the McCrery-Shaw privatization bill, and has consistently advocated for private accounts in her campaigns, town hall meetings and even in op-eds. She was active in urging House Republican leaders to try and push through privatization legislation when it appeared their efforts had stalled in June of 05.<sup>40</sup>

Thelma Drake (VA-02) is a first term member who hasn't taken a large role in the Social Security debate, but is for privatization and is openly debating the issue with her current challenger, Phil Kellam.<sup>41</sup> It is also no secret that J.D. Hayworth (AZ-5) supports privatization. He clearly states it on his website,<sup>42</sup> on the 2000 Cato survey, and on the 2004 NTU survey.

Charles Bass (NH-02) is yet another privatization ideologue who has repeatedly publicly stated his preference for private accounts and even said he would vote for Bush's privatization scheme.<sup>43</sup> Curt Weldon (PA-07) was a supporter of Bush's plan and also a cosponsor of the McCrery-Shaw privatization bill, even though he agrees that private accounts would create short-term funding problems. He has also come out against common sense proposals that would further prolong the solvency of Social Security, such as raising the \$90,000 cap on wages subject to Social Security taxes.<sup>44</sup> The defeat of any privatization ideologues would be a crucial step in the fight to protect Social Security.

### Flip-Floppers

The largest and perhaps most decisive voting bloc in the House are the undecideds and/or flip-floppers. This is the group that has also sometimes been referred to as the Fainthearted Caucus for their refusal to take any stance whatsoever.<sup>45</sup> They sometimes timidly claim to be against privatization, yet would not always vote against privatization proposals. It is important to get this bloc's positions on Social Security and make sure they understand the consequences they will face for supporting private accounts and diverting money needed by our seniors.

### *Flip-flopping Incumbents:*

Chris Shays (CT-4) is a textbook example of a member who is a privatizer at heart, but who has read the polls and felt the heat in 2005, causing him to come out against Bush's privatization plan. But he clearly was for privatization in 2000.<sup>46</sup> In fact, Cato had called him a strong supporter of privatization.<sup>47</sup> More recently he declared himself for privatization in the 2004 NPAT survey<sup>48</sup> and the 2004 AAPR Candidate's Survey, saying, "I believe any plan we enact

should give Americans the opportunity to invest a portion of their Social Security contribution in a broad-based index of the stock markets.”<sup>49</sup> While Shays should be applauded for eventually coming out against Bush’s privatization proposal the last time around, he remains a supporter of private accounts who could potentially cast the deciding vote in 2007.

Rob Simmons of Connecticut is another example of a member who has gone back and forth on the issue, making his true stance unclear. In May 2001, Rep. Rob Simmons co-signed a letter to the President’s Commission to Strengthen Social Security urging for privatization. In July 2001, Simmons voted in favor of privatizing Social Security by opposing an amendment prohibiting implementation of the final report of President Bush’s Commission to Strengthen Social Security.<sup>50</sup> More recently, he has said he “visualized a two-tiered system” in which Social Security remains the foundation of retirement security, while personal savings accounts become a “second tier.”<sup>51</sup> While he has also come out with statements against privatization, his history on this issue keeps him as a target for privatization supporters.

Mark Foley (FL-16) has clearly flip-flopped on both sides of the privatization debate. He co-signed a letter to the President’s Commission to Strengthen Social Security urging support for privatization in 2001. Then in 2003 he indicated he was against total privatization because of “unscrupulous” people who would take advantage of investors, and in early 2005 he said he was not trying to “privatize” the program and that he was worried about the cost. Despite these concerns, in January of 2005 he indicated he was willing to risk his political career to push the issue, and in May he said he was not willing to take carve-outs “off the table.”<sup>52</sup>

Mike Sodrel (IN-09) supported privatization when he first ran for Congress, publicly stating so on the National Taxpayers Union survey. While he may have wavered on the president’s proposal in 2005, he and his office have made it clear numerous times that he still favors the concept of private accounts.<sup>53</sup> But his hedging is nothing compared to his fellow Hoosier Congressman Chris Chocola (IN-02). In 2000, Chris indicated that he favored private accounts in a Congressional survey and stated that he wanted to see the whole Social Security system privatized,<sup>54</sup> yet in the 2002 AARP questionnaire he said he opposed privatization. But by 2005 he was back to being a privatization ideologue, cosponsoring the McCrery-Shaw legislation that would create private accounts.<sup>55</sup>

Geoff Davis (KY-4) has flip-flopped numerous times on both sides of the issue. This is surprising, given his personal history. When he was a child, his family received Social Security survivor benefits after the death of his step-father that made a huge difference to his family.<sup>56</sup> Nevertheless, he was on record favoring private accounts in an interview with the Cincinnati Enquirer in 2001 and in the 2002 National Taxpayers Union survey.<sup>57</sup> In the 2004 survey, he marked that he opposed privatization. Yet after Bush started pushing his privatization ideas in 2005, Geoff Davis went back on the fence, saying he was undecided<sup>58</sup> before finally coming out against Bush’s privatization scheme.<sup>59</sup> While we applaud him his pro-Social Security statements in 2005, his history of flip-flopping causes concern in 2007.

