

# FILIBUSTERED

**How the Right is Obstructing America's Progress**

July 2007

By  
Max Pike  
Alex Carter  
Robert Gerson  
Eric Lotke

**CAMPAIGN** FOR **AMERICA'S FUTURE**  

---

ourfuture.org

## FILIBUSTERED

### How the Right is Obstructing America's Progress

Campaign for America's Future

July 18, 2007

---

The 2006 election was a repudiation of President Bush and his conservative policies, and a mandate for change. The American people wanted a new course in Iraq. They wanted an increase in the minimum wage. They wanted stem cell research, increased student aid and investments in renewable energy.

Six months into the new 110<sup>th</sup> Congress, little has changed. The American people's initial enthusiasm has degenerated into disappointment. Congressional approval ratings are at all-time lows. The Democrats' approval rating, only fractionally higher than the Republicans,' is sinking after the failure to override Bush's veto of the spending bill that would have ended the war in Iraq. The American people want change. The Democratic Congress has been unable to deliver.

- ❖ "Do you approve or disapprove of the way Congress is handling its job?" Gallup, June 11-14, 2007

Approve	24%
Disapprove	71%

- ❖ "Do you approve or disapprove of the way Democrats/Republicans are doing their job?" ABC News/Washington Post, May 29-June 1, 2007.

	Democrats	Republicans
Approve	44%	36%
Disapprove	49%	58%

An analysis of voting records, however, makes clear that the problem is not a failure of Democratic leadership but of Republican obstructionism. The Democrats had a remarkably productive first six months. Every single item on House Speaker Nancy Pelosi's 100 Hours Agenda passed the House, often with considerable margins.

The Senate and the President, however, stopped progress. The President vetoed the bill that would end the occupation of Iraq. Republicans continually threaten to filibuster, requiring 60 votes for cloture (a limit on debate) to proceed on a wide variety of measures. In the first six months of the 110<sup>th</sup> Congress, there have been 13 cloture votes. In comparison, in the first sessions of the 108<sup>th</sup> and 109<sup>th</sup> Congresses, when Democrats were in the minority, there were a total of four cloture votes. Republican whip Trent Lott told *Roll Call*, "The strategy of being obstructionist can work or fail... and so far, it's working for us."<sup>1</sup> Democrats are the ones taking the blame for not getting anything done.

The votes show how an obstructionist minority is thwarting the will of a simple majority. What follows are some crucial examples.

**Employee Free Choice Act**  
**H.R. 800**

The Employee Free Choice Act of 2007 simplifies the procedures by which members of a workplace can unionize for collective bargaining. At present, workers are typically required to hold formal elections. This Act would allow people to form unions simply upon proof of interest. Workers would be able to use formal elections if they choose, but elections would not be required. As an alternative, workers could check cards and sign their names to indicate their interest in organizing.

To reduce other obstacles to worker organizing, the Act provides civil fines of up to \$20,000 per violation against employers found to have willfully violated employees' rights during an organizing campaign. It provides victims of illegal firing with three times the amount of back pay owed to them. Lastly, the Act gives the option to call in a neutral third party to settle collective bargaining disputes between employers and newly certified unions when a contract is not reached after three months. These provisions are designed to respond to concerns that employers often stretch out or prejudice the unionization process by harassing or intimidating employees and organizers.

The bill was passed by the House of Representatives by a wide margin, but did not survive Republican opposition in the Senate. A majority vote was achieved, but not the 60-vote supermajority needed for cloture against a filibuster.

