

What Kind of Women Matter? A Study of Women's Representation in the United States Senate

Zoe Colman

Advisor: Professor Jeremy Elkins
Political Science Senior Thesis
April 28, 2014

Abstract

This thesis seeks to answer the question of how women in the United States Senate work to represent the needs of female citizens. To understand how women empirically represent women, the thesis looks at two contrasting theories of representation: critical mass and critical action. Critical mass theory asserts that women work together as a collective group to advance the women's agenda, while critical action theory states that individual leadership actions are more effective. The work uses data from five Congressional sessions in an attempt to determine which theory fits best with our current system. Although the results of the data analysis are not definitive, they suggest that individual actions are more important. However, there may need to be a critical mass for women to have the leadership potential to perform these actions.

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	7
Literature Review.....	8
Gaps in Literature.....	18
Overview of My Project.....	19
Definition of Women’s Issue.....	22
Voting Data Methods.....	24
Voting Data Results.....	27
Regression Results.....	37
Sponsorship Data Methods.....	39
Sponsorship Data Results.....	41
Analysis and Discussion of Data.....	50
Conclusions.....	57
Appendix.....	63
Works Cited.....	94

Table of Figures

Table 1A: 111 th Senate Bills.....	27
Table 2A: 110 th Senate Bills.....	27
Table 3A: 108 th Senate Bills.....	28
Table 4A: 103 rd Senate Bills.....	28
Table 5A: 102 nd Senate Bills.....	28
Table 1B: Summary of Results.....	37
Table 2B: Analysis of Variance (ANOVA).....	37
Table 3B: Coefficients.....	37
Table 4B: Variable Correlations.....	38
Table 1C: Total Bills and Members.....	41
Table 2C: Women’s Issue Bills.....	41
Table 3C: Women’s Issue Bills cont.....	42
Table 4C: Bills Sponsored by Women.....	42
Table 5C: Bills Sponsored by Men.....	42

Introduction

“I’m no lady. I’m a member of Congress.”

When Mary Teresa Norton, one of the first women elected to Congress, proclaimed these words, women and Congressman were seen as two mutually exclusive entities. Since the first woman was elected to Congress in 1917, our world and culture have changed drastically. However, it is questionable how much the laws and landscape of Congress have evolved as more women enter the legislature. It appears to be the common belief that as more women are elected to Congress, the women’s agenda continues to advance. Most citizens subscribe to the theory of critical mass, which states that as a group grows in size, their power and influence will also grow.

This thesis serves to question how females in Congress empirically represent the interests of women. Assuming women in the legislature do advocate for other women, I want to determine how women in Congress work to advance women’s issues. I will explore what roles female legislators as a collective and women leaders as individuals play in the introduction and passage of bills related to women’s rights and concerns. This thesis will take a stand on the question of the importance of female politicians. I will examine different theories of representation to understand how women could or should be represented, and then look at historical legislative data to determine the roles that these theories have played in women’s actions. The two theories of representation I will focus on are critical mass and critical actions. The theory of critical mass states that as the number of members of a minority group increases, their voice and power will also increase. At a certain threshold, the “critical mass,” these groups will gain enough influence to create change. My data examine how women work together as a collective, and whether their sheer numbers in Congress have an affect on policy. In contrast, other scholars assert that strong

critical actions are most effective at bringing about change. This theory helps us understand the role of individual women in making legislative change. These theories can be applied to many types of minority groups, but I am particularly interested in the representation of women and women-specific issues.

Women are strongly underrepresented in our government, but I question the best way for women in politics to bring about change. The obvious answer is that we just need more women (critical mass) but empirically this does not seem to be the only barrier to representation. Further, there may be a relationship between the size of a group and the agency of its members to take leadership. My thesis examines how these two theories have manifested in the United States Senate. From the data I collected, I argue that the individual actions of female legislators are more important for bringing about change, but women may need to have a critical mass in order to have influence. Critical actions are more important, but a certain number of women might need to be present in the legislature for change to be made. I am hopeful that this knowledge of how women act will enhance our understanding of the Senate so that legislators and interest groups can discover the best way to make legislative change and improve the lives of women.

Literature Review

Through my review of the literature, I have found a compelling debate that I would like to explore further. The literature suggests multiple hypotheses regarding the ways that women need to be represented. I began by looking at general theories of democratic representation to understand the basis of the women's movement. Then, I examined the two main theories I will be looking at: critical mass and critical actions. I then reviewed the arguments that have been made about the interaction between women's representation and these two theories. Finally, I

will explain how this debate remains unresolved, and how I can contribute to the literature and research on this topic.

Hanna Pitkin's book *The Concept Of Representation* (1967) discusses the meaning of a representative democracy and the theories on which that system is based. This is a seminal work that legitimized the quest for increased representation for women. Pitkin's assertion that minorities should be fairly represented in government paved the way for future theories on women's representation. Although the work focuses on minorities in general, it has been extrapolated to theories about the role of women. Pitkin discusses theories from Hobbes, Burke, and Madison. Most relevant to my research is the idea of "descriptive representation." Pitkin asserts, "true representation, these writers argue, requires that the legislature be so selected that its composition corresponds accurately to that of the whole nation; only then is it really a representative body" (60). It is interesting that Pitkin uses John Adams, one of the founders of our political system, as a proponent of this type of representation. It appears that the American idea of a representative democracy should follow this theory, but we know that it empirically does not. If our democratic system were truly descriptive, women would make up about 50 percent of the legislature, proportional to their numbers in society. Although Pitkin does not explicitly discuss the role of minorities in government, she does address the concept of proportional representation, which serves as the basis for later theories of critical mass and quotas. She also recognizes the difference between descriptive and substantive representation, which is seen in the much more current discourse on the role of minorities. The numbers in a group matter because descriptive representation will lead to substantive representation. By substantive representation, I am referring to a system where a legislator addresses the needs and voices of their constituents. Pitkin's work serves as background theory for my question, as well

as many of the theories I will explore as I study the larger question of the role of women in government. The two theories forthcoming explore ways that a minority group can gain influence without needing full descriptive representation. It is unlikely that women will make up 50 percent of Congress in the near future, but this does not mean they cannot gain enough power to change the legislative agenda and improve the lives of women.

Pitkin helps us understand why it is so important that women are adequately represented. Rosabeth Moss Kanter and Drude Dahlerup take this a step further, and suggest how exactly women should be represented. Their ideas about critical mass theory and the theory of critical acts shape my question, as I would like to find out which theory best fits the needs of female citizens. Critical mass theory stems from Kanter's seminal book *Men and Women of the Corporation* (1977). Although the book never explicitly uses the term "critical mass," Dahlerup extends Kanter's work to apply the theory to politics, specifically women in politics. Kanter's book studies the role of male and female workers in a large industrial firm. She asserts that the women in the company do not have their voices heard because they are a small minority, and that women's representation must be increased for that voice to carry weight. One of Kanter's most important contributions to the critical mass debate is her discussion of the four types of group dynamics: uniform, skewed, tilted, and balanced. Uniform groups are 100 percent homogenous, and have no minority. Skewed groups have a typical ratio of 85:15. Within this type of society, there are two groups, the "dominants" and the "tokens" (208). Tilted groups have a ratio that is closer to 65:35. In these groups, "minority members have potential allies among each other, can form coalitions, and can affect the culture of the group" (209). Finally, balanced groups have a 50:50 ratio, with no dominant forces.

Kanter ends her book with suggestions on how to change the power dynamics within a

skewed or tilted group. She suggests, “a mere shift in *absolute* numbers, then, as from one to two tokens, could potentially reduce stresses in a token’s situation even while *relative* numbers of women remained low” (238). The more women are added, the closer the organization comes to a tilted group where the minority can form a coalition and begin to have influence. Further, she argues that individual characteristics are not as important as the total numbers present. She asserts, “it seems clear that numbers, especially relative numbers, can strongly affect a person’s fate in an organization. This is a system rather than an individual construct— located not in the characteristics of the person but in how many people, like that person in significant ways, are also present” (241). She recognizes that these findings come close to ideas about quotas. She does not argue for or against quotas, but recognizes that those ideas are based on her theories of systematic change. Kanter never gives a specific ratio that is desired to create a “critical mass,” but it is clear that some type of systematic change will occur as numbers change.

Drude Dahlerup’s article “From a Small to a Large Minority—Women in Scandinavian Politics” (1988) extends Kanter’s theories to women in worldwide politics. It is important to note that actions and representation are very different in the workplace and in the political arena, but these theories of representation can generally apply to both. However, the way that the theories manifest themselves within a minority group may look very different. To outline her argument, Dahlerup first gives an excellent definition of the theory, “The term ‘critical mass’ implies that the size of the minority is crucial, and that to women in politics a fundamental change may happen long before they reach the 50 (or maybe 60) percent of the seats” (275). To better understand this concept, Dahlerup obtained empirical data from five Nordic countries including interviews, questionnaires, and survey data (277). In these five countries, the percentage of women in the legislature of local councils varied from 20 to 30 percent. Dahlerup asserts that the

target percentage is 30 (chart, 281). Using data from questionnaires, Dahlerup was able to discern how the political climate has changed since these numbers have risen to their current levels. She finds that women in these legislatures still struggle, but that general public opinion of female politicians has changed dramatically (286). Further, the political discourse has shifted to include women's issues. A larger proportion of women helps bring these concerns to the forefront of political conversations and allows the women to make significant change.

Dahlerup recognizes that an increase of women does seem to have a positive influence on the state of women in politics. However, she questions whether the proportion of women is the causal factor in these changes. She proposes, "maybe we should replace the concept of a critical mass with the new concept of a critical act, better suited to the study of human behavior. A critical act is one which will change the position of the minority considerably and lead to further changes" (296). Dahlerup gives examples of these types of "critical acts" such as women recruiting other women, gender quotas, the introduction of feminist legislation, and the creation of institutions to promote equality. Dahlerup asserts that the countries studied incorporate all of these acts, and that they are the main factors that have brought about changes in representation.

In 2006, Dahlerup published an essay entitled "The Story of the Theory of Critical Mass," which shed light on her earlier arguments and how they have been used to shape recent policy. She explains how her previous work had a large impact on international politics, specifically quotas. Although she did not seem entirely convinced that there is a magic number for change, she did use the 30 percent mark frequently in her original argument. In this essay, she explains how 30 percent has become the most common percentage for political quotas. In fact, "in 1990, the United Nations Economic and Social Council endorsed a target of 30% women in decision-making positions in the world by 1995" (515). Although neither Dahlerup nor Kanter

gives definitive evidence for a particular proportion, their theories carried a lot of weight. Dahlerup's criticism of quotas in this article implies that she is now more convinced by the critical act argument.

Dahlerup also addresses the issue of how we talk about the research on representation. She identifies two separate questions— how women influence policy outcomes (policy outcome perspective), and how the percentage of women influences the performance of women (the politics as workplace perspective) (519). By performance of women, she is specifically referring to the way that women work as a collective unit to act on behalf of all women. Dahlerup believes that the first question can be explained with the critical acts theory, while the second is more connected to critical mass theory. My goal is to find answers to both of these questions. I hypothesized that I would find evidence to support Dahlerup's claim that policy outcomes are correlated with critical actions, specifically critical actions taken by women. I also wanted to better understand how the percentage of women in a group affects policy outcomes and the legislative agenda in general.

In recent years, many authors have used these two scholars to examine modern political climates, and theorize on current systems of representation. Manon Tremblay and Réjean Pelletier examine the contrasting theories of critical mass versus critical actions in their article "More Feminists or More Women? Descriptive and Substantive Representations of Women in the 1997 Canadian Federal Elections" (2000). Their work used survey data on female and male candidates in Canada. Using these data, they introduce a new but related theory that changes in women's representation are due to key political *actors*, not actions. Political actions come from political actors, so following this theory, those who have the greatest agency will be performing these acts. The theory aligns with the theory of critical actions, but extends our understanding of who

is committing these acts. Instead of seeing women's "token" status as a weakness, the right type of woman can use her minority status to assert power. They find, "Electing a great number of women in Canadian politics is not necessarily the best strategy for meeting the needs, demands and interests of women in a feminist context. It is probably more appropriate to elect feminists—mostly women, but also men" (397). These scholars counter Kanter's argument that the type of woman does not matter. It takes strong, assertive women to perform critical actions that will promote a feminist agenda.