Rep. Nancy Johnson of Connecticut is another member who tries to play both sides of the issue by playing word games and trying to differentiate between privatization and private accounts. Earlier in her career, she was on record specifically saying she favored private accounts,<sup>60</sup> but she soon began going back and forth on this. For example, she put she was for privatization in the NTU survey, while saying she was against privatization in an AARP survey the same year! And while her spokesman claimed she “strongly opposes privatization of Social Security. . . Social

Security is the pillar of American's retirement security; it is an essential government program and an essential government guarantee. It must always remain so.<sup>61</sup>” in late April of 2005, the previous month she told a reporter that she “would favor a plan to let some Social Security dollars flow into properly structured private accounts.<sup>62</sup>

Jon Porter (NV-03) is another flip-flopper on Social Security. According to the *Las Vegas Sun*, Porter said he supported privatizing Social Security during his 2000 campaign<sup>63</sup> and answered in favor of privatization on the 2002 NTU survey.<sup>64</sup> Yet in 2002, Jon Porter also claimed his previous statements were misinterpreted and he was against privatization.<sup>65</sup> That didn't stop him saying he could support some form of personal accounts early in 2005,<sup>66</sup> before flip-flopping back to say that he now opposed privatization because of the economy's downturn in July of the same year.<sup>67</sup>

Jeb Bradley (NH-01) is definitely a flip-flopper on privatization. In his 2002 election campaign he unequivocally opposed privatization, a position he reiterated in 2003 and when he ran for reelection in 2004. However, in the spring of 2005 he started to hedge and adopt a wait and see approach to the Bush plan. However, when he was criticized for changing his position, he made conflicting statements, saying that he still opposed privatization, but that private accounts might be acceptable.<sup>68</sup> He is playing the word game to try and seem like a staunch opponent of privatization, while still being open to voting for private accounts.

Mike Ferguson (NJ-7) is the definition of a flip-flopper. Going back to 2000, when he favored privatization, through 2002, when he opposed it, and on to 2005 where he both favored and opposed it, Ferguson has consistently been on both sides of the issue. In 2000 he responded to a Cato Institute survey saying he was in favor of privatization, and in 2001 he signed the DeMint letter supporting the findings of the Bush Social Security commission. However, in 2002, he told AARP that he was opposed to privatization, and also said so on his web site. By 2005 he was “opposing” privatization again, but was still open to privatization proposals.

John Sweeney (NY-20) has planted himself firmly on the fence regarding privatization, and he does not appear interested in moving. He has not been a leader on the issue, essentially avoiding it, and he has been relentless in his stand of not taking a stand. However, he has not ruled private accounts out and so must be considered a possible vote for the phase out of traditional Social Security.

Sweeney's colleague from New York, Randy Kuhl (NY-29), had also avoided taking any stance on the Bush privatization plan. But as one of the cosponsors of the McCrery-Shaw privatization proposal, he is a member who unfortunately is even more likely to support the privatization of our sacred Social Security system. Steve Chabot (OH-01) has tried to avoid taking a stand at all costs, although he did say private accounts are one of the keys to saving Social Security.<sup>69</sup> Similarly, Richard Pombo (CA-11) has avoided making his Social Security position well known, although his history as a party loyalist make it likely he would vote with the leadership on any privatization proposals.

Mike Fitzpatrick avoided taking a stance by not responding to candidate questionnaires on the topic, but then came out against privatization in his 2004 election.<sup>70</sup> Yet in early 2005 the *Philadelphia Intelligencer* reported that Mike Fitzpatrick flip-flopped on his previous position, saying he favored private savings accounts.<sup>71</sup> He has tried to finesse the issue by playing word

games and saying there is a difference between “privatization,” which he opposes, and “private savings accounts,” which he favors.

Don Sherwood’s (PA-10) record on Social Security is a little unclear, but as his opponent likes to point out, he did stump for President Bush’s plan to privatize Social Security. His opponent, Chris Carney, is trying to make Rep. Sherwood’s support of privatization a political issue in the upcoming election.<sup>72</sup>

Dave Reichert (WA-08) at first came out in support of privatization, responding he favored personal accounts in the AARP’s 2004 questionnaire and also in responding to a question from the *Seattle Times*.<sup>73</sup> According to a *Roll Call* article, Dave Reichert claimed he “was the only Member in a targeted race to formally support the creation of private accounts.”<sup>74</sup> However, in light of the increasing unpopularity of Bush’s privatization plans, Reichert started to hedge in 2005. According to his spokesperson, he hadn’t taken a strong public position on Social Security yet in March of 2005. Reichert is a member who would probably vote for privatizing Social Security in absence of the continued strong public outcry against it from his constituents.