House Vote  
 Employee Free Choice Act; H.R. 800; Roll Call #118  
 Passed March 1, 2007

	<b>Total</b>	Democrat	Republican
Yes	<b>241</b>	228	13
No	<b>185</b>	2	183
Not Voting	<b>8</b>	3	5

Senate Vote  
 Employee Free Choice Act; H.R. 800; Roll Call #227  
 Rejected on Cloture Vote, June 26, 2007

	<b>Total</b>	Democrat	Republican	Independent
Yes	<b>51</b>	48	1	2
No	<b>48</b>	0	48	0
Not Voting	<b>1</b>	1	0	0

**Part D – Medicare Prescription Drug Price Negotiation Act**  
**H.R. 4/S. 3**

The 2003 Medicare Modernization and Reauthorization Act, which provides prescription drug coverage to senior citizens, includes a provision that prohibits Medicare from using its bulk-buying power to negotiate lower prices with drug manufacturers. That is a benefit long enjoyed by the Department of Veterans Affairs and many foreign countries. Making negotiated prices a part of a Medicare-offered plan, as the price negotiation bill would have done, would yield combined estimated savings for both seniors and taxpayers of between \$40 billion and \$65 billion a year.<sup>2</sup>

The bill passed the House by a wide margin. However, it was unable to overcome Republican opposition in the Senate. While the bill received a simple majority of votes, 60 votes were needed for cloture against a filibuster.

House Vote  
Drug Price Negotiation Act; H.R. 4; Roll Call #23  
Passed January 12, 2007

	<b>Total</b>	Democrat	Republican
Yes	<b>255</b>	231	24
No	<b>170</b>	0	170
Not Voting	<b>10</b>	2	8

Senate Vote  
Drug Price Negotiation Act; S. 3; Roll Call #132  
Rejected on Cloture Vote April 18, 2007

	<b>Total</b>	Democrat	Republican	Independent
Yes	<b>55</b>	47	6	2
No	<b>42</b>	1	41	0
Not Voting	<b>3</b>	1	2	0

**Minimum Wage Act**  
**H.R. 2**

The federal minimum wage has not been increased since 1997 and has its lowest buying power in 50 years. Responding to its own sense of fairness and 77 percent of Americans' desire for change, one of the new Democratic Congress's first bills was a bill to raise the minimum wage. Democrats drafted a simple, clean bill to increase the minimum wage to \$7.25 over two years. The measure quickly and overwhelmingly passed the House on January 10, 2007, mere days after the new Congress was sworn in.

In the Senate, however, the bill was subjected to Republican amendments that included tax breaks and other unrelated provisions that slowed it down. Senate Democrats had a simple majority but they were nonetheless thwarted in their effort to pass a clean bill. Eventually, enough Senate Democrats conceded to the amendments to allow the bill to pass in the chamber. However, the Republican Senate amendments were unacceptable in the House. The bill stalled in conference between the chambers of Congress.

House Vote  
Fair Minimum Wage; H.R.2; Roll Call #18  
Passed January 10, 2007

	<b>Total</b>	Democrat	Republican
Yes	<b>315</b>	233	82
No	<b>116</b>	0	116
Not Voting	<b>4</b>	0	4

Senate Vote  
Minimum Wage Act, H.R. 2, with tax amendment; Roll Call #42  
Passed February 1, 2007

	<b>Total</b>	Democrat	Republican	Independent
Yes	<b>94</b>	47	45	2
No	<b>3</b>	0	3	0
Not Voting	<b>3</b>	2	1	0

The minimum wage bill remained in a conference committee until it was attached to the war appropriation, described below.

**Ending the War in Iraq**  
**H.R. 1591**

At the end of March 2007, the House and Senate passed the U.S. Troop Readiness, Veterans' Care, Katrina Recovery, and Iraq Accountability Appropriations Act of 2007. The bill provided \$124 billion to fully fund the war, the troops and veterans who returned home. However, unlike past appropriations for the war, it imposed conditions on funding. Specifically, it imposed a timetable for withdrawal of U.S. forces. It started to end the war.