Sarah Childs and Mona Lena Krook highlight holes in Kanter and Dahlerup's arguments in their work "Critical Mass Theory and Women's Political Representation" (2008). Their four main concerns with Kanter's work are that she does not address how women act once they are in positions of power, how many women are actually needed, what role gender specifically plays, and the role of feminist men. They criticize Dahlerup's assumption that a greater number of women means that women are working together and have the same goals. They are also skeptical of her "30 percent" idea. The authors suggest that we change our discussion of representation to focus on "how the substantive representation of women occurs," and "what specific actors do" (734). These questions seem to fit better with theories of critical acts than critical mass. My research will attempt to answer the questions presented by these authors, and find out specifically how women substantively represent other women.

Child and Krook work to answer those questions in a second article, "Analyzing Women's Substantive Representation: From Critical Mass to Critical Actors" (2009). They seek to determine who acts, and how they act. A case study of a tax law in Britain in 2000 demonstrates the importance of one critical actor. A section of the bill would have rescinded an extra tax on feminine products, because many women found the policy unfair. A female Labour

MP (member of parliament), Christine McCafferty, gave a speech on BBC radio that triggered support for her bill to rescind the tax (140). Her outspoken action made the bill an important political issue and helped mobilize other women. Without this one important “token” woman’s action, the bill would likely not have advanced. Childs and Krook note that there was a statistically significant difference in male and female votes on this issue, likely stemming from McCafferty’s actions. Her critical action changed the course of a piece of legislation.

Kathleen Bratton’s essay “Critical Mass Theory Revisited: The Behavior and Success of Token Women in State Legislatures” challenges the theory of critical mass, and looks at the role of critical action. Bratton questioned whether a significant number of women are needed to bring about legislative change. She studied the sponsorship and passage of bills pertaining to women’s issues in three states: California, Illinois, and Maryland. She looked the gender makeup of their state legislatures in four specific years: 1969, 1979, 1989, and 1999. Bratton finds that the number of women in a legislature does not influence bill passage. This further complicates my question of how female legislators represent women’s interests, and whether a critical mass or cohesive group of women is really needed to bring about change. However, Bratton also finds that “as the number of women in the legislature grows, the potential for changes in the day-to-day lives of female citizens increases” (122). Assuming women do advocate for women’s issues, as the number of women rises, the number of bills relating to women’s issues will increase as well. Although Bratton’s work is useful for the debate of critical actions versus critical mass, she fails to account for other explanatory factors such as party. In my research I hoped to determine whether women are advocating for these types of bills because they hope to represent the interests of women specifically, or if they are simply aligning with the agenda of their party.

Arturo Vega and Juanity Firestone’s 1995 article "The Effects of Gender on

Congressional Behavior and the Substantive Representation of Women” questions whether women have had any substantive effect on women’s issues in the House of Representatives. The authors use Pitkin’s theories of representation, as well as theories on group cohesion and small group dynamics. They use data from a voting behavior study of the 97th through 102nd Congresses. The scholars find that party and ethnicity are much better predictors of voting behavior than gender, although they found one year that showed significant differences between the voting patterns of men and women. Women are representing women’s issues, but being a woman does not have as large an effect as previously predicted. These scholars present compelling findings that are very similar to my results. As these data are more than ten years old, I wanted to analyze similar data from more recent Congresses and discover whether or not the cohesiveness of women has changed.

Kira Sanbonmatsu and Kathleen Dolan’s article “Do Gender Stereotypes Transcend Party?” presents an intersectional study of gender and political party that looks at the role of public opinion (2008). The authors hypothesize that within a political party, voters will view male and female candidates as having different ideologies. They used a telephone survey to examine what they call “ideology stereotype.” Their goal was to find out if voters perceived women as having more liberal views on issues such as abortion. They find that gender stereotypes on certain issues transcend party lines. These stereotypes are more beneficial for Democratic women, and could possibly be barriers for electing Republican women. One possible explanation for this is that women are generally perceived to be less conservative than men, even among Republicans. This article has implications for my research because public opinion plays a vital role in the representation of women. It is important to understand not just how women are being represented through policy, but if they feel that their voice is being heard. How women think

they are being represented has many implications for policy because people will vote for candidates who they believe have their best interests in mind. If women believe that female legislators are fairly representing them, they will continue to vote for them and the number of women in Congress will grow. However, if women do not believe that female politicians are representing their interests, they may not be motivated to give them their vote.

Karin Tamerius's article "Sex, Gender and Leadership in the Representation of Women" (1995) helped me understand the different types of substantive representation. This article asks the question, "are women in public office more supportive of women's issues than their male counterparts?" Tamerius theorizes that levels of support, commitment, awareness and expertise will have an affect on political action. She looks at four measures of legislative action— roll call voting, co-sponsorship, speeches, and sponsorship. Her findings come from the behavior of 24 female and 24 male representatives in the 101st Congress. She finds a small difference in the role call voting of men and women, but finds the most pronounced differences in speeches and sponsorship. Tamerius concludes that voting is not an ideal measure of favorability toward women's issues because it requires such a low level of political involvement. She suggests that scholars look at gender differences at high levels of leadership and more demanding legislative activities. Her work led me to the conclusion that in order to determine the effectiveness of individual women, it would be prudent to examine sponsorship and leadership roles, as well as voting records. Such data hopefully can help us understand which type of representation is most effective.

Michelle Swer's book *The Difference Women Make* employs very similar research and theoretical methods as my work. Swers uses Pitkin and similar theories of representation to better understand how women act in Congress. Swers' data focus on the House of

Representatives in the 103rd and 104th Congresses (36). Swers examines sponsorship data as well as the specific sponsorship of amendments. She also investigates other independent variables besides gender such as party and state Presidential votes (84). Through these data Swers determines that being a woman in Congress does make a difference. According to her data, women will advocate for other women through sponsorship and roll-call votes. My thesis will expand on the work done by Swers, covering more Congresses and focusing on the Senate instead of the House. Swers' work serves as a model for my own work; together, our data should give us a more complete picture of how women act in the U.S. Congress.

Gaps in Literature

The works that I have reviewed give us many ideas about the representation of women in the legislature, but scholars disagree about the ways that women act. While some argue that a greater number of women leads to more effective representation, others view individual actions as the driving force behind these measures. Further, other scholars question whether or not women actually act differently from men at all. What is missing from this arena is a more complete look at how women act at different levels of representation, and an examination of how women's representation deviates from party representation. Using Tamerius's stratification of legislative activity, I hope to determine at which levels women directly advocate for the needs of their female constituents. Tamerius and other scholars suggest that more in-depth data must be collected on empirical activities in Congress, and that is what I plan to do.

These works provided a platform for my research design, but the question cannot be answered simply with theory. Although from the outside it may appear that women act a certain way in the legislature, more extensive data are needed to form conclusions. My data serve to examine how women act both individually and as group. The data will attempt to build on the

theories of critical mass and critical actions by demonstrating how actors vote and lead within Congress. Although I cannot draw any solid conclusions as to which model the women of Congress have followed, my thesis will advance this scholarly debate and enhance our knowledge of what it means to be a modern-day woman who holds elected office.

It is important to note that some authors have used voting and sponsorship data in their studies. This is not a new or original concept. However, the type of evidence we get from my data has not been used directly to address theories of representation in the Senate and compare the two theories. Further, most articles use similar data to compare two subsequent sessions or sessions within a short period of time. My data covers a much longer period, almost twenty years, which gives us a more complete picture of how women's representation has evolved over time. My data are unique because they cover Congressional sessions that include varying levels of women, as well as different political landscapes, Presidents, and majorities. These data may be present in some types of scholarly works, but my specific project fills the need for data to analyze these particular theories of representation.

Overview of My Project

Using the theories of the scholars noted above, my work seeks to enhance our understanding of how female members of Congress represent the needs of women. I used the theories of critical mass and critical actions to look at the role of women's sheer numbers and women's individual actions. My thesis explores whether women as a group or individual women are more important for passing women-friendly legislation in the Senate.

Interestingly, most studies of women's political representation are done in other countries. There is a lack of data on representation in the United States. This is likely because other nations have a greater proportion of women in the legislature and therefore a larger

sample size. These studies have provided insightful background for my research as well as models to guide me. For example, Manon Tremblay and Réjean Pelletier's article concluded that individual ideology and leadership is more important than the number of women in Canada. My goal was to find data that would either support or refute these claims using the U.S. model. It is difficult to apply these theories to the U.S. Congress simply because of the small number of women, but this could potentially be an advantage because it is easier to see the impacts of individual women. Further, I believe that action within the government is a better measure of representation than public opinion data. The public may have a position on how women should or could act, but Congressional data show us what politicians actually do. Actions speak louder than words, and prove how a politician is committed to a cause.

To examine critical mass in Congress, I chose to analyze roll call voting behavior because voting demonstrates how members vote (or do not vote) as a cohesive unit or group. It is important to note that we do not know what number a "critical mass" would be in the Senate. The theorists were very clear that there is no set number or percentage that equates to a critical mass, but there are ways for minorities to gain influence before they reach proportional representation. Because we are not sure what that tipping point is or whether we have reached it, I am using the theory more generally to look at women as a collective mass rather than at their "critical" mass. Voting behavior helps us look at the role of the number of women in Congress as a collective unit. These data shows if women vote together as a group. We do not know what a critical mass would be, but we can explore the possible linear correlation between the number of women in the Senate and voting behavior. It is also important to note that voting is just one way to explore the power of women as a group, but it is not the only way. Women may work together in ways that are difficult to quantify or record. This is a critical limitation of my research and the

data I have access to, but I hope to learn more about collective women using the data available to me.

To explore critical actions, I chose to investigate bill sponsorship. Sponsorship is an important and prominent act of leadership taken by an individual member. These data identify the members who are taking these kinds of critical actions, and how gender affects the types of bills introduced. Such data tell us if there is a correlation between the number of women's issue bills sponsored and the number of women in the Senate. The data also helps us understand if women are the ones taking these critical actions, or if other members are taking leadership.

I compared these two data sets to determine which model best aligns with our Congressional system. When we have a better understanding of how women act and how their numbers affect the women's agenda, we can use this information to make future legislative change. A better understanding of how Congressional women act will inform the actions and strategies of legislators and interest groups.

When I first began this project, I examined one Congress, the 111th, to test whether or not there was any difference in the way that men and women act. I used the information from this Congress as a test model to create the rest of my project. From this small set of data I discovered that information on the Senate was much more intriguing and useful than my data in the House. Because there is so much turnover of membership in the House, representatives are much more subject to political and re-election pressures. Further, there are so many members in the House (435) that each individual member does not have as much of a voice. In contrast, each Senator plays an important role in making legislation. Many Senate bills are determined by only a few votes, meaning that every member's voice has a significant impact. Based on this small data set, I decided to continue my project with a closer exploration of the Senate. I chose five Senate

sessions over a period of twenty years, which gave me a broad picture of how the increase in the number of women has affected the way that women act and the type of legislation produced. All of my data are taken from five Senate sessions, the 111th (2009-2010), 110th (2007-2008), 108th (2003-2004), 103rd (1993-1994) and 102nd (1991-1992). My data did not give us a full picture of either theory, but the project was worthwhile because it gave us a clearer picture of women's individual and collective actions, and suggestions for further research in areas of representation.