Heather Wilson plays the word game to mislead media and the reporters on her Social Security positions more than any other member. She was originally for privatization when she was first elected.<sup>75</sup> But as she saw how the issue played in her competitive district, she has resorted to portraying herself as staunchly against privatization, even though she is still in favor of private accounts. Many reporters have been frustrated by her attempt to dance around the issue and have accused her of playing semantics with the issue.<sup>76</sup>

#### *Potential privatization candidates:*

There are also several candidates who have been trying to avoid taking a stance. Many have been listed in a category specific to them, but one deserves particular mention. In the open seat race in Illinois’s 6<sup>th</sup> district, Republican candidate Peter Roskam missed the vote on the issue of whether he supported privatization or not in the State Senate, despite the fact that he attended several votes before and after. This is a clear example of a candidate not wanting to take a stance on what is sure to be one of the most crucial votes in 2007.

#### **Conclusion:**

The 2006 elections will be critical to protect the full, guaranteed benefits delivered by Social Security. With the President and Republican leadership vowing to bring back privatization, should the elections see privatization advocates gain seats, it would set the stage for a fierce legislative battle in 2007. On the other hand, should several privatization ideologues be defeated, it could drive the stake in the heart of privatization efforts. In light of this, the grassroots coalition that defeated Bush’s plan last time around is seeking to educate the American public on the importance of protecting the guaranteed Social Security benefits the traditional system offers. The electorate should be fully aware of the impact the upcoming elections will have on the future of Social Security.

## Appendix 1

List of competitive House seats according the July 19<sup>th</sup>, 2006 Competitive House Race Chart by The Cook Political Report. Available at:

[http://www.cookpolitical.com/races/report\\_pdfs/2006\\_house\\_comp\\_jul19.pdf](http://www.cookpolitical.com/races/report_pdfs/2006_house_comp_jul19.pdf)

### Likely Democrat

CO-03 John Salazar R+6  
IL-17 OPEN (Evans) D+5  
KS-03 Dennis Moore R+4  
LA-02 Bill Jefferson D+28  
ND-AL Earl Pomeroy R+13  
OH-13 OPEN (Brown) D+6  
OR-05 Darlene Hooley D+1  
SD-AL Stephanie Herseth R+10  
UT-02 Jim Matheson R+17  
WA-02 Rick Larsen D+3

### Republican Toss up

AZ-08 OPEN (Kolbe) R+1  
CO-07 OPEN (Beauprez) D+2  
CT-02 Rob Simmons D+8  
CT-04 Chris Shays D+5  
FL-22 Clay Shaw D+4  
IL-06 OPEN (Hyde) R+3  
IN-08 John Hostettler R+9  
IN-09 Mike Sodrel R+7  
IA-01 OPEN (Nussle) D+5  
KY-04 Geoff Davis R+12  
NM-01 Heather Wilson D+2  
NC-11 Charles Taylor R+7  
OH-18 Bob Ney R+6  
PA-06 Jim Gerlach D+2  
VA-02 Thelma Drake R+6

### Lean Democrat

GA-08 Jim Marshall R+3  
GA-12 John Barrow D+5  
IL-08 Melissa Bean R+5  
IA-03 Leonard Boswell D+1  
LA-03 Charlie Melancon R+5  
OH-06 OPEN (Strickland) D+0  
SC-05 John Spratt R+6  
TX-17 Chet Edwards R+18  
VT-AL OPEN (Sanders) D+9  
WV-01 Alan Mollohan R+6

### Lean Republican

AZ-05 J.D. Hayworth R+4  
CA-11 Richard Pombo R+3  
CT-05 Nancy Johnson D+4  
IN-02 Chris Chocola R+4  
KY-03 Anne Northup D+2  
MN-06 OPEN (Kennedy) R+5  
NV-03 Jon Porter D+1  
NH-01 Jeb Bradley R+0  
NH-02 Charlie Bass D+3  
NJ-07 Mike Ferguson R+1  
NY-20 John Sweeney R+3  
NY-24 OPEN (Boehkert) R+1  
NY-29 Randy Kuhl R+5  
OH-01 Steve Chabot R+1  
OH-15 Deborah Pryce R+1  
PA-07 Curt Weldon D+4  
PA-08 Mike Fitzpatrick D+3  
PA-10 Don Sherwood R+8  
TX-22 OPEN (DeLay) R+15  
WA-08 Dave Reichert D+2  
WI-08 OPEN (Green) R+4

### Likely Republican

CA-04 John Doolittle R+11  
CA-50 Brian Bilbray R+5  
CO-04 Marilyn Musgrave R+9  
FL-08 Ric Keller R+3  
FL-09 OPEN (Bilirakis) R+4  
FL-13 OPEN (Harris) R+4  
FL-16 Mark Foley R+2  
ID-01 OPEN (Otter) R+19  
IL-10 Mark Kirk D+4  
IL-11 Jerry Weller R+1  
IA-02 Jim Leach D+7  
KY-02 Ron Lewis R+13  
MN-01 Gil Gutknecht R+1  
NV-02 OPEN (Gibbons) R+8  
NY-19 Sue Kelly R+1  
NY-25 James Walsh D+3  
OH-02 Jean Schmidt R+13  
WY-AL Barbara Cubin R+19

## Appendix 2

S Amdt 3087 to S Con Res 83, Vote # 68, 3/16/06. The DeMint Amendment would divert money from traditional Social Security to create private accounts.