House Vote  
Bill to End the War in Iraq; H.R. 1591; Roll Call #186  
Passed House March 23, 2007

	<b>Total</b>	Democrat	Republican
Yes	<b>218</b>	216	2
No	<b>212</b>	14	198
Present, Not Voting	<b>1</b>	1	0
Not Voting	<b>3</b>	2	1

Senate Vote  
Bill to End the War in Iraq; H.R. 1591; Roll Call #126  
Passed Senate March 29, 2007

	<b>Total</b>	Democrat	Republican	Independent
Yes	<b>51</b>	48	2	1
No	<b>47</b>	0	46	1
Not Voting	<b>2</b>	1	1	0

The House and Senate spent a few weeks in April hammering out details and presented the bill to end the war to the President Bush on May 1, 2007. He vetoed it the same day.

On May 2, House Democrats tried to override the veto. They failed, however, to produce the two-thirds majority necessary. In the Senate, the leadership recognized they did not have the votes necessary to override and did not bring the measure to a vote. In the end, the Democrats surrendered on the requirement to end the war and voted to authorize funding for continued military operations without withdrawal provisions. "The debate will go on," Speaker Nancy Pelosi vowed.<sup>3</sup> For now, however, the crucial vote is the one that attempted to end the war.

House Vote  
 Bill to end the War in Iraq; H.R.1591; Roll Call #276  
 Veto Override Failed; May 2, 2007

	<b>Total</b>	Democrat	Republican
Yes	<b>222</b>	220	2
No	<b>203</b>	7	196
Present, Not Voting	<b>1</b>	1	0
Not Voting	<b>7</b>	4	3

In the aftermath of the veto over the troop withdrawal, negotiators reconsidered their positions. The Iraq war funding and minimum wage bills were combined, along with funding for Katrina recovery and veterans care. In some cases, the considerations of the Iraq war outweighed consideration of the minimum wage, leading some Democrats to vote against the measure. Finally, at the end of May, the minimum wage increase along with Iraq war funding, without troop removal deadlines, passed in both chambers of Congress and was signed into law.<sup>4</sup>

House Vote  
 U.S. Troop Readiness, Veterans' Care, Katrina Recovery, and Iraq Accountability Appropriations Act, 2007; H.R.2206; Roll Call #333  
 Passed March 24, 2007

	<b>Total</b>	Democrat	Republican
Yes	<b>348</b>	225	123
No	<b>73</b>	1	72
Not Voting	<b>12</b>	6	6

Senate Vote  
 U.S. Troop Readiness, Veterans' Care, Katrina Recovery, and Iraq Accountability Appropriations Act, 2007; H.R.2206: Roll Call # 181  
 Passed May 24, 2007

	<b>Total</b>	Democrat	Republican	Independent
Yes	<b>80</b>	37	42	1
No	<b>14</b>	10	3	1
Not Voting	<b>6</b>	2	4	0

**Webb Amendment: Rest for the Weary**  
**S. Amdt. 2012**

The Webb Amendment to the defense authorization bill, proposed by freshman senator Jim Webb, D-Va, would enforce break periods during the deployment of individual U.S. troops in Iraq. Despite unanimous Democratic support, a supermajority of 60 votes was not reached. Thus the threat of a filibuster prevented the amendment from moving forward.

Senate Vote  
Webb Amendment; S.Amdt.2012 to H.R. 1585; Roll Call #241  
Rejected on Cloture July 11, 2007

	<b>Total</b>	Democrat	Republican	Independent
Yes	<b>56</b>	48	7	1
No	<b>41</b>	0	40	1
No Vote	<b>3</b>	1	2	0

**Levin Amendment: Iraq Pullout**  
**S. Amdt. 2087**

S.Amdt.2087 would have resulted in the withdrawal of troops from Iraq beginning 120 days after the bill was signed into law. The measure aimed to withdrawal all troops by April 2008, except for military personnel involved in training Iraqi security forces, conducting counterterrorism operations against al-Qaida and protecting U.S. personnel.

Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid fought fiercely to encourage members of both parties to look beyond political games and vote on the merits of the bill. As has been the case all too often in this session of the 110th Congress, the bill failed to move past a cloture vote. Four Republicans voted for cloture, and Reid ultimately voted against cloture on procedural grounds so he may reintroduce the amendment in the Senate at a later time.