Definition of Women's Issues

Before I can explain and analyze my data, I must first define the terms and parameters I will use in my evidence. It is important to note that this is my personal definition, and may not reflect the views of all women. My definition focuses on progressive policies that promote choice and equality for all. Nearly every article on theories about women has an explanation of the author's definition of a "women's issue." There are two main theories regarding this definition. The first theory defines women's issues as issues pertaining to the traditional gender roles of women. As Beth Reingold explains, "defined in traditional notions of gender, women's issues span a wide range of concerns related to women's domestic and public roles as caregivers and nurturers: anything having to do with children, families, education, health care, the welfare of the poor and needy, and the environment" (164). These issues certainly still fall under the category of women's issues. However, the second theory expands on this to include a modern feminist definition. According to Reingold, "feminist-defined women's issues do not simply address the status and material well-being of women; they *promote* the status and material well-being of women in ways that feminists advocate" (166). Bills included under this theory would not only pertain to women advocating for their families, but also women advocating for equality

and the advancement of women's rights. Further, Childs and Krook propose, "women's issues may be regarded as constructed by those actors who claim to represent women" (133).

Because these varying theories make it difficult to define one set of parameters, in my research I will use a broad definition of women's issues that incorporates both of these theories. For my data, the best definition is one that Childs and Krook propose. Under their parameters, women's issue bills "capture a broader range of issues affecting women's everyday lives" (133). It is important to keep a part of the original definition because women are still closely connected to children and their families. Bills focused on child or family issues would certainly have an effect on the lives of women. Most obviously, bills that affect women's work or home environments directly also would be included.

To better understand my parameters, some examples may be helpful. When the general public thinks of women's issues, they often immediately think of bills related to health and care giving. However, for my data I will not qualify every health-related bill as a women's bill. If a bill has a specific connection to the health of women or children I will define it as a women's bill. However, if a bill relates to another health matter such as health insurance, it would not fall under my definition. I understand that any bill may have implications for women and their families, but to keep my data focused I will only include instances where those connections are obvious and direct. Further, there are some women's issue bills that fall under categories not traditionally associated with women. For instance, some crime and law enforcement bills contain sections related to child abuse, domestic violence, or rape laws. These are not women's "issue" bills because women are not traditionally associated with these arenas, but the bills have direct consequences for the well being of women and children.

I attempted to choose my data as objectively as possible, although I know that these choices are inherently subjective. Because I chose my data by hand it is impossible to impose unbiased strict standards for these definitions, but I have done my best to define criteria for bills that will best answer my question. The data presented in the next section focuses on bills that have a direct affect on women's lives and wellbeing. For some parts of my data and analysis I have divided my data into two categories: direct and general women's bills. The general bills are defined by the broader understanding of traditional women's issues. These bills focus on issues of children and families but do not specifically mention women. In contrast, the direct women's bills have much clearer connections to the daily lives of women. For each session I have outlined the bills I feel are most important for women, but it is important to remember the limitations of my personal choices.

Voting Data Methods

The first level of data I collected was information on voting patterns. To understand voting behavior, I compiled tables (Appendix A) stratified by each voting member of the Senate for each session included in the study. For each session, I compiled voting data for all the bills pertaining to women's issues. I also have included some bills not traditionally associated with women to have some controls for my data. It is important to note that the bills in this data set are ones that went to a roll call vote. The majority of bills in Congress do not make it out of committee, and if they are, they are agreed to by voice vote. Voice votes occur for bills that are generally not controversial and have a wide base of support. Individual votes are not recorded for voice votes. In contrast, some bills are more formally voted on, in a process call a roll call vote. Each Senator is called upon to voice their vote publicly, and these votes are recorded. Generally, a simple majority is needed to pass a vote by roll call. Only a small portion of bills that are

introduced get as far as a roll call vote. However, these are the bills deemed most important by Congress, so in theory they should be the ones to which we devote our attention.

In addition to the bills, I have compiled other information about the Senators. Also on my data set is voting data from the Presidential election that is closest to that session. I obtained election data from the American Presidency Project. For each state, I recorded the percentage of the population that voted for the Democratic candidate. The data set for each session is ordered from most to least liberal. These data give us insight into the current political landscape of that session. Although we know that empirically Senators may not always represent their constituents, this information serves as a marker to help us understand how constituents would like the Senator to act. For example, if a moderate Republican represents a state where the majority of people voted for the liberal Presidential candidate, we could hypothesize that the Senator will more likely vote with the Democrats, or more generally the liberal perspective. Further, I included columns for party and gender so that we can clearly see how these stratifications affect voting patterns.

After I collected these data, I also ran a multivariate linear regression analysis to determine which factor or factors are the strongest predictor of voting outcomes. I translated my data into numerical values to calculate the relationship between the percentage of liberal votes cast by each Senator and their party, gender and level of liberalism in their state (Appendix B). To calculate the level of liberalism, I created a ratio of Presidential Democratic to Republican votes for each session in which the member participated. I used the Presidential election that was closest to the dates of each session. I then averaged the ratios for all sessions each member was present to come up with a single indicator of the level of liberalism in their state. Although the political climate in each state changed drastically in the nearly twenty-year period that this data

covers, this average ratio demonstrates the general state of the constituency. For the columns for party and gender, I used binary values (0 and 1) to code for Republican (0)/ Democrat(1) and male(0)/ female(1). To come up with a comprehensive assessment of voting patterns, I looked at each Senator's votes for all sessions they were members of the Senate. I then calculated the percentage of those votes that were in line with the liberal position. I excluded abstentions because they do not tell us anything about voting behavior. For this calculation I followed the assumption that a liberal vote was a vote to support women. This is not to say that only Democrats sponsor bills that are pro-women, but my definition of a progressive women's issue best aligns with the liberal agenda. Because some Senators served in all five sessions while others only voted for two or three bills, I created a weighting factor for the regression analysis. I created a separate column with the number of votes cast by each member. This weighting factor ensures that the percentages for Senators with more votes are given more weight. The longer a member is in Congress, the more valuable the data on their behavior. This analysis yielded an R-squared value that tells us how effective these factors are at predicting votes. I also ran separate analyses for each independent variable (gender, party, liberal ratio) to find correlations between each of the values.

Voting Data Results

Table 1A. 111th Senate Bills

Vote	Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act	Family Smoking Prevention and Tobacco Control Act	Helping Families Save their Homes Act	Children's Health Insurance Program Reauthorization Act	Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act	FDA Food Safety Modernization Act	Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act	Serve America Act
GOP yea	0 (0%)	23 (59%)	35 (88%)	8 (20%)	4 (10%)	15 (38%)	0 (0%)	21 (53%)
GOP nay	39 (100%)	16 (41%)	5 (12%)	32 (80%)	36 (90%)	25 (62%)	40 (100%)	19 (47%)
Dem yea	58 (100%)	54 (98%)	54 (100%)	56 (100%)	55 (100%)	56 (100%)	54 (95%)	56 (100%)
Dem nay	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (5%)	0 (0%)
GOP Women yea	0 (0%)	4 (100%)	4 (100%)	4 (100%)	4 (4%)	3 (75%)	0 (0%)	4 (100%)
GOP Women nay	4 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)	4 (4%)	0 (0%)
Dem Women yea	17 (100%)	16 (94%)	17 (100%)	17 (100%)	17 (100%)	17 (100%)	17 (100%)	17 (100%)
Dem Women nay	0 (0%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

Table 2A. 110th Senate Bills

Vote	Children's Health Insurance Program Reauthorization Act	College Cost Reduction and Access Act	Fair Minimum Wage Act
GOP yea	16 (35%)	28 (61%)	44 (94%)
GOP nay	30 (65%)	18 (39%)	3 (6%)
Dem yea	46 (100%)	48 (100%)	48 (100%)
Dem nay	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
GOP Women yea	4 (80%)	5 (100%)	5 (5%)
GOP Women nay	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Dem Women yea	11 (100%)	11 (11%)	11 (100%)
Dem Women nay	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

Table 3A. 108th Senate Bills

Vote	Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act	Laci and Connor's Law	Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act	Prescription Drug and Medicare Improvement Act
GOP yea	48 (94%)	48 (96%)	50 (100%)	40 (80%)
GOP nay	3 (6%)	2 (4%)	0 (0%)	10 (20%)
Dem yea	16 (36%)	13 (27%)	45 (96%)	35 (76%)
Dem nay	29 (64%)	35 (73%)	2 (4%)	11 (24%)
GOP Women yea	3 (60%)	4 (80%)	5 (5%)	5 (100%)
GOP Women nay	2 (40%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Dem Women yea	2 (22%)	1 (11%)	8 (89%)	8 (89%)
Dem Women nay	7 (78%)	8 (89%)	1 (11%)	1 (11%)

Table 4A. 103rd Senate Bills

Vote	Improving America's Schools Act	Freedom of Access of Clinic Entrances	Family and Medical Leave Act	Goals 2000: Educate America Act	School-to-Work Opportunities Act
GOP yea	40 (87%)	20 (43%)	18 (42%)	19 (43%)	13 (30%)
GOP nay	6 (13%)	26 (57%)	25 (58%)	25 (57%)	30 (70%)
Dem yea	54 (100%)	49 (92%)	53 (96%)	52 (100%)	49 (98%)
Dem nay	0 (0%)	4 (8%)	2 (4%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)
GOP Women yea	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)
GOP Women nay	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Dem Women yea	5 (100%)	5 (100%)	5 (100%)	5 (100%)	4 (100%)
Dem Women nay	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

Table 5A. 102nd Senate

Vote	Neighborhood Schools Improvement Act	Child Abuse, Domestic Violence, Adoption and Family Services Act	Biden-Thurmond Crime Control Act
GOP yea	37 (86%)	42 (100%)	26 (62%)
GOP nay	6 (14%)	0 (0%)	16 (38%)
Dem yea	55 (100%)	54 (100%)	45 (82%)
Dem nay	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	10 (18%)
GOP Women yea	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
GOP Women nay	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Dem Women yea	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
Dem Women nay	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

In the 111th Senate, which took place in 2009 and 2010, there were 17 women: four Republicans and thirteen Democrats. This session had a Democratic majority and a Democratic President, Barack Obama. For this Senate, I analyzed voting data for eight pieces of legislation (Table 1A). All eight bills passed the Senate, and seven of them became law. Six of the bills were related to family and children's issues, one bill was related to the military, and one was related directly to the women's agenda. The women's bill was the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act (S. 181), a bill that banned businesses from penalizing workers from obtaining salary information about other employees. The bill is named after a woman who was severely underpaid because of her gender, but was unable to file a claim because she was informed of the pay gap too late to receive proper compensation (National Women's Law Center 2013). The bill amended the civil rights act to extend the amount of time that employees can file claims for underpayment (National Women's Law Center 2013). Because there are only four GOP women in this Congress, their votes gave me great insight into voting patterns. Except for one bill, the four GOP women voted as a block, often aligning with the Democratic women. The only vote where the GOP women did not vote together was the FDA Food Safety Modernization Act (S. 510). Kay Hutchison (R-TX) was the only woman to vote no on the bill. This bill imposed stricter standards on food regulation to ensure the safety of the public. I included this bill because it is a major public health bill that falls under the general category of a feminine issue. Fifteen Republicans did vote for the bill, so support was fairly bipartisan. The GOP women voted for most of the women and family legislation, but there were two bills in particular in which they significantly deviated from their party. All four women voted for the Children's Health Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2009 (S. 279), while only eight GOP members total voted for the bill. It appears that women deviated from their party to support the health of children. These

four women were also the only Republicans to vote for the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act. The Lilly Ledbetter law was the only piece of women's issue legislation introduced by a woman that went to a roll call vote in this session. The bill was sponsored by Senator Barbara Mikulski (D-MD). For the rest of the bills in this session the women voted as a block, but the bills were very bi-partisan so none of the women were necessarily deviating from their party.

The other five bills I looked at during this session did not give me any significant results or insight into how women vote. However, they were still important for my overall analysis. The first bill was the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (H.R. 3590) popularly known as Obamacare. The second bill was the Family Smoking Prevention and Tobacco Control Act (H.R. 1256), which helped keep families healthy. Another piece of legislation, the Helping Families Save their Homes Act (H.R. 1106), helped low-income families keep their housing. The next bill was the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act (H.R. 4872), a comprehensive bill that extended health care coverage and increased college grants. The last bill was the Serve America Act (H.R. 1388), which extended current community service and volunteer programs. These bills were all indirectly related to women because they covered a wide variety of health, education, and family issues, arenas traditionally associated with women. Overall, women in the Senate voted favorably for women's legislation. The Lilly Ledbetter law was by far the strongest piece of pro-feminist legislation, and the voting patterns of the GOP women suggest that they may deviate from their party to support these types of women's issues.