Full vote total available at:

[http://www.senate.gov/legislative/LIS/roll\\_call\\_lists/roll\\_call\\_vote\\_cfm.cfm?congress=109&session=2&vote=00068](http://www.senate.gov/legislative/LIS/roll_call_lists/roll_call_vote_cfm.cfm?congress=109&session=2&vote=00068)

### YEAs ---46

Alexander (R-TN)  
Allard (R-CO)  
Allen (R-VA)  
Bennett (R-UT)  
Bond (R-MO)  
Brownback (R-KS)  
Bunning (R-KY)  
Burr (R-NC)  
Chambliss (R-GA)  
Coburn (R-OK)  
Cochran (R-MS)  
Coleman (R-MN)  
Cornyn (R-TX)  
Craig (R-ID)  
Crapo (R-ID)  
DeMint (R-SC)

DeWine (R-OH)  
Dole (R-NC)  
Ensign (R-NV)  
Enzi (R-WY)  
Frist (R-TN)  
Graham (R-SC)  
Grassley (R-IA)  
Gregg (R-NH)  
Hagel (R-NE)  
Hatch (R-UT)  
Hutchison (R-TX)  
Inhofe (R-OK)  
Isakson (R-GA)  
Kyl (R-AZ)  
Lott (R-MS)  
Martinez (R-FL)

McCain (R-AZ)  
McConnell (R-KY)  
Murkowski (R-AK)  
Roberts (R-KS)  
Santorum (R-PA)  
Sessions (R-AL)  
Shelby (R-AL)  
Specter (R-PA)  
Stevens (R-AK)  
Sununu (R-NH)  
Thomas (R-WY)  
Thune (R-SD)  
Vitter (R-LA)  
Warner (R-VA)

### NAYs ---53

Akaka (D-HI)  
Baucus (D-MT)  
Bayh (D-IN)  
Biden (D-DE)  
Bingaman (D-NM)  
Boxer (D-CA)  
Burns (R-MT)  
Byrd (D-WV)  
Cantwell (D-WA)  
Carper (D-DE)  
Chafee (R-RI)  
Clinton (D-NY)  
Collins (R-ME)  
Conrad (D-ND)  
Dayton (D-MN)  
Dodd (D-CT)  
Domenici (R-NM)  
Dorgan (D-ND)

Durbin (D-IL)  
Feingold (D-WI)  
Feinstein (D-CA)  
Harkin (D-IA)  
Inouye (D-HI)  
Jeffords (I-VT)  
Johnson (D-SD)  
Kennedy (D-MA)  
Kerry (D-MA)  
Kohl (D-WI)  
Landrieu (D-LA)  
Lautenberg (D-NJ)  
Leahy (D-VT)  
Levin (D-MI)  
Lieberman (D-CT)  
Lincoln (D-AR)  
Lugar (R-IN)  
Menendez (D-NJ)

Mikulski (D-MD)  
Murray (D-WA)  
Nelson (D-FL)  
Nelson (D-NE)  
Obama (D-IL)  
Pryor (D-AR)  
Reed (D-RI)  
Reid (D-NV)  
Rockefeller (D-WV)  
Salazar (D-CO)  
Sarbanes (D-MD)  
Schumer (D-NY)  
Smith (R-OR)  
Snowe (R-ME)  
Stabenow (D-MI)  
Talent (R-MO)  
Wyden (D-OR)

### Not Voting - 1

Voinovich (R-OH)

### Appendix 3

Congressman signing on to the Demint's letter to President's Bush Commission on Social Security urging privatization. 5/24/01.