House Vote  
Iraq Pullout; H.R.1585; Roll Call #373  
Passed House May 17, 2007

	<b>Total</b>	Democrat	Republican
Yes	<b>397</b>	202	195
No	<b>27</b>	25	2
No Vote	<b>8</b>	4	4

Senate Vote  
Iraq Pullout; H.R.1585; Roll Call #252

	<b>Total</b>	Democrat	Republican	Independent
Yes	<b>52</b>	47	4	1
No	<b>47</b>	1	45	1
No Vote	<b>1</b>	1	0	0

NOTE: Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid voted against the bill for procedural reasons, as is customary for the majority leader; with his the support the vote would have been 53-46.

**CLEAN Energy Act of 2007**  
**H.R. 6**

Since taking control of the House and Senate, Democrats have introduced several bills intended to improve U.S. energy policy. The primary vehicle for change was H.R. 6, the CLEAN Energy Act. This Act rolls back gas and oil subsidies, and taps record profits to fund development of clean new technologies. The House version of the CLEAN Energy Act passed in January.

Progress was slower in the Senate, however. A variety of amendments were proposed with the threat of filibusters in the background. Not until a cloture vote passed, 62 to 37, on June 21 was the actual bill considered on its merits. It passed the same evening, 65 to 27, with 20 Republicans joining the nearly unified Democrats.

The Republican minority stymied two crucial provisions of the CLEAN Energy Act. One provision by Senate Energy Committee Chairman Jeff Bingaman, D-N.M., would set a national standard of 15 percent of our electricity to come from renewable sources, such as wind, solar and geothermal power. Bingaman appeared to have enough votes to pass the standard on a majority vote but he didn't have the 60 votes needed to overcome the filibuster threat by the committee's ranking minority member, Sen. Pete Domenici, R-N.M. Republicans would "not let the Bingaman amendment come up for awhile," he declared.<sup>5</sup>

In addition, Senate Democrats sought to extend tax credits for solar power and wind energy facilities, with funding derived from taxes on oil and gas production. Again, they had a simple majority but lacked the 60 votes needed to overcome a filibuster. The cloture vote fell shy, 57-36 (S.Amd.1704; Roll Call #223). Eventually Senate Democrats recognized that they would be unable to overcome the Republican filibusters of the provisions for renewable energy sources. H.R. 6 passed without those provisions.

House Vote  
 CLEAN Energy Act of 2007; H.R. 6; Roll Call #40  
 Passed January 18, 2007

	<b>Total</b>	Republican	Republican
Yes	<b>264</b>	228	36
No	<b>163</b>	4	159
Not Voting	<b>8</b>	1	7

Senate Vote  
 Tax Credit for Wind and Solar; S.Amd.1704; Roll Call #223  
 Rejected on Cloture Vote, June 21, 2007

	<b>Total</b>	Democrat	Republican	Independent
Yes	<b>57</b>	47	8	2
No	<b>36</b>	0	36	0
Not Voting	<b>6</b>	2	4	0

Senate Vote  
 CLEAN Energy Act of 2007; H.R. 6; Roll Call #226  
 Passed June 21, 2007

	<b>Total</b>	Democrat	Republican	Independent
Yes	<b>65</b>	43	20	2
No	<b>27</b>	4	23	0
Not Voting	<b>7</b>	2	5	0

The CLEAN Energy Act is presently in conference. However, the President has threatened to veto it.<sup>6</sup> Such a veto would compound the obstruction that already forced compromises to get the legislation out of the Senate in the first place; it would nullify both chambers' efforts to improve U.S. energy policy.

**Intelligence Authorization Act**  
**S. 372**

This bill would have authorized fiscal year 2007 funding for the intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States government. The budget is believed to be approximately \$44 billion; the actual budget figure is classified. Backers of the legislation hailed its directives to the spy community, such as one to create an inspector general position for the Office of the Director of National Intelligence. But President Bush threatened to veto the bill.