In the 110th Senate, which took place in 2007 and 2008, there were only three bills related to women or traditionally female issues (Table 2A). I used the same 2008 Presidential election data as the 111th session. This Senate had 16 women, five Republicans and eleven Democrats. All three bills passed the Senate but only two became law. The GOP women mostly voted

together, except on the Children's Health Insurance Program Reauthorization Act (H.R. 3963). Elizabeth Dole (R-NC) was the only GOP woman to vote no, even though the bill was moderately bipartisan, with 16 GOP members total voting yes. The other two bills, the College Cost Reduction and Access Act (H.R. 2669) and the Fair Minimum Wage Act (H.R. 2), were both very bi-partisan. The College Cost Reduction and Access Act was a general women's bill because it focused on issues of education and social welfare. The Fair Minimum Wage Act was an important piece of legislation to raise the national minimum wage. This bill was especially important for women because women are more likely to be underpaid and work minimum wage jobs. The bill would have ensured that both men and women earn a "living wage" so that they can adequately care for themselves and their families. Only three Senators total voted no on the Fair Minimum Wage Act, implying that labor policies may be important to both parties, at least in certain circumstances. However, even though the bill passed the Senate it did not become law.

Although these were the only important roll call votes, there were some other bills related to women and families that were agreed to or passed by voice vote. Those bills are the Protect Our Children Act (S. 1378), Newborn Screening Saves Lives Act (S. 1858), and the KIDS Act (S. 431). None of the relevant bills in this session were sponsored by women, but they were all sponsored by Democrats. Further, it is important to note that this session of Congress took place during a Presidential election year, meaning votes and bills presented may be slightly different, or less controversial from other sessions.

The next Senate I looked at was the 108th. I chose to include this session because I wanted a sample under a Republican President with a Republican majority in the Senate. This session took place in 2003 and 2004, while George W. Bush was President. This is the only Senate I looked at where the Republicans had a majority. There were fourteen women total, nine

Democrats and five Republicans. For this Senate I examined four bills, one related to education, one about medicine, one regarding violence and one about abortion (Table 3A). All four bills passed the Senate, and three became law. Two of these bills had significant results for my research question. The first bill of interest is the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act (S. 3), sponsored by Senator Rick Santorum (R-PA). This bill prohibited women from having a “partial-birth abortion,” a political term for a type of late-term abortion procedure (Rovner 2006). Under this bill, this act would only be allowed if it were necessary to save the life of the mother. The Democratic women and GOP women were both split in their votes. Seven Democratic women voted no, while two voted yes. The two who voted yes were Blanche Lincoln (D-AR) and Mary Landrieu (D-LA). It is important to note that both these women come from fairly conservative states. 16 Democrats in total voted for the bill, almost all of them coming from moderately to very conservative states, according to the Presidential votes in their state. In the GOP, three of the women, Elizabeth Dole (R-NC), Kay Hutchison (R-TX) and Lisa Murkowski (R-AK) voted yes. The two Republican women from Maine, Olympia Snowe and Susan Collins, both voted no. There was only one other GOP member who voted no, Lincoln Chaffee (R-RI). Looking at the votes of all these women, there seems to be a clear divide between the progressive states and conservative states, regardless of the party or gender of the Senators. This vote shows some women deviating from their parties, but the general politics of their geographic region may have also been a factor.

The other interesting vote was on Laci and Conner’s Law (H.R. 1997), officially known as the Unborn Victims of Violence Act. This bill “Provides that persons who commit certain Federal violent crimes and thereby cause the death of, or bodily injury to, a child who is in utero shall be guilty of a separate offense” (Library of Congress 2003). The law was sponsored by

Representative Melissa Hart (R-PA). For this vote, the women had mixed votes in both parties. All of the Democratic women voted no except for one, Mary Landrieu (D-LA). Thirteen Democratic members total voted for the bill. All of the GOP women voted yes except for one, Olympia Snowe (R-ME). Snowe was one of only two Republicans to vote no on the bill. The other Senator to vote no was Lincoln Chaffee (R-RI), who also voted with the Democrats on the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act. These votes generally align with regional political climates. Mary Landrieu voted with the Southern majority, while Snowe and Chaffee voted with the North.

The other bills I looked at for this session were the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (H.R. 1350), an education bill, and the Prescription Drug and Medicare Improvement Act (H.R. 1). The latter bill was not a women's bill but a control to see how members vote on a non-gendered, non-ideological bill. Other bills that were passed by agreement or voice vote include the Prevention of Child Abduction Partnership Act (S. 2883), A Bill to Reauthorize Certain School Lunch and Nutrition Programs (S. 2241) and the Keeping Children and Families Safe Act (H.R. 14). From the votes in this session it appears that women may not always align with their party on women's issues. However, regional political climates may play a large role in the voting behavior of Senators.

The next Congress was the 103rd, which took place in 1993 and 1994. This session is significant because it took place right after the "year of the woman" in 1992, an election year where a record number of women were elected into public office. I was curious to see if this dramatic influx of women would have an effect on the types of legislation introduced and passed in the Senate. During this session, Bill Clinton was President and the Democrats had a majority in the Senate. There were seven women total, five Democrats and two Republicans, Nancy

Kassebaum (R-KS) and Kay Hutchison (R-TX). For this session, I examined five bills (Table 4A). Three of those bills were related to education, while the other two were more directly related to the needs of women. All five bills passed the Senate and became law. The first, the Freedom of Access of Clinic Entrances Act (S. 636), was introduced by Senator Ted Kennedy (D-MA). The bill protected the rights of anyone who wishes to enter a clinic to obtain reproductive health services. The bill prohibits “intentionally injuring, intimidating, or interfering with, or attempting to injure, intimidate, or interfere, any person by force, threat of force, or physical obstruction because that person is or has been... obtaining or providing reproductive health services” (Library of Congress 1994). Along with all of the Democratic women, both of the GOP women voted yes on the bill. However, 20 GOP members, 43%, voted yes on the bill. This indicates that these women may not have really been deviating from their party, although they did all support the women’s agenda.

The Family and Medical Leave Act (H.R. 1) was the second interesting bill in this session. This is an extremely important bill that immensely expanded working women’s rights and was a huge success for the feminist movement. The Family and Medical Leave Act mandates that employers provide their employees with at least twelve weeks of job-guaranteed leave. This is meant specifically for maternity leave, but can also be taken to care for a sick family member. The leave does not have to be paid, but a worker’s job must be protected. The bill was introduced by Representative William Ford (D-MI). While the Democratic women all voted yes, the GOP women were split. Kay Hutchison voted yes, while Nancy Kassebaum voted no. 18 Republicans voted yes on the bill, so it was a fairly bipartisan vote. Kassebaum is generally more conservative than Hutchison so these results are not surprising. From these two

bills it appears that female Senators could be slightly more likely to vote for women's issues, although regional bias may again play a part.

The other three roll call bills I looked at were not as significant but give us an overall picture of the session. These bills were the Improving America's Schools Act (H.R. 6), the Goals 2000: Educate America Act (H.R. 1804) and the School-to-Work Opportunities Act (H.R. 2884). All three of these bills were related to education and not directly to women. In addition to these bills there were a few more pieces of relevant legislation that passed by agreement or voice vote. These included the Human Services Amendments (H.R. 4250) and the Federal Employees Leave Sharing Amendment Act (H.R. 4361). These bills worked to improve and support family life. Overall, there were some differences in legislation when the number of women greatly increased.

The last session I looked at was the 102nd, which took place in 1991 and 1992. I wanted to see if there were significant differences in legislation before and after the "year of the woman." Republican George H.W. Bush was President during this session, although the Democrats had a majority in the Senate. In this Senate there were two women, Democrat Barbara Mikulski (D-MD) and Republican Nancy Kassebaum (R-KS). For this session I reviewed three bills relating to education and violence but there were no roll call bills in this session that focused directly on women's rights (Table 5A). All three of the bills passed the Senate, but only two became law. The first bill of interest was the Neighborhood Schools Improvement Act (S. 2), which was sponsored by Senator Ted Kennedy (D-MA). Both women in the Senate voted yes on the bill. However, only six members total voted no, making this an extremely bipartisan vote. The second bill I examined was the Child Abuse, Domestic Violence, Adoption and Family Service Act (S. 838), sponsored by Senator Chris Dodd (D-CT). This was a comprehensive bill to fight child abuse and support adoption programs. The vote was unanimous, with no members

voting no. The third bill was the Biden-Thurmond Violent Crime Control Act (S. 1241), sponsored by Senator Joe Biden (D-DE). This bill was a comprehensive crime bill that included measures related to child abuse, juvenile criminals, and kidnapping. This vote was slightly less bipartisan, with 62% of the Republicans voting for the bill. Both women in the Senate voted yes, neither significantly deviating from their parties.

In addition to those bills, there were two relevant bills that did not go through roll call vote, the Childhood Nutrition Assistance Act (S. 2875), sponsored by Senator Patrick Leahy, and the Nontraditional Employment for Women Act (S. 367), sponsored by Senator Howard Metzenbaum (D-OH). The latter bill served to increase training programs for women in industries where women make up less than 25% of the workforce (Library of Congress 1991). The bill passed by voice vote. From an analysis of the roll call and voice votes in this session it seems that the female Senators did not take any significant actions on behalf of women. With only two women in this session it is difficult to make generalizations about how women were represented, but they do not appear to have deviated from their party to support gendered issues. However, there is a stark contrast between this Congress and the 103rd Congress. There is a possible correlation between the great increase in female Senators and the type of legislation passed. The number of female Senators tripled between these two sessions, and there was an increase in women and family-friendly legislation. This correlation does not necessarily mean that the increase of women caused the change in legislation, but this Senate's actions suggest that a having greater number of women Senators does make a difference.

Regression Results

Table 1B. Summary of Results

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.298 ^a	.089	.075	2.36294

a. Predictors: (Constant), Ratio Average, Female, Party

b. Dependent Variable: % liberal votes

c. Weighted Least Squares Regression - Weighted by total votes

Table 2B. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

ANOVA^{a,b}

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	107.795	3	35.932	6.435	.000 ^c
	Residual	1105.530	198	5.583		
	Total	1213.325	201			

a. Dependent Variable: % liberal votes

b. Weighted Least Squares Regression - Weighted by total votes

c. Predictors: (Constant), Ratio Average, Female, Party

Table 3B. Coefficients

Coefficients^{a,b}

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.445	.154		2.881	.004
	Female	-.073	.164	-.030	-.442	.659
	Ratio Average	.050	.143	.027	.352	.725
	Party	.445	.121	.286	3.688	.000

a. Dependent Variable: % liberal votes

b. Weighted Least Squares Regression - Weighted by total votes

Table 4B. Variable Correlations

		Correlations ^a			
		% liberal votes	Female	Party	Ratio Average
Pearson Correlation	% liberal votes	1.000	.010	.296	.162
	Female	.010	1.000	.127	.129
	Party	.296	.127	1.000	.482
	Ratio Average	.162	.129	.482	1.000
Sig. (1-tailed)	% liberal votes	.	.446	.000	.011
	Female	.446	.	.036	.034
	Party	.000	.036	.	.000
	Ratio Average	.011	.034	.000	.
N	% liberal votes	202	202	202	202
	Female	202	202	202	202
	Party	202	202	202	202
	Ratio Average	202	202	202	202

a. Weighted Least Squares Regression - Weighted by total votes

The multivariate linear regression yielded interesting results that do not support a correlation between gender and voting patterns. However, the results do indicate the all three variables together (gender, party, and level of liberalism in the state) have some correlation with the percentage of a Senator’s liberal votes. The ANOVA model (Table 2B) tells us that the regression is statistically significant, and therefore the data we gleaned are valid for our analysis. The adjusted R-squared value of the model is 0.075, indicating that 7.5% of the variance in the percentage of liberal votes can be explained by the three variables (Table 1B). This is not a large portion of the data, but indicates that there is some connection between the variables. Looking at the coefficients in the analysis, party (being a Democrat) is the only statistically significant independent variable (Table 3B). This means that the relationship between being female and voting behavior is not explained by this model. The coefficient model in Table 3B tells us we can predict that Democrats will vote for the liberal position 91% of the time, and Republicans will

cast a liberal vote 45% of the time. Although these numbers are interesting, they do not tell us anything about the specific role of women.