Akin, W. Todd	Foley, Mark	Portman, Rob
Armey, Richard K.	Gibbons, Jim	Pryce, Deborah
Baker, Richard H.	Goss, Porter J.	Putnam, Adam H.
Ballenger, Cass	Graham, Lindsey O.	Radanovich, George
Barr, Bob	Gutknecht, Gil	Rehberg, Dennis R.
Bartlett, Roscoe G.	Hansen, James V.	Reynolds, Thomas M.
Barton, Joe	Hastings, Doc	Riley, Bob
Bass, Charles F.	Hayworth, J. D.	Rogers, Mike
Bereuter, Doug	Herger, Wally	Rohrabacher, Dana
Biggert, Judy	Hoekstra, Peter	Ryan, Paul
Bilirakis, Michael	Houghton, Amo	Ryun, Jim
Boehner, John A.	Hutchinson, Asa	Schrock, Edward L.
Bonilla, Henry	Isakson, Johnny	Sessions, Pete
Bono, Mary	Issa, Darrell E.	Shadegg, John B.
Boyd, Allen	Istook, Ernest J., Jr.	Shimkus, John
Brown, Henry E., Jr.	Johnson, Sam	Simmons, Rob
Burr, Richard	Jones, Walter B.	Simpson, Michael K.
Burton, Dan	Keller, Ric	Skeen, Joe
Calvert, Ken	Kennedy, Mark R.	Smith, Lamar S.
Camp, Dave	Kerns, Brian D.	Smith, Nick
Cantor, Eric	Knollenberg, Joe	Souder, Mark E.
Chabot, Steve	Kolbe, Jim	Spence, Floyd
Collins, Mac	Largent, Steve	Stearns, Cliff
Cooksey, John,	Lucas, Frank D.	Stenholm, Charles W.
Cox, Christopher	Manzullo, Donald A.	Sununu, John E.
Crane, Philip M.	Miller, Dan	Sweeney, John E.
Crenshaw, Ander	Miller, Gary G.	Tancredo, Thomas G.
Cubin, Barbara	Myrick, Sue Wilkins	Terry, Lee
Culberson, John Abney	Nethercutt, George R., Jr.	Tiahrt, Todd
Cunningham, Randy "Duke"	Northup, Anne M.	Tiberi, Patrick J.
Davis, Jo Ann	Norwood, Charlie	Toomey, Patrick J.
DeMint, Jim	Ose, Doug	Walden, Greg
Dooley, Calvin M.	Otter, C. L. "Butch"	Wamp, Zach
Dunn, Jennifer	Oxley, Michael G.	Watkins, Wes
Ehlers, Vernon J.	Pence, Mike	Watts, J. C., Jr.
Ehrlich, Robert L., Jr.	Peterson, John E.	Weldon, Curt
English, Phil	Pickering, Charles W. "Chip"	Weller, Jerry
Everett, Terry	Pitts, Joseph R.	Whitfield, Ed
Flake, Jeff	Platts, Todd Russell	Wicker, Roger F

#### Appendix 4

Members cosponsoring the McCrery-Shaw bill to divert Social Security funds to create personal accounts.

[Rep McCrery, Jim](#) [LA-4] (introduced 7/14/2005)  
[Rep Akin, W. Todd](#) [MO-2] - 7/14/2005  
[Rep Alexander, Rodney](#) [LA-5] - 7/14/2005  
[Rep Bachus, Spencer](#) [AL-6] - 7/14/2005  
[Rep Baker, Richard H.](#) [LA-6] - 7/14/2005  
[Rep Barrett, J. Gresham](#) [SC-3] - 7/14/2005  
[Rep Bartlett, Roscoe G.](#) [MD-6] - 7/14/2005  
[Rep Bishop, Rob](#) [UT-1] - 7/14/2005  
[Rep Brady, Kevin](#) [TX-8] - 7/14/2005  
[Rep Burton, Dan](#) [IN-5] - 7/18/2005  
[Rep Cannon, Chris](#) [UT-3] - 9/7/2005  
[Rep Cantor, Eric](#) [VA-7] - 7/14/2005  
[Rep Chocola, Chris](#) [IN-2] - 7/14/2005  
[Rep Conaway, K. Michael](#) [TX-11] - 7/14/2005  
[Rep Feeney, Tom](#) [FL-24] - 7/14/2005  
[Rep Flake, Jeff](#) [AZ-6] - 7/14/2005  
[Rep Foxx, Virginia](#) [NC-5] - 7/14/2005  
[Rep Gilchrest, Wayne T.](#) [MD-1] - 7/14/2005  
[Rep Gingrey, Phil](#) [GA-11] - 7/14/2005  
[Rep Gohmert, Louie](#) [TX-1] - 7/28/2005  
[Rep Hart, Melissa A.](#) [PA-4] - 7/28/2005  
[Rep Hensarling, Jeb](#) [TX-5] - 7/14/2005  
[Rep Herger, Wally](#) [CA-2] - 7/14/2005  
[Rep Issa, Darrell E.](#) [CA-49] - 7/14/2005  
[Rep Istook, Ernest J., Jr.](#) [OK-5] - 7/14/2005