Congress Daily in April reported that as Republicans threatened to filibuster the bill on the Senate floor, Intelligence committee chairman John D. Rockefeller “called on Republicans to ‘put politics aside’ and vote for cloture ... Earlier in the day, the Senate accepted several amendments proposed by Rockefeller to address objections by the White House.<sup>7</sup>” When a vote was called to end debate and proceed to final passage, a majority voted in favor, but not enough to prevent a filibuster. Republican obstructionism ruled the day once more.

Senate Vote  
Intelligence Authorization Act; S.372; Roll Call #131  
Rejected on Cloture Vote, April 17, 2007

	<b>Total</b>	Democrat	Republican	Independent
Yes	<b>50</b>	46	2	2
No	<b>45</b>	0	45	0
No Vote	<b>5</b>	3	2	0

**Sense of Senate on Alberto Gonzales**  
**S. J .Res. 14**

The Senate investigation into the firings of nine U.S. attorneys last year spurred the introduction of a joint resolution to reflect the American people and the Senate’s sense of no confidence in Attorney General Alberto Gonzales. The resolution was also prompted by Gonzales’ role in the misuse of National Security letters by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the National Security Agency’s violation of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act in conducting domestic warrantless wiretapping, the politicization of the hiring of career attorneys in the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice, and the development of the legal framework for the use of torture and the creation of military commissions.

In the face of bipartisan sentiment on Capitol Hill that Gonzales should be replaced, Gonzales has said he will not resign and President Bush has refused to fire him. The resolution would not have the force of law, but it was expected that once it passed the resulting political pressure would have led to Gonzales’ departure. Despite majority opposition to Gonzales’ poor record, the resolution could not come to a final vote on the Senate floor due to Republican obstructionism.

Senate Vote  
Sense of Senate of Alberto Gonzales; S.J.Res.14; Roll Call #207  
Rejected on Cloture June 11, 2007

	<b>Total</b>	Democrat	Republican	Independent
Yes	<b>53</b>	45	7	1
No	<b>38</b>	0	37	1
Present, No Vote	<b>1</b>	0	1	0
No Vote	<b>7</b>	4	3	0

**Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act**  
**S. 5**

Embryonic stem cell research has the potential to produce cures for different forms of cancer and diabetes, and neurological disorders such as Parkinson's and Lou Gehrig's disease. Although all of the uses of stem cells are not yet understood, it is widely considered to be a highly promising therapy for otherwise untreatable diseases. Studies conducted for years have led to the general consensus that embryonic stem cells hold more promise than adult stem cells.

There has been significant bipartisan support for legislation to repeal the order issued by President Bush on August 9, 2001, preventing any federal funding of stem cell research on cells taken from embryos after that date. The proposed bill would have lifted that federal ban and allowed stem cells to be collected from donated embryos from in vitro fertilization clinics. The embryos collected for further stem cell research would only be taken with the informed consent of the donor, and would otherwise be discarded by the clinic. Embryo donors would not be permitted to receive any inducement, financial or otherwise, to make a donation.

In a poll conducted by *The Washington Post* in January 2007,<sup>8</sup> 61 percent of Americans said they favored further embryonic stem cell research, compared to 31 percent who oppose it. Despite widespread support of the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act, President Bush vetoed the bill after it passed the House and the Senate on June 20, 2007.

House Vote  
Passed January 11, 2007  
Stem Cell Research; H.R.3; Roll Call #44

	<b>Total</b>	Democrat	Republican
Yes	<b>253</b>	216	37
No	<b>174</b>	16	158
Not Voting	<b>8</b>	1	7

Senate Vote  
Passed Senate June 7, 2007  
Stem Cell Research; S.5; Roll Call #127

	<b>Total</b>	Democrat	Republican	Independent
Yes	<b>63</b>	44	17	2
No	<b>34</b>	2	32	0
Not Voting	<b>3</b>	3	0	0

Past efforts to override a Presidential veto on stem cell research have failed. It is unclear at present if and how further efforts will be made, since there do not appear to be sufficient Republican dissenters to overcome the obstruction of the Republican president.