When we look closer at the model, the breakdown of correlations between each of the variables (Table 4B) informs us of the relationships among different factors. Although the correlation between voting and being female is not statistically significant, the results have important implications for my work. This model informs us that the correlation is 0.010, which is extremely low. Being female does not suggest that Senators are more likely to cast a liberal vote. The correlation between being female and being a Democrat is also interesting, at 0.127. Party and ratio average (of Democratic Presidential votes in a state) are strongly correlated with the percent of liberal votes, 0.296 and 0.162 respectively, but these results are not surprising. Overall, the results from the regression analysis suggest that the three factors may be related and together have some correlation with voting behavior, but being a woman does not directly influence voting patterns.

Sponsorship Data Methods

In addition to voting data, I have also examined sponsorship data for the five sessions. The voting data gave me information on the collective voices of female Senators, but sponsorship gives me insight into leadership and individual action. I wanted to know if women are sponsoring women's legislation at higher rates than men, and whether these bills are getting passed. Further, the party introducing women's legislation will help us understand whether women's legislation is disproportionately introduced by a particular group. This data will also help us determine if men play a significant role in advancing women's issues and supporting the women's agenda.

I compiled two sets of sponsorship data for each session (Appendix C). For the first set I

created a spreadsheet of all women's issue bills for each session of Congress. Using Library of Congress data, I read through bills for each session. Because every session had between 10,000 and 20,000 total bills introduced, I narrowed my data to bills that were put to floor consideration. This criterion ensures that the bills were given significant consideration. The majority of bills do not come out of committee to the floor, so these bills were all deemed viable and important by members. I went through all bills that made it to the floor for each session, and recorded bills that were related to women or women's issues. For each relevant bill, I recorded the sponsor, party of the sponsor, issue that the bill was concerned with, and how far the bill went through Congress. It is important to note that the bills I reviewed were only ones introduced by members of the Senate. Bills are often considered in both chambers, but for the purpose of this project I wanted to focus on leadership among Senate members. It may appear that some important bills are excluded from this data set, but those bills were originally introduced by members of the House and therefore are not relevant to this project.

For the second set of data, I looked at all of the bills sponsored by women in each session. I used the same floor consideration criteria so that I would have comparable results to the original data set. For this set I recorded all bills sponsored by each female member, whether the bill was a women's issue bill, and how far the bill went. Not every female member is included on these sets because not all of them sponsored bills in each session, or their bills did not move out of committee.

Using these data, I created tables displaying how many bills out of the total bills were related to women's issues, how far those bills went, and who sponsored them (male, female, Democrat, Republican). I also compiled data on the percentage of legislation introduced by women that were women's issues bills, and how far in Congress these bills went compared to the

general set of bills. This data helped me understand who is leading the women’s agenda in the Senate and whether women really do advocate for women more than men.

Sponsorship Data Results

The following five tables summarize my findings, although I will go into more detail on each session and my specific results. Table 1C gives a general overview of the bills considered and how far they went in Congress. Table 2C breaks down sponsorship for women’s issue bills. Table 3C goes into more detail on the gender and party make-up of the women’s issue bills. Table 4C focuses on legislation sponsored by female Senators. Table 5C examines legislation sponsored by men. Unless otherwise noted in this section, the bills I will refer to are bills that reached floor consideration. The results of my data are as follows:

Table 1C. Total Bills and Members

Session	Total Bills Sponsored	Bills Sponsored by Women	Total Bills that went to floor	Women’s Issue Bills	Total Bills that Became Law	Women’s Bills that Became Law	Total Women in Session
111 th	4059	862 (21.4%)	219	17 (7.8%)	112 (51.1%)	10 (58.8%)	17 (17%)
110th	3741	787 (21.0%)	338	24 (7.1%)	134 (39.6%)	9 (37.5%)	16 (16%)
108th	3035	575 (18.9%)	456	24 (5.3%)	142 (31.1%)	7 (29.2%)	14 (14%)
103rd	2569	130 (5.0%)	364	16 (4.4%)	111 (30.5%)	5 (31.3%)	7 (7%)
102nd	3390	53 (1.6%)	479	20 (4.2%)	131 (27.3%)	6 (30%)	2 (2%)
Total	16,794	2407 (14.3%)	1856	101 (5.4%)	630 (33.9%)	37 (36.6%)	56 (11.2%)

Table 2C. Women’s Issue Bills

Session	Women’s Issue Bills	Direct Women’s Bills (% of all women’s issue bills)	WI Bills Sponsored by Women	WI Bills Sponsored by Men	WI Bills Sponsored by Dems	WI Bills Sponsored by Republicans
111th	17 (6.8%)	4 (23.5%)	7 (41.2%)	10 (58.8%)	15 (88.2%)	2 (11.8%)
110th	24 (7.1%)	3 (12.5%)	3 (12.5%)	21 (87.4%)	18 (75%)	6 (25%)
108th	24 (4.8%)	6 (25%)	7 (22.7%)	17 (77.3%)	5 (20.8%)	19 (79.2%)
103rd	16 (4.4%)	2 (12.5%)	0 (0%)	16 (100%)	11 (68.8%)	5 (31.3%)
102nd	20 (4.2%)	6 (30%)	0 (0%)	20 (100%)	18 (90%)	2 (10%)
Total	99 (5.3%)	21 (21.2%)	16 (16.2%)	84 (84.8%)	64 (66%)	33 (34%)

Table 3C. Women's Issue Bills cont.

Session	WI bills sponsored by Female Dems	WI Bills Sponsored by Female Republicans	WI Bills Sponsored by Male Dems	WI Bills Sponsored by Male Republicans
111 th	5 (29.4%)	2 (11.8%)	10 (58.8%)	0 (0%)
110th	2 (8.3%)	1 (4.2%)	16 (66.7%)	5 (20.8%)
108th	3 (12.5%)	4 (16.7%)	2 (11.8%)	15 (62.5%)
103rd	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	11 (68.7%)	5 (31.3%)
102nd	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	18 (90%)	2 (10%)
Total	10 (9.9%)	7 (6.9%)	57 (56.4%)	27 (26.7%)

Table 4C. Bills Sponsored by Women

Session	Bills Introduced by Women (% of total)	Women's Issue Bills	% Total Women's bills that became law	% Women's Issue Bills Sponsored by Women that Became Law
111th	46 (21.0%)	7 (15.2%)	29 (63.0%)	5 (71.4%)
110th	50 (14.8%)	3 (8.8%)	20 (40%)	1 (33.3%)
108 th	67 (14.7%)	7 (10.4%)	18 (26.9%)	0 (0%)
103rd	14 (3.8%)	0 (0%)	6 (42.8%)	N/A
102nd	1 (0.2%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	N/A
Total	178 (9.6%)	16 (9%)	66 (37.1%)	6 (37.5%)

Table 5C. Bills Sponsored by Men

Session	Bills Sponsored by Men	WI Bills Sponsored by Men (% of all men's bills)	Bills Sponsored by Men that Became Law	WI Bills Sponsored by Men that became law
111th	173 (79%)	10 (5.8%)	83 (37.9%)	4 (40%)
110th	288 (85.2%)	21 (7.3%)	114 (39.6%)	8 (38.1%)
108th	389 (85.3%)	17 (4.4%)	124 (31.9%)	7 (41.2%)
103rd	350 (96.2%)	16 (4.6%)	105 (94.6%)	5 (31.3%)
102rd	478 (99.8%)	20 (4.2%)	130 (99.2%)	6 (30%)
Total	1678 (90.4%)	84 (5%)	556 (33.1%)	30 (35.7%)

In the 111th Senate, women made up 17% of the total members. It was the session with the fewest number of bills to reach floor consideration, although it had a moderate number of women's issue bills (7.8%). Because this session had both a Democratic majority in the Senate and a Democratic President, 189 bills or 86.3% of the legislation, were sponsored by Democrats. Similarly, 88.2% of all women's legislation was sponsored by Democrats. Of the 17 women's issue bills in this session, only four of the bills directly impacted women. The first was A Bill to Award A Congressional Gold Metal to the Women Airforce Service Pilots (WASP) (S. 614) sponsored by Kay Hutchison (R-TX). This bill focused on honoring female soldiers, and became law. The second bill was the Improving Assistance to Domestic and Sexual Violence Victims Act of 2009 (S. 327), introduced by Patrick Leahy (D-VT), which did not become law. The last two bills focused on the rights of women in the workplace. The first was the Lily Ledbetter Fair Pay Act of 2009 (S. 181), which was discussed above in the "voting" section. The second women and work bill was the Paycheck Fairness Act (S. 3772), sponsored by Harry Reid (D-NV), which did not become law.

Of the bills sponsored by female Senators, the women sponsoring the most bills were Diane Feinstein (D-CA) who sponsored ten bills and Mary Landrieu (D-LA) who sponsored seven. Fifteen out of the 17 total female Senators in this session sponsored legislation that made it to floor consideration. In this session, the percentage of women's issue bills sponsored by women was also double that for women-sponsored bills in total— 15.2% compared to 7.8% (Tables 1C and 4C). However, out of the seven women's issue bills sponsored by women, only two were directly related to women. Those bills were the WASP and Lily Ledbetter bills mentioned above. Interestingly, 63% of bills sponsored by women became law, while only 51.1% of the total bills did (Tables 1C and 4C). This could potentially indicate that women do

exert specific influence in Congress because their critical actions were successful. Overall, this session had a significant number of bills sponsored by women, but it also had the most women in any session.

Although the 110th Congress did not have the greatest amount of women, this session had the greatest number of total women's issue legislation sponsored. During this session there was a Republican President, while the Senate had 49 Democrats and 49 Republicans, with two Democratic-leaning Independents. In this session there were 24 or 7.1% women's issue bills, both the highest number and the highest percentage of any session. Democrats sponsored 69.2% of all legislation in this session. The majority of the women's bills (75%) were also sponsored by Democrats. However, 87.4% of the women's bills were sponsored by men (Tables 2C and 3C). Of all the women's issue bills, three of them were directly related to women's everyday lives. The first was the Pregnant Women Support Act (S. 2407), sponsored by Senator Robert Casey (D-PA). This bill would provide pregnant women with greater access to pre-natal care and health information. The second bill was the National Breast and Cervical Cancer Early Detection Program Reauthorization Act of 2007 (S. 264), sponsored by Senator Barbara Mikulski (D-MD). This bill also supported health care specifically for women. The third bill was the Executive Branch Family Leave Act (S. 80), sponsored by Senator Ted Stevens (R-AK). This bill would have provided paid maternal leave to some women working in the federal government.

Of the 16 female Senators, 15 sponsored legislation that made it to floor consideration. Senator Diane Feinstein (D-CA) had the greatest number of sponsored bills, sponsoring 13. Of the three women's issue bills introduced by women, only one, Mikulski's breast and cervical cancer bill, related directly to women. However, a significant portion of bills introduced by women (40%) became law. The number was slightly lower for all bills, at 39.6%, and the

percentage of women's issue bills that became laws was even lower at 37.5% (Tables 1C and 4C). Although this session had the greatest amount of women's issue legislation, it does not appear that the female Senators played a significant role in bringing those issues to the floor of Congress. Women made up 16% of Congress, but only sponsored 12.5% of the women's issue legislation (Tables 1C and 2C). Further, only 8% of the legislation sponsored by women was women's issue legislation, which is relatively low considering their total numbers. This session did not follow the expected progression of the most recent three sessions I looked at, and is a possible outlier.