[Rep Jindal, Bobby](#) [LA-1] - 7/14/2005  
[Rep Johnson, Sam](#) [TX-3] - 7/14/2005  
[Rep King, Steve](#) [IA-5] - 7/28/2005  
[Rep Kingston, Jack](#) [GA-1] - 7/14/2005  
[Rep Kline, John](#) [MN-2] - 7/26/2005  
[Rep Lewis, Ron](#) [KY-2] - 7/14/2005  
[Rep Marchant, Kenny](#) [TX-24] - 7/26/2005  
[Rep McCaul, Michael T.](#) [TX-10] - 7/14/2005  
[Rep McHenry, Patrick T.](#) [NC-10] - 7/14/2005  
[Rep Myrick, Sue](#) [NC-9] - 7/14/2005  
[Rep Northup, Anne M.](#) [KY-3] - 7/14/2005  
[Rep Pence, Mike](#) [IN-6] - 7/14/2005  
[Rep Pitts, Joseph R.](#) [PA-16] - 7/14/2005  
[Rep Price, Tom](#) [GA-6] - 7/14/2005  
[Rep Ryan, Paul](#) [WI-1] - 7/14/2005  
[Rep Sessions, Pete](#) [TX-32] - 7/14/2005  
[Rep Shadegg, John B.](#) [AZ-3] - 7/14/2005  
[Rep Shaw, E. Clay, Jr.](#) [FL-22] - 7/14/2005  
[Rep Terry, Lee](#) [NE-2] - 9/7/2005  
[Rep Weldon, Dave](#) [FL-15] - 7/14/2005  
[Rep Wicker, Roger F.](#) [MS-1] - 7/14/2005  
[Rep Wilson, Joe](#) [SC-2] - 10/26/2005  
  
[Rep Kuhl, John R. "Randy", Jr.](#) [NY-29] - 7/14/2005(withdrawn - 11/4/2005)  
[Rep Gerlach, Jim](#) [PA-6] - 7/26/2005(withdrawn - 7/27/2005)