**Ethics and Lobbying Disclosure Act**  
**S. 1, H.R. 2316**

Corruption in the Republican controlled Congress was legion. House Majority leader Tom DeLay, R-Texas, was indicted for money laundering; Rep. Duke Cunningham, R-Calif., pled guilty to taking million-dollar bribes; Rep. Billy Tauzin, R-La., negotiated his new \$2 million job as president of the drug industry’s top lobbying group while designing Medicare’s new prescription drug coverage.

The 2006 election results reflected the voters’ demands to change that. In response, legislation on lobbyist financing, gifts and travel, and the revolving door between Congress and industry passed in both houses of Congress in the spring of 2007.

But then it stalled. Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell, R-Ky., blocked appointment of Senate conferees so the bills passed in each chamber could not be reconciled. The bills sat in conference and never became law.

House Vote  
 Ethics and Lobbying; H.R.2316; Roll Call #423  
 Passed May 24, 2007

	<b>Total</b>	Democrat	Republican
Yes	<b>346</b>	158	188
No	<b>71</b>	64	7
Not Voting	<b>16</b>	10	6

Senate Vote  
 Ethics and Lobbying; S.1; Roll Call #19  
 Passed January 18, 2007

	<b>Total</b>	Democrat	Republican	Independent
Yes	<b>96</b>	48	46	2
No	<b>2</b>	0	2	0
Not Voting	<b>2</b>	1	1	0

**Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act**  
**S. 1348/S. 1639**

By the time it reached the Senate floor in June, the Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act reflected extensive compromises made by the White House and about a dozen senators from both parties. In the end, though, the compromises suited almost no one entirely, and the bill was overwhelmed by dissatisfaction from all sides.

The most controversial provisions of the legislation would allow the approximately 14 million illegal immigrants in the United States to stay and work their way towards legal status and

ultimately citizenship. In addition, the bill provided \$4.4 billion in mandatory spending for border security and enforcement, and created a temporary guest-worker program.

Some Democrats objected to the guest-worker program and provisions that would reduce the role that family ties play in awarding green cards, or permanent legal resident status. Others in both parties, particularly Republicans, questioned the legalization provision — calling it “amnesty” — and complained that past enforcement promises have yet to be fulfilled. After the first iteration of the bill, introduced by Majority Leader Harry Reid, was rejected, Sen. Edward Kennedy, D-Mass., introduced a slightly altered version as S. 1639. Although it was more successful in getting broad support, Republican-led obstructionism stopped the bill from moving forward.

Senate Vote  
Immigration Reform; S. 1348; Roll Call #204  
Rejected on Cloture June 7, 2007

	<b>Total</b>	Democrat	Republican	Independent
Yes	<b>34</b>	33	0	1
No	<b>61</b>	13	47	1
No Vote	<b>4</b>	3	1	0

Senate Vote  
Immigration Reform; S.1639; Roll Call #235  
Rejected on Cloture June 28, 2007

	<b>Total</b>	Democrat	Republican	Independent
Yes	<b>46</b>	33	12	1
No	<b>53</b>	15	37	1
No Vote	<b>1</b>	1	0	0

### **Senate Campaign Disclosure Parity Act** **S. 223**

The Senate Campaign Disclosure Parity Act would end the Senate practice of submitting campaign financial disclosure reports on paper rather than electronically. Currently, Senate candidates print their computerized finance reports on paper and then physically deliver them to the Senate office of public records, where the paper records are scanned into computer files for electronic transmission to the Federal Elections Commission (FEC). The FEC then prints these records on paper and ships them to Virginia, where the information is manually entered into electronic databases. This antiquated process increases the cost and slows the process, defeating the very purpose of disclosure. In the 2006 election cycle, the watchdog group Campaign Finance Institute found that contributions received by candidates five months earlier still were not available online a week before the November 6 elections for six of the 10 most competitive Senate races.<sup>9</sup>

The House has filed its financial disclosure reports electronically for years, and they are available for scrutiny without delay. The Senate Campaign Disclosure Parity Act would mandate similar procedures in the Senate.