The 108th Congress had a large amount of legislation introduced, and was the only session examined that had a Republican President and Republican majority. In this session, 456 bills came to floor consideration, and there were 14 women in the Senate. Of all the legislation introduced, 24 or 5.3% of the total bills sponsored were women's issue bills. Of those bills, six were directly related to the wellbeing of women. The first two, both introduced by Senator Judd Gregg (R-NH), were the Pregnancy and Trauma Care Access Protection Act of 2004 (S. 2207) and the Healthy Mothers and Healthy Babies Access to Care Act of 2003 (S. 2061). The next bill, also related to women's health, was the Mammography Quality Standards Reauthorization Act of 2004 (S. 1879), sponsored by Barbara Mikulski (D-MD). The fourth bill, one of the most controversial I studied, was the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act of 2003 (S. 3), sponsored by Senator Rick Santorum (R-PA). This bill was also included in my voting data, and was voted by roll call vote to pass the Senate, eventually becoming law. The last two bills were both sponsored by Olympia Snowe (R-ME) and focused on women in small businesses. These bills were the Women's Sustainability Recovery Act of 2004 (S. 2267) and the Women's Business Centers Preservation Act of 2003 (S. 1247). It is interesting to note that of all the women's issue bills in

this session, only one bill was sponsored by a female Democrat. Further, the number of Democrats sponsoring women's legislation was the lowest of any session, at 20.8% (Table 2C). Democrats only sponsored 38.3% of the total legislation, much lower than any of the other sessions. This is likely because the Democrats did not have a majority in the session, and therefore not as much power to commit critical acts. Having a Republican majority translated into a very different picture of women's issue bills. Although men and women from various backgrounds sponsored women's legislation, the bills sponsored were not as progressive as in other sessions, even among Democratic members.

For this session, 13 out of 14 female Senators sponsored legislation that went to floor consideration. Of the 67 total bills the women sponsored, only seven were related to women's issues, and only three were directly related to women (see bills sponsored by Mikulski and Snowe above). It is also intriguing that women sponsored such a significant amount of legislation despite the largely Republican political landscape because there were only two Republican women in the session. However, this number of women's legislation did not translate into a significant number of women's issue laws. Women sponsored many different types of legislation, but none of their women's issue bills became law. This is possibly because female Democrats sponsored more than half of this legislation and they did not have as much agency in this session to get their bills passed. Similar to the voting data, we can see how gender and party are closely connected and can both influence legislation.

The 103rd Senate was very interesting because it is the first session with a significant number of women, seven in total. Of the 364 bills that went to the floor, only 16 (4.4%) were women's issue bills. The bills sponsored were largely Democratic, with 100% of the women's issue bills sponsored by Democrats. Democrats sponsored 78.2% of the total bills. Women

sponsored none of the women's issue bills in this session. However, two of the bills sponsored by men were important pieces of legislation that directly affected women. Both of these bills went to roll call votes, and became law. The first was the Freedom of Access to Clinic Entrances Act of 1994 (S. 636), sponsored by Senator Ted Kennedy (D-MA). The second was the Family and Medical Leave Act (S. 5), sponsored by Senator Chris Dodd (D-CT). For more details on these bills, see section on voting data.

All seven female Senators sponsored legislation that was considered on the floor. None of the bills sponsored by these women were focused on women's issues. However, 42.8% of these bills became law, compared to 30.5% of laws in the total session (Tables 1C and 4C). Five out of seven of these women were freshman Senators, but they were still able to have an impact and introduce legislation. The percentage of women's issue bills becoming law was actually slightly higher than the total session, at 31.3% (Table 1C). The small sample of legislation and female legislators in this session make it difficult to analyze these data, but this set indicates that women's issues were not the focus of this session.

The 102nd Congress had only two female Senators, one Democrat and one Republican. It was a mixed session, with a Republican President and Democratic majority. This session had the most total bills, 479, but the lowest percentage of women's issue legislation, at 4.2%. Democrats sponsored 81.4% of the total bills, while 90% of the women's issue bills were sponsored by Democrats (Table 2C). Of the 20 women's bills sponsored, six of them were directly related to the lives of women. This is the highest percentage of bills that were related to women's daily lives. The first bill was the Women Veterans Health Programs Act of 1992 (S. 2973) sponsored by Senator Alan Cranston (D-CA). Another important bill was the Family Planning Amendments Act of 1992 (S. 323), sponsored by Senator John Chaffee (R-RI). The bill would ensure that

counseling was provided for low-income pregnant women, and that they were informed of family planning options. This bill was passed by Congress, but was vetoed by the President. The Child Abuse, Domestic Violence, Adoption and Family Services Act of 1992 (S. 838), sponsored by Senator Chris Dodd (D-CT), provided protection for victims of domestic violence. Another interesting piece of legislation for women was the Nontraditional Employment for Women Act (S. 367), sponsored by Senator Howard Metzenbaum (D-OH). This bill created training programs for women in male-dominated professions, and was signed into law. The last bill of note was the Commission on the Assignment of Women in the Armed Forces Act of 1991 (S. 1515), sponsored by Senator Sam Nunn (D-GA). The bill proposed a commission to examine the possibility of putting women in combat positions. The Family and Medical Leave Act was also introduced in this session, but did not pass until the 103rd session.

Senator Barbara Mikulski (D-MD) was the only one of the women to sponsor a bill that made it to the floor in this session. Senator Mikulski sponsored one bill, the Scientific and Advanced-Technology Act of 1992 (S. 1146), which was signed into law. This puts the percentage of bills sponsored by women that became law at 100%, which is not a useful sample for our analysis. However, it is interesting that the percentage of women's issue bills voted into law is higher than that for the total set of bills (30% versus 27.3%) (Table 1C). The two female Senators may have not played a large role in the advancement of women in this session directly, but Democratic men appear to have taken the lead (Table 5C). The sample size in this data set does not give us a great picture of the gender dynamics in this session, but the moderate amount of women's issue legislation suggests that the role of men is important to the women's agenda. Although there were only two women in this session, their presence may have influenced the behavior of legislative men, and contributed to a greater concern for the women's agenda.

The analysis of these data leads to some general conclusions about the role of female Senators and leadership in general. I chose to compile the data for all the sessions rather than averaging it because an average would greatly skew the outcomes. This grand data set helps us understand the general climate within the Senate over this twenty-year period. Of the 1,856 bills I examined, 101 or 5.4% were concerned with women's issues. However, only 21 or 21.2% of all the women's bills dealt directly with women's issues (Table 1C). The rest of the bills covered a wide variety of issues, but the majority focused on childhood health, safety, and education.

From this data compilation I gleaned some insightful information about the sponsors and fate of these bills. Overall, women's issue bills were slightly more likely to become law than the total set (33.9% versus 36.6%). Further, the majority of women's issue legislation was sponsored by Democratic men. Men sponsored 86.6% of the women's issue bills, and 66% were sponsored by Democrats, while women sponsored 16.5% of the bills. However, women made up 11.2% of all these sessions. This could indicate that women do perform critical actions despite their relatively small numbers. This does not hold true for all five sessions, but all together women demonstrated a significant amount of leadership and individual action.

Nearly all of the female Senators sponsored at least one bill per session, but overall the number of bills sponsored by women was very small considering their proportion of the Senate. However, when women did sponsor legislation, the proportion of that legislation that was related to women was higher than the total percentage. The rate of these bills becoming laws was also the highest for any category, at 37.5%. This implies that when women do sponsor legislation, they exert significant power and leadership. These women did not sponsor an overwhelming amount of legislation specifically for women and their concerns, but they did demonstrate a bold force overall.

Analysis and Discussion of Data

Although the relatively small sample size of our data makes it difficult to make definitive conclusions about the representation patterns of women, the information gleaned can enhance our understanding of how women act. Looking at all five sessions together, there are no obvious patterns in the way that women vote on certain types of legislation. However, there are a few votes and key pieces of legislation that give us some indication that women do advocate for women's rights. In the 111th Congress, Republican women significantly deviated from their party to support the Lilly Ledbetter Act. This bill was the only instance where the GOP women were the only members to deviate from their party, indicating that women may cross party lines for important women's issues. However, this was the only case of this phenomenon in all five sessions. Lily Ledbetter was one of the most important pieces of women's legislation passed during this time period, and the fact that all women supported it is significant. However, because the Democrats had a majority in this session they did not rely on the votes from the GOP women. It is intriguing that out of all the relevant bills for these sessions, Lily Ledbetter was the only one sponsored by a woman. Even though women might vote to support women, most of the women and family bills that went to roll call vote were sponsored by men, which may come as a surprise.

The Partial-Birth Abortion Act bill in the 108th session is also intriguing because both parties of women were split. In this case, the Republicans did not have a majority and needed Democratic votes to pass the bill. Because 16 Democrats voted for the bill, the two Democratic women who voted for the bill were not completely surprising. However, this bill gives us insight into a possible mitigating factor: geographic region. Looking at the breakdown of this vote, the instances where Senators did deviate from their party indicate that they tend to align with other

members in their region. The two Democratic women who voted yes on the bill were Southern Democrats from largely conservative regions, and the GOP women who voted no came from the liberal Northeast. Regional pressures, whether from constituents or fellow Senators, could provide an explanation for why women do not vote always as block, or even with their party.

Looking at the major transition from the 102nd to the 103rd Congress, there is some evidence that the tripling of the amount of women may have been significant. The fact that the Family and Medical Leave Act was passed right after the “year of the women” election could imply that women had greater agency as their numbers increased. Having more women in the Senate could have given both male and female legislators the momentum they needed to pass such innovative legislation. However, this correlation could also be due to the change of party in the Senate. In the 102nd Senate there was only one bill directly related to women, a bill that included protection for victims of domestic violence. However, the bill was a fairly comprehensive child and family bill that passed by unanimous vote. Not only did the number of women’s issue bills nearly double from the 102nd to the 103rd sessions, but the content of later bills were much more progressive and substantive. Women may not have been taking the lead on this legislation, but their collective presence possibly made a difference in the type of legislation introduced. The small sample size of women in these last two sessions makes it very difficult to form conclusions about the voting patterns of the female Senators, but the change in numbers may be important.

When we look at all five sessions together and break them down by the type of legislation, we get some interesting results. While some of these women’s bills focused on fairly bi-partisan issues, others centered on much more contentious issues such as abortion or universal health care. It is logical that the bills on these ideological issues would be much more partisan,

and voting would fall along traditional party lines. If I were to analyze my data without these bills we get a very different picture of how women act. When we remove these controversial bills, women appear to vote as a more cohesive unit. Women mostly voted together on issues of general health and education. Most of these bills were bipartisan, so women were not necessarily crossing party lines to support these issues, but the fact that all women voted together may be remarkable. We cannot be sure of the motives behind these votes, and whether women were aligning more with their gender or party. However, it is possible that these instances demonstrate the power of women as a group.

My analysis of the voting data as a whole suggests there were some instances of solidarity among women, but the evidence is not strong enough to conclude that women's collective actions influenced the advancements of women's rights. It may be true that many women did vote to support women's issue legislation, but the data do not tell us the motive behind these votes. Women may be actively supporting women, or simply aligning with their party or region. From the data I had access to it is impossible to tell if women were uniting in support for women's issues. If the data were to follow Kanter's theory of critical mass, we would expect the women to vote in similar patterns, no matter what their numbers. According to Kanter, minorities will stick together and work as a unit until they have achieved equal representation. If Kanter were correct, we would see women aligning with other women instead of with their party or region. Because so many of these women's issue bills were bipartisan, we cannot use this data to determine if the women were directly working together.

Further, Dahlerup's model of political representation does not take into account other factors that influence political behavior such as party, constituent views, personal views, and regional alliances. My regression analysis showed that gender does not independently correlate

with voting patterns, but gender coupled with party has some relationship to voting. This voting data clearly shows some other mitigating factors at work besides gender, although the data are not conclusive as to what exactly those factors are. My data do not necessarily indicate that the number of women matters, but it is one explanation for the voting patterns I found.