- 
- <sup>1</sup> John Harwood, "Bush Faces Obstacle From Republicans on Social Security," Wall Street Journal, 12/1/2004.
- <sup>2</sup> Amy Fagan, "Social Security battle reignites," The Washington Times. 07/06/06.
- <sup>3</sup> Committee on Finance press release, 1/11/06. Available at:  
<http://finance.senate.gov/press/Bpress/2005press/prb071106a.pdf>
- <sup>4</sup> Chris Cillizza, "AARP Survey Haunt GOP," Roll Call, 2/9/2005. Available at:  
[http://www.rollcall.com/issues/50\\_71/news/8086-1.html](http://www.rollcall.com/issues/50_71/news/8086-1.html)
- <sup>5</sup> June 16<sup>th</sup>, Wall Street Journal
- <sup>6</sup> Gregg Robb, "Paulson says won't run away from Social Security fight," MarketWatch. 8/1/2006.
- <sup>7</sup> Charles Hurt, "It's my job to ensure that our members get a good bill," Washington Times, 7/31/2006. Available at: [http://www.washtimes.com/national/20060730-114623-8962r\\_page2.htm](http://www.washtimes.com/national/20060730-114623-8962r_page2.htm)
- <sup>8</sup> Martin Vaughan, "McCrery: Social Security Change Should Top '07 Agenda," Congress Daily, 6/5/06.
- <sup>9</sup> Peter Baker and Claudia Deene, "House Incumbents at Risk, Poll Finds," The Washington Post, 8/8/2006.
- <sup>10</sup> Mike Stanton, "Chafee not buying Bush's plans to fix Social Security," The Providence Journal, 3/14/05.
- <sup>11</sup> S Amdt 3087 to S Con Res 83, Vote # 68, 3/16/06. See Appendix 2 for full vote.
- <sup>12</sup> Anne McFeatters, Voinovich opposes Bush effort to make tax cuts permanent," Toledo Blade, 2/10/2005. Available at: <http://www.toledoblade.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20050210/NEWS09/502100447>
- <sup>13</sup> The status of the race is determined by the Cook Political Report, 6/29/2006.
- <sup>14</sup> Libby Quaid, "Missourians mull State of Union proposals, Associated Press, 1/20/99.
- <sup>15</sup> HR 306, 3/17/93.
- <sup>16</sup> Mike Dennison, "President to Pressure Both GOP, Democrats," Great Falls Tribune, 2/3/05.
- <sup>17</sup> Deborah Pryce and Rick Santorum, "A Guide to Social Security Reform," 1/27/2005. Viewable at:  
<http://talkingpointsmemo.com/docs/gop.socsec.strategy.memo.pdf>
- <sup>18</sup> CQ, 5/10/05.
- <sup>19</sup> Keith Koffler and Mark Wegner, "Bush, Out West, Continues Pushing for Private Accounts," National Journal's Congress Daily, 3/21/2005.
- <sup>20</sup> Cato's 2000 Candidate survey. Available at: <http://www.socialsecurity.org/election00/congress/index.html>. See attached spreadsheet for full breakdown of current member's responses.
- <sup>21</sup> "AARP Poll Shows Social Security Still an Issue," WPLN News Transcripts, 7/27/2006. Available at:  
<http://wpln.org/news/transcripts/?p=833>
- <sup>22</sup> Josh Marshall, Talking Points Memo, 6/29/2006. Available at:  
<http://www.talkingpointsmemo.com/archives/008886.php>
- <sup>23</sup> David Postman, "McCavick on Social Security," The Seattle Times, 6/30/2006. Available at:  
[http://blog.seattletimes.nwsourc.com/davidpostman/archives/2006/06/mcgavick\\_on\\_social\\_security.html](http://blog.seattletimes.nwsourc.com/davidpostman/archives/2006/06/mcgavick_on_social_security.html).
- <sup>24</sup> Josh Gohlke and Trenton Bureau, "Menendez links Keane, Bush on Social Security," 7/25/2006. Available at:  
<http://www.northjersey.com/page.php?qstr=eXJpenk3ZjczN2Y3dnFIZUVFeXk1JmZnYmVsN2Y3dnFIZUVFeXk2OTY2MTU4JnlyXJ5N2Y3MTdmN3ZxZWVFRXl5Mg>
- <sup>25</sup> Senate Resolution 94. More info is available at: [http://www.njleg.state.nj.us/2004/Bills/SR/94\\_11.HTM](http://www.njleg.state.nj.us/2004/Bills/SR/94_11.HTM)
- <sup>26</sup> The National Journal, 11/11/2000
- <sup>27</sup> "DeMint Letter" to The Social Security Reform Commission, 5/24/01. See Appendix 3 for full list of signees.
- <sup>28</sup> Pete Ricketts campaign website, [http://www.petericketts.com/about\\_issues.asp#ss](http://www.petericketts.com/about_issues.asp#ss)
- <sup>29</sup> Nate Jenkins, "In Omaha, Rove touts Social Security plan," Lincoln Journal Star. 7/8/2006. Available at:  
<http://www.journalstar.com/articles/2005/07/08/local/doc42cf060cbf828229509436.txt>
- <sup>30</sup> Jill Lawrence, "Black groups hesitant about Bush proposal," USA Today, 3/1/2005.
- <sup>31</sup> 2006 Iowa Christian Alliance Issues Survey. Available at:  
<http://www.iowachristian.com/survey/ushouse2006.htm>.
- <sup>32</sup> Mike Whalen for Congress website, bio, 8/2/2006. Available at: <http://www.mikewhalen.com/about.html>.
- <sup>33</sup> National Taxpayers Union 2004 Congressional Survey. Available at:  
[http://www.ntu.org/main/components/cansurvey2004/candidate\\_survey\\_template.php](http://www.ntu.org/main/components/cansurvey2004/candidate_survey_template.php). For full list of current member responses, see appendix ##.
- <sup>34</sup> "O'Donnell's U-turn on Social Security," Denver Post, 7/28/2006. Available at:  
[http://www.denverpost.com/opinion/ci\\_4104552](http://www.denverpost.com/opinion/ci_4104552).
- <sup>35</sup> Mike Whalen, "Two views of the Bush Social Security plan," Sioux City Journal, 8/8/2006. Available at:  
[http://www.siouxcityjournal.com/articles/2005/04/28/news\\_opinion/letters/9a11d73709ae523586256ff10045b78c.txt](http://www.siouxcityjournal.com/articles/2005/04/28/news_opinion/letters/9a11d73709ae523586256ff10045b78c.txt)
- <sup>36</sup> "Can Mike Whalen Save Social Security?: Heart of America Founder Leads Think Tank's Grass-Roots Effort to Alter the Program", by Jeff Ignatius, *River Cities' Readers* (#508 Vol 12 Dec 22-28, 2004)