But it has never come up to a vote.

An anonymous Republican Senator has used an obscure rule to place a “hold” on the bill, preventing it from leaving committee. Nobody knows which Senator placed the hold, although Republican Jim Bunning of Kentucky admitted that the hold originated on the Republican side of the aisle. The Sunlight Foundation reports that it called every single Republican Senator on the committee, and none of them admitted to placing the original hold. “[W]e now know that one or more Senators are lying to their constituents,” the foundation staff concluded.<sup>10</sup>

## **Conclusion**

The country wants to move forward. The American people want change, and the Democrats in Congress are trying to deliver it. The votes in this report indicate both the direction the country could go and the forces obstructing change.

<b>Yes votes in the House and Senate on key bills</b>		
	<b>House (majority 218)</b>	<b>Senate (majority 51)</b>
Minimum Wage (with tax amendments) H.R.2206	348	80
Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act S.5	253	63
End the War H.R. 1591	222 (284 needed to override veto)	51 (67 needed to override veto)
Employee Free Choice Act H.R.800	241	51
Medicare Prescription Drug Price Negotiation Act H.R.4/S.3	255	55
Ethics and Lobbying Disclosure Act S.1, H.R.2316	346	96 (Senate Minority Leader blocking naming of conferees.)
Senate Campaign Disclosure Parity Act	N/A	Unnamed Republican placed hold on bill, blocking vote
Intelligence Authorization Act S.372	N/A	50
Sense of Senate – Alberto Gonzales S.J.Res.14	N/A	53
Webb Amendment S.Amdt.2012	N/A	56

In each of these votes, the Democrats had a majority. In a functioning democracy, this would be enough to pass these bills and send them to the President to be signed into law. But it isn’t happening. This report identifies the reason for the delay in moving America forward.

## ENDNOTES

---

- 1 Pierce, Emily. GOP Complains Reid Filing Cloture Too Often. Roll Call. April 18, 2007. [http://www.rollcall.com/issues/52\\_110/news/18024-1.html](http://www.rollcall.com/issues/52_110/news/18024-1.html)
- 2 Baker, Dean. The Excess Cost of the Medicare Drug Benefit. CEPI and IAF. February , 2006. <http://www.ourfuture.org/docUploads/Excess%20Cost%20-%20Med%20Drug%20Benefit.pdf>
- 3 Hulse, Carl. The Struggle For Iraq. The New York Times. May 25, 2007. <http://select.nytimes.com/search/restricted/article?res=F70A11F63D540C768EDDAC0894DF404482>
- 4 Public Law 110-028; May 25, 2007
- 5 Renewable-Power Dispute Slows Progress on Senate Energy Legislation. CQ Today. June 14, 2007. <http://www.cq.com/display.do?docid=2532014&sourcetype=6>
- 6 Geman, Ben & Samuelsohn, Darren. Energy Policy: Senate adds climate amendments to sweeping energy bill. Energy Policy & Markets Vol. 10 No. 9. June 22, 2007. <http://www6.lexisnexis.com/publisher/EndUser?Action=UserDisplayFullDocument&orgId=574&topicId=25148&docId=1:630719340&start=8>
- 7 National Journal Congress Daily, 4/18/07. <http://democrats.senate.gov/journal/entry.cfm?id=277868&>
- 8 Washington Post-ABC News Poll. The Washington Post. January 20, 2006. [http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/politics/polls/postpoll\\_012007.htm](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/politics/polls/postpoll_012007.htm)
- 9 Malbin, Michael. Stop Papering the Senate. Washington Times. May 17, 2007. <http://www.cfinst.org/pr/prRelease.aspx?ReleaseID=148>
- 10 Blumenthal, Paul. Another Objection! S.223 Still Blocked. Sunlight Foundation. April 26, 2007. <http://www.sunlightfoundation.com/node/2486>