My data seem to align best with Bratton's findings that the number of women does not influence bill passage. However, as Bratton's article suggests, it is possible that the presence of legislative women contributed to the lives of women in intangible ways. My data support Vega and Firestone's research, which concluded that party was a better predictor of voting behavior than gender. Their data were much older than mine, but both data sets yielded very similar results. This presents evidence that women feel stronger ties to other groups than their token collective group. I do not have enough data to make a substantial claim on the nature of women's representation in the Senate, but the data I collected do not support the critical mass, or sheer number, model by itself as an empirical method of representation for women. Women may vote for women-friendly legislation most of the time, but their voting behavior is likely more influenced by other factors such as personal views, constituent views, party and region. It is difficult to isolate these factors because they have a lot of overlap, but being female is not the best predictor for voting behavior. However, it is important to note that voting is not the only indicator of critical mass, so we cannot dismiss the theory entirely based on my findings. There appear to be changes in the political climate as the number of women increases, but my data do not demonstrate women working together toward a critical mass.

The sponsorship data I collected provides us with information on the critical actions model of representation, and is also suggestive of some aspects of critical mass theory. If my data were to follow Child and Krook's model of critical actions, we would anticipate that

women's issue legislation would be primarily sponsored by women. There are a few patterns in my examination of sponsorship that could indicate that women take an active role in advocating for women. One aspect of sponsorship I examined was the percentage of the legislation that was women's issue legislation, and what percentage of legislation introduced by each party was women's issue legislation. It is important to note that in the two earliest sessions I looked at, women did not sponsor any women's issue bills. However, for the three sessions that they did, my results were consistent in that the percentage of women's issue bills sponsored by women was higher than the percentage for all the bills together. Women were not generally more likely than men to sponsor legislation, but when they did sponsor legislation, they were more likely to sponsor women's issue bills. Further, the percentage of women's issue bills as part of the total number of bills introduced steadily increased as the number of women in the Senate increased. This could indicate that an increase in the number of females in the Senate had a positive effect on the women's agenda. However, it does not necessarily indicate that it was women who took leadership or stood as critical actors in these situations.

The breakdown of women's issue legislation by gender and party yields results that are intriguing but do not generally support the notion of women taking primary leadership for women's issues. Although women were more likely to sponsor women's issue legislation when they sponsored bills, men overwhelmingly sponsored the majority of women's issue bills. Men sponsored between 59% and 100% of women's issue bills in each session. Overall, men sponsored 86.6% of all of this type of legislation. However, relative to the gender breakdown of these Senates, women sponsored more legislation than would be expected. Women made up 11.2% of all five sessions, but sponsored 16.4% of the women's issue legislation. This suggests

that women did take some significant leadership actions to advocate for women, but the critical actions of men are also important.

Further, the breakdown of women's issue bills by party reveals that the majority of women's issue legislation (66%) was sponsored by Democrats. Democrats made up 53.4% of all members, which means they sponsored more legislation than expected. However, if we look closer, the party sponsoring the majority of the legislation changed depending on who had the majority in the Senate. It is possible that my data might be slightly skewed because I only looked at one session with a Republican majority. It is not clear if party sponsorship is a better indicator of who had influence at that particular time, or which party was more concerned with the women's agenda in general. What we do know is that male Democrats sponsored the greatest number (56.4%) of all women's issues bills I studied for these five sessions. Republican men were the second biggest category, at 26.7%. Considering the substantial number of women in the last two sessions, it is surprising that these numbers are so high for men because women made up almost a third of the Democratic party, and likely had significant political influence. Men in these sessions took many significant critical actions, but it is unclear why, and if the women in the Senate were influential in shaping these actions.

From this data we get conflicting evidence for and against the theory of critical actions. As the number of women increased, the legislation related to issues of concern to women also increased. Women seemed to sponsor legislation at slightly higher rates than men in each session. Although the number of bills increased as the number of women increased, the majority of those bills were sponsored by men. It's clear that the increase in women did have a positive effect, but it was not necessarily in the form of leadership through sponsorship. Women certainly performed some critical actions, but so did men.

Another remarkable finding was that the women who sponsored the majority of the women's legislation were the most senior members. Of the sessions I studied, Barbara Mikulski was the longest seated female member, and the most active in the later sessions. Diane Feinstein, another longstanding member, also sponsored many bills in each Senate she was present. It is possible that their seniority increased their ability to lead the women's movement. However, many bills in the 103rd session were sponsored by freshman female Senators, who appear to have agency from the beginning of their term. There is a possible correlation between seniority and critical actions, but I do not have strong enough data to prove this. This possibility would enhance our understanding of who performs critical actions and why not all women take leadership. Overall, the data indicate that critical actions by both men and women are vital to the advancement of the women's agenda. This data also suggest that we must consider the role of men as allies and leaders of the women's agenda. This is not to say that we should rely on men to advance the status of women, but clearly they are a vital part of the legislative process. Further study could be done into why this is, and what specific roles these men play.

While the data I compiled gives us insight into different theories of representation, there are certain intangible aspects of Congressional action that are much more difficult to quantify. Even though women might not form a cohesive unit or always take significant leadership on issues, there more subtle ways that women work to influence other members and advance the women's agenda. Debra Dodson explores the "behind the scenes" work that women do in Congress. Theories of representation work to explore concrete ways that people behave, but some actions are hard to categorize or measure. Dodson's work uses interviews with Congressional women to enhance our understanding of the work that these women do. This was

an unrealistic method for my work, but these insider stories demonstrate that representation is not as clear as concrete actions such as voting and sponsorship.

Dodson asserts that women make a difference by “expanding the congressional agenda, insisting on attention to new issues” (Dodson 9). Although Dodson similarly acknowledges that not all bills are specifically women’s issue bills, women are affected by all types of legislation. Dodson asserts that women help other members of Congress understand how every bill affects women, whether it is a crime bill or a health bill. Women do this by offering amendments, getting on committees, and working with party leadership (Dodson 13-15). According to Dodson, “women often worked together to advance a collective agenda whose success was influenced by several factors including: the extent to which women organized to exert pressure both inside and outside Congress” (16). The lobbying efforts of women were vital to the advancement of women’s rights, but there is a lack of record for these actions over the past few sessions. Some scholars such as Dodson have interviewed these women directly to develop evidence on this type of experience, but this was not a realistic research method for my research. However, it is important to keep the impact of these types of experiences in mind because they have implications for the overall picture of representation. The significant number of women taking leadership on women’s legislation demonstrates that women care about women’s issues and work to make women’s rights a reality, but the ways in which they act are not always easy to recognize or acknowledge.

Conclusions

Although my data do not provide a comprehensive analysis of women’s representation in Congress, my results are suggestive of some findings that enhance our understanding of which theories fit best with our system of representation. The data make it apparent that women

actively work to represent women in many ways, but men also play a large role in advancing the feminist agenda. Looking at all the data together, the critical action model seems to best explain how women in these five Congresses worked to represent women. However, parts of each data set have implications suggestive of both theories, it is prudent to explore both possible conclusions.

Overall, the voting data was not confirmatory of critical mass theory. The theory suggests that women, or any minority group, would act as a cohesive “mass.” Although many important pieces of legislation for women were passed during these Congresses, women did not appear to vote together as a group to pass these bills. Even within each party, the women did not always vote as a block to support a specific agenda. Further, the regression analysis determined that gender had almost no correlation with the percentage of a Senator’s liberal votes, which would generally be votes that are pro-women. If gender does not determine voting behavior, it would indicate that women are not working together collectively. The regression analysis did indicate a correlation between party, gender, and voting behavior, which would suggest that gender and party are intimately linked. Women did generally support women’s issue bills, but we do not know whether they are aligning with their gender, party, or geographic region. Women may be intentionally voting together, but the data cannot confirm the motives behind these votes. The critical mass theory would only fit if women were actively working together, and not just aligning with their party or region.

Although the sponsorship data were primarily focused on the individual actions of women, they yielded some information that could potentially suggest that a greater number of women do make a difference. As the number of women in the Senate increased, the number and percentage of women’s issue legislation being introduced increased. This correlation could mean

that women have some collective power, even if this power is not reflected in their voting patterns. A larger number of women increased the agency of all the women, but it is unclear how exactly this process occurs. Women may not intentionally collaborate when they vote, but this doesn't mean that they don't collaborate at all. Critical mass is much more difficult to measure because it is difficult to quantify how women work together. This theory may play a role in the way female Senators act, but the correlation between voting and gender does not independently provide us with evidence for critical mass.

The sponsorship data I analyzed gives us stronger evidence that the critical action model is at play in the Senate. Despite their relatively small numbers in these sessions, women made a significant impact on the amount of women's issue legislation introduced. Although men sponsored the majority of the women's legislation because of their sheer numbers, when women did sponsor bills in these Congresses, they were more likely than men to sponsor women's issue bills. This means that women on average took strong actions to advocate for women, and demonstrated significant leadership. As the number of women in the legislature rose, women sponsored more legislation. This could mean that there is a connection between a critical mass and the agency of women to perform critical actions. Critical mass and critical actions are not mutually exclusive, and it seems likely that they may be dependent upon each other in the Senate. Critical actions play an important role in the representation of women, but these actions only seem to happen at a critical mass, or when women make up a significant portion of the legislature.

Another important implication of my data analysis is the role of men. Men, who make up the majority of the legislature in all sessions, do seem to take significant action on behalf of women. Contrary to my predictions, men take an active role in advocating for women. I expected

that the “women’s issue” bills that men sponsored would mostly be bills related to general female issues such as children and health, but men sponsored some important pieces of legislation directly related to women. For example, the Freedom of Access to Clinic Entrances Act (S. 6360) was sponsored by Senator Ted Kennedy, and the Pregnancy and Trauma Care Access Protection Act of 2004 (S. 2207) was sponsored by Senator Judd Gregg. Bills such as these indicate that men do care about women’s issues and definitely play a role in helping their cause. The strong role of men in these sessions makes me question whether adding more women to the legislature really is the best way to advance the women’s agenda. My data suggest that men, specifically men who support feminist positions, could be a part of the critical mass, or support the critical mass in an important way. Further, as the data show, men have taken numerous critical actions to help women.

There are two possible explanations for the large role that men play. The first is that the men themselves are changing their views on women’s issues due to our cultural climate and outside political forces. This change could be because of personal experiences, the needs of female constituents, or the increasing effectiveness of the feminist lobby. There are many outside forces that could influence the stance men take on these issues. Men showed their support for women by introducing women’s issue legislation, and by voting for these bills. There have always been so-called “feminist” men in the legislature, but their numbers have grown over time. This growth potentially correlates with the growing number of women in the legislature, which would explain why more women’s issue bills are introduced and passed as the number of women increases.

The second possible explanation is that as the number of women in the Senate increases, the female Senators are able to exert more influence over the male Senators. This would mean

that women work together as a group to gain support for feminist values from other members, especially within their parties. Women may change the culture and attitudes within the Senate, although these actions are hard to detect within the data. This explanation would be logical in the Democratic party, where women now make up almost a third of the members. This would suggest that women now have significant agency within their party to change the course of the legislation produced. Male Senators can no longer ignore the demands or values of these women. This second possibility would indicate that women have increasing agency within the Senate, although it is unclear if this influence is exerted by women as a group, or individual women.

We cannot be sure which explanation best describes the motives behind the actions of these men, but it is clear that we cannot ignore the role of male Senators. Perhaps the greatest misconception in both these theories is that men don't care about the needs of women. The data show that the number of women has an effect on the legislation, but women are not making these changes without the help of men. Women perform critical actions and introduce important feminist legislation, but it is mostly men who are actually voting these bills into law. It is unlikely that women will gain equal representation in the Congress in the near future, so we most focus on the power of both men and women. The data reveal that adding women will improve representation for female citizens, but we must not discount the ways that men both support and lead the feminist agenda. As the number of women in the Senate continues to increase, the political climate will continue to evolve. Men and women will both likely take critical actions to advance the women's agenda, but the dynamics will change as the number of women grows.

Although women may not yet have descriptive representation in the Senate, female Senators are successfully improving the lives of female citizens. My data may not be conclusive as to which theory of representation best fits with our current system, but it does show that both

men and women are committed to the women's agenda. With further research into both houses of Congress and more sessions we could get a stronger understanding of how women behave, but the data I analyzed provides the beginnings of our insight into how female legislators improve the lives of female citizens.

Appendix

Appendix A- Voting Data

111th

State	Party	Member	Obama 08 (% by state)	Female?	H.R. 3590	H.R. 1256	H.R. 1106	S. 279	S. 181	S. 510	H.R. 4872	H.R. 1388
HI	D	Akaka, Daniel	72	Yes	NAY	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	NAY	YEA
HI	D	Inouye, Daniel	72	Yes	NAY	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	NAY	YEA
VT	D	Leahy, Patrick	68		YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
VT	I	Sanders, Bernie	68	Yes	NAY	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	NAY	YEA
RI	D	Reed, John	63		NAY	NAY	YEA	YEA	NAY	YEA	NAY	YEA
RI	D	Whitehouse, Sheldon	63		NAY	YEA	YEA	YEA	NAY	NAY	NAY	NAY
NY	D	Gillibrand, Kirsten	62		YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
NY	D	Schumer, Charles	62		YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	NO VOTE
MD	D	Cardin, Benjamin	62		NAY	YEA	NAY	NAY	NAY	YEA	NAY	YEA
MD	D	Mikulski, Barbara	62	Yes	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
MA	D	Kerry, John	62		NAY	NAY	YEA	NAY	NAY	NAY	NAY	NAY
MA	D	Kirk, Paul	62		YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
IL	D	Burriss, Roland	62		YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
IL	D	Durbin, Richard	62		YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
DE	D	Carper, Thomas	62		YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
DE	D	Kaufman, Edward	62		YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
CT	D	Dodd, Christopher	61		YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
CT	I	Lieberman, Joseph	61		YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
CA	D	Boxer, Barbara	61		YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
CA	D	Feinstein, Dianne	61	Yes	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
ME	R	Collins, Susan	58		YEA					YEA	YEA	
ME	R	Snowe, Olympia	58	Yes	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
WA	D	Cantwell, Maria	57		NAY	YEA	YEA	NAY	NAY	NAY	NAY	NAY
WA	D	Murray, Patty	57		NAY	YEA	YEA	NAY	NAY	NAY	NAY	NAY
OR	D	Merkley, Jeff	57		YEA	NO VOTE	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
OR	D	Wyden, Ron	57		YEA	YEA	NO VOTE	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
NM	D	Bingaman, Jeff	57		YEA	YEA	NO VOTE	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
NM	D	Udall, Tom	57		NAY	YEA	YEA	NAY	NAY	NAY	NAY	NAY
NJ	D	Lautenberg, Frank	57		NAY	NAY	YEA	NAY	NAY	NAY	NAY	YEA
NJ	D	Menéndez, Bob	57		NAY	NAY	YEA	NAY	NAY	NAY	NO VOTE	YEA

MI	D	Levin, Carl	57		NAY	YEA	YEA	NAY	NAY	YEA	NAY	YEA
MI	D	Stabenow, Debbie	57		YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
WI	D	Feingold, Russell	56		NAY	NAY	YEA	NAY	NAY	NAY	NAY	YEA
WI	D	Kohl, Herb	56		NAY	NAY	YEA	NAY	NAY	NAY	NAY	YEA
PA	D	Casey, Bob	55		NAY	YEA	YEA	NAY	NAY	NAY	NAY	YEA
PA	D	Specter, Arlen	55		NAY	YEA	YEA	NAY	NAY	NAY	NAY	YEA
NV	R	Ensign, John	55		NAY	NAY	NAY	NAY	NAY	NAY	NAY	NAY
NV	D	Reid, Harry	55		NAY	NAY	YEA	NAY	NAY	NAY	NAY	NAY
NH	R	Gregg, Judd	54		YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
NH	D	Shaheen, Jeanne	54		YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
MN	D	Franken, Al	54		YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
MN	D	Klobuchar, Amy	54		YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
IA	R	Grassley, Chuck	54	Yes	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
IA	D	Harkin, Tom	54	Yes	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
CO	D	Bennet, Michael	54		YEA	NO VOTE	NO VOTE	NO VOTE	NO VOTE	YEA	NAY	YEA
CO	D	Udall, Mark	54		YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
VA	D	Warner, Mark	53		NAY	YEA	YEA	NAY	NAY	NAY	NAY	NAY
VA	D	Webb, Jim	53		NAY	YEA	YEA	NAY	NAY	NAY	NAY	NAY
OH	D	Brown, Sherrod	51		NAY	NAY	YEA	NAY	NAY	NAY	NAY	NAY
OH	R	Voinovich, George	51		NAY	YEA	YEA	NAY	NAY	NAY	NAY	YEA
FL	R	LeMieux, George	51		YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
FL	D	Nelson, Bill	51		YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
NC	R	Burr, Richard	50		NAY	NAY	YEA	NAY	NAY	YEA	NAY	YEA
NC	D	Hagan, Kay	50	Yes	YEA	NAY	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
IN	D	Bayh, Evan	50		YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
IN	R	Lugar, Richard	50		YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
MO	R	Bond, Kit	49		YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
MO	D	McCaskill, Claire	49		YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
MT	D	Baucus, Max	47		NAY	YEA	YEA	YEA	NAY	YEA	NAY	YEA
MT	D	Tester, Jon	47		YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
GA	R	Chambliss, Saxby	47	Yes	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
GA	R	Isakson, John	47	Yes	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
SD	D	Johnson, Tim	45		NO VOTE	NAY	NAY	NAY	NAY	NAY	NAY	NAY
SD	R	Thune, John	45		NAY	NAY	YEA	NAY	NAY	NAY	NAY	NAY
SC	R	DeMint, Jim	45		NAY	YEA	YEA	NAY	NAY	YEA	NAY	YEA
SC	R	Graham, Lindsey	45		YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	NAY	YEA
ND	D	Conrad, Kent	45		YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
ND	D	Dorgan, Byron	45		NAY	YEA	YEA	YEA	NAY	YEA	NAY	YEA
AZ	R	Kyl, Jon	45	Yes	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA		YEA	YEA	YEA
AZ	R	McCain, John	45		YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
TX	R	Cornyn, John	44	Yes	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
TX	R	Hutchison, Kay	44		NAY	YEA	YEA	NAY	NAY	YEA	NAY	NAY
WV	D	Byrd, Robert	43		NAY	NAY	NAY	NAY	NAY	NAY	NAY	NAY
WV	D	Rockefeller, Jay	43		NAY	NAY	NAY	NAY	NAY	NAY	NAY	NAY
MS	R	Cochran, Thad	43		YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
MS	R	Wicker, Roger	43		NAY	YEA	YEA	NAY	NAY	YEA	NAY	YEA

TN	R	Alexander, Lamar	42		NAY	NAY	YEA	NAY	NAY	NO VOTE	NAY	NAY
TN	R	Corker, Bob	42		NAY	NAY	YEA	NAY	NAY	NAY	NAY	NAY
NE	R	Johanns, Mike	42		NAY	NO VOTE	YEA	NAY	NAY	NO VOTE	NAY	YEA
NE	D	Nelson, Ben	42	Yes	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
KY	R	Bunning, Jim	41		YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
KY	R	McConnell, Mitch	41		YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
KS	R	Brownback, Sam	41		YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
KS	R	Roberts, Pat	41	Yes	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
LA	D	Landrieu, Mary	40		YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
LA	R	Vitter, David	40		YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
AR	D	Lincoln, Blanche	39		YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
AR	D	Pryor, Mark	39		YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
AL	R	Sessions, Jeff	39		YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
AL	R	Shelby, Richard	39		YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
AK	D	Begich, Mark	38		YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
AK	R	Murkowski, Lisa	38		YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
ID	R	Crapo, Michael	36		YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
ID	R	Risch, James	36		YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
UT	R	Bennett, Robert	34	Yes	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	NAY	YEA
UT	R	Hatch, Orrin	34		YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	NAY	YEA
OK	R	Coburn, Thomas	34		NAY	YEA	YEA	NAY	NAY	NAY	NAY	NAY
OK	R	Inhofe, Jim	34	Yes	NAY	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	NAY	NAY	YEA
WY	R	Barrasso, John	33		NAY	YEA	YEA	NAY	NAY	NAY	NAY	NAY
WY	R	Enzi, Michael	33		NAY	YEA	YEA	NAY	NAY	YEA	NAY	YEA

110th

State	Party	Member	Obama 08 (% by State)	Female?	H.R. 3963	H.R. 2669	H.R. 2
HI	D	Akaka, Daniel	72		YEA	YEA	YEA
HI	D	Inouye, Daniel	72		YEA	YEA	YEA
VT	D	Leahy, Patrick	68		YEA	YEA	YEA
VT	I	Sanders, Bernie	68		YEA	YEA	YEA
RI	D	Reed, John	63		YEA	YEA	YEA
RI	D	Whitehouse, Sheldon	63		YEA	YEA	YEA
DE	D	Biden, Joseph	62		YEA	YEA	YEA
DE	D	Carper, Thomas	62		YEA	YEA	NO VOTE
IL	D	Durbin, Richard	62		YEA	YEA	YEA
IL	D	Obama, Barack	62		NO VOTE	NO VOTE	YEA
MD	D	Cardin, Benjamin	62		YEA	YEA	YEA
MD	D	Mikulski, Barbara	62	Yes	YEA	YEA	YEA
MA	D	Kennedy, Ted	62		YEA	YEA	YEA

MA	D	Kerry, John	62		YEA	YEA	YEA
NY	D	Clinton, Hillary	62	Yes	NO VOTE	YEA	YEA
NY	D	Schumer, Charles	62		YEA	YEA	YEA
CA	D	Boxer, Barbara	61	Yes	YEA	YEA	YEA
CA	D	Feinstein, Dianne	61	Yes	YEA	YEA	YEA
CT	D	Dodd, Christopher	61		NO VOTE	YEA	YEA
CT	I	Lieberman, Joseph	61		YEA	YEA	YEA
ME	R	Collins, Susan	58	Yes	YEA	YEA	YEA
ME	R	Snowe, Olympia	58	Yes	YEA	YEA	YEA
MI	D	Levin, Carl	57		YEA	YEA	YEA
MI	D	Stabenow, Debbie	57	Yes	YEA	YEA	YEA
NJ	D	Lautenberg, Frank	57		YEA	YEA	YEA
NJ	D	Menéndez, Bob	57		YEA	YEA	YEA
NM	D	Bingaman, Jeff	57		YEA	YEA	YEA
NM	R	Domenici, Pete	57		YEA	YEA	YEA
OR	R	Smith, Gordon	57		YEA	YEA	YEA
OR	D	Wyden, Ron	57		NO VOTE	YEA	YEA
WA	D	Cantwell, Maria	57	Yes	YEA	YEA	YEA
WA	D	Murray, Patty	57	Yes	YEA	YEA	YEA
WI	D	Feingold, Russell	56		YEA	YEA	YEA
WI	D	Kohl, Herb	56		YEA	YEA	YEA
NV	R	Ensign, John	55		NAY	NAY	YEA
NV	D	Reid, Harry	55		YEA	YEA	YEA
PA	D	Casey, Bob	55		YEA	YEA	YEA
PA	D	Specter, Arlen	55		YEA	YEA	YEA
CO	R	Allard, Wayne	54		NAY	NAY	YEA
CO	D	Salazar, Ken	54		YEA	YEA	YEA
IA	R	Grassley, Chuck	54		YEA	YEA	YEA
IA	D	Harkin