- 
- <sup>37</sup> Star Tribune, 2/21/06. Available at: [www.startribune.com](http://www.startribune.com).
- <sup>38</sup> Deborah Pryce and Rick Santorum, "A Guide to Social Security Reform," 1/27/2005. Viewable at: <http://talkingpointsmemo.com/docs/gop.socsec.strategy.memo.pdf>
- <sup>39</sup> Patricia Swanson, "Constituents get chance to discuss, protest Social Security," Evansville Courier & Press, 5/22/2005.
- <sup>40</sup> Amy Fagan, "Republicans say Social Security vote is unlikely," Washington Times, 6/16/2005.
- <sup>41</sup> John M.R. Bull, "Drake, Kellam go around on war, illegal immigrants," Daily Press, 7/23/2006. Available at: <http://www.dailypress.com/news/local/southofjames/dp-81592sy0ju123.0.1816810.story?coll=dp-news-local-soj>
- <sup>42</sup> J.D. Hayworth Congressional website, [http://jdhayworth.com/hayworth\\_contents/issues/socialsecurity/](http://jdhayworth.com/hayworth_contents/issues/socialsecurity/)
- <sup>43</sup> Donna Moxley, "Rep Bass Hears from Voters on Social Security," New Hampshire Public Radio, 3/25/2005. Available at: <http://www.nhpr.org/node/8487>
- <sup>44</sup> "Florida lawmakers' stand on Social Security," Florida Today, 3/18/2006.
- <sup>45</sup> Made popular by Josh Marshall at Talking points memo, [www.talkingpointsmemo.com](http://www.talkingpointsmemo.com)
- <sup>46</sup> 2000 Cato candidate survey. Available at: <http://www.socialsecurity.org/election00/congress/index.html>
- <sup>47</sup> Cato, Social Security This Week, 6/4/2001. Available at: <http://www.socialsecurity.org/sstw/sstw06-04-01.pdf>
- <sup>48</sup> Project Vote Smart 2004 Congressional National Political Awareness Test. Available at: [http://www.vote-smart.org/npat.php?old=true&can\\_id=H0681103&npatform\\_id=328#18](http://www.vote-smart.org/npat.php?old=true&can_id=H0681103&npatform_id=328#18)
- <sup>49</sup> AARP 2004 Candidate Survey. Available at [www.aarp.org](http://www.aarp.org).
- <sup>50</sup> HR 2590, Roll Call #273, 7/25/01.
- <sup>51</sup> "Crossing A Line On Social Security," Hartford Courant, 4/7/05.
- <sup>52</sup> Lesly Clark, "Social Security Plan a Florida Flash Point," The Miami Herald, 1/25/2005.
- <sup>53</sup> Alex Davis, "About 300 in Jeff have lunch with Cheney: Fund-raiser held for GOP's Sodrel," Louisville Courier-Journal, 3/29/2005.
- <sup>54</sup> Jack Colwell, "Remarks on Social Security Revisited," South Bend Tribune, 7/28/2002.
- <sup>55</sup> H.R. 3304, Available at: <http://www.thomas.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/z?d109:HR03304:@@P>. Full list of cosponsors available in Appendix ##.
- <sup>56</sup> Geoff Davis Congressional website. Available at: <http://geoffdavis.house.gov/Issues.aspx?Section=10>
- <sup>57</sup> Patrick Crowley, "N.Ky. exec to run for Lucas' job," Cincinnati Enquirer, 10/11/01.
- <sup>58</sup> Bruce Schreiner, "Northrup openly supportive of creating personal accounts," Lexington Herald Leader, 3/9/2005.
- <sup>59</sup> Patrick Crowley, "Clooney, Davis jab on Social Security," Cincinnati Enquirer, 9/23/2004.
- <sup>60</sup> "CT5: Johnson, Maloney Debate Social Security Privatization," Hartford Courant, 10/28/2002.
- <sup>61</sup> Scott Whipple, "Dems, others protest efforts at privatizing Social Security," New Britain Herald, 04/27/2005, Available at: [http://www.newbritainherald.com/site/news.cfm?newsid=14421711&BRD=1641&PAG=461&dept\\_id=10110&rfi=6](http://www.newbritainherald.com/site/news.cfm?newsid=14421711&BRD=1641&PAG=461&dept_id=10110&rfi=6)
- <sup>62</sup> Lolita C. Baldor, "Social Security group to run ads opposing Bush plan in Connecticut," The Associated Press State & Local Wire, 3/15/2002.
- <sup>63</sup> Erin Neff, "Gephardt brings Democratic clout to Herrera's campaign," Las Vegas Sun, 8/30/2002.
- <sup>64</sup> National Taxpayers Union 2002 Congressional Survey, Question #5.
- <sup>65</sup> Erin Neff, "Gephardt brings Democratic clout to Herrera's campaign," Las Vegas Sun, 8/30/2002.
- <sup>66</sup> Suzanne Struglinski, "Porter criticized on Social Security, Las Vegas Sun, 2/25/2005.
- <sup>67</sup> CQ Daily, 7/24/2005.
- <sup>68</sup> "Congressman says he could support Bush on Social Security," The Associated Press State & Local Wire, 2/18/2005.
- <sup>69</sup> Carl Weiser, "Ohio's GOP lawmakers wary of Bush's Social Security reform," Gannett News, 2/3/2005.
- <sup>70</sup> Hawkes, "Mr. Fitzpatrick Goes to Washington" The Intelligencer, 2/22/05.
- <sup>71</sup> Hawkes, "Mr. Fitzpatrick Goes to Washington" The Intelligencer, 2/22/05.
- <sup>72</sup> Chris Carney's campaign website. Available at: <http://www.carneyforcongress.com/site/health-security/>
- <sup>73</sup> "Candidates take a stand on the issues," The Seattle Times, 10/22/04.
- <sup>74</sup> Chris Cillizza, "AARP Survey Haunt GOP," Roll Call, 2/9/2005. Available at: [http://www.rollcall.com/issues/50\\_71/news/8086-1.html](http://www.rollcall.com/issues/50_71/news/8086-1.html)
- <sup>75</sup> "Views of 1st Congressional District candidates on selected issues," Associated Press, 10/7/98.
- <sup>76</sup> Michael Coleman, "Wilson Leery of President's Social Security Proposal," Albuquerque Journal, 2/13/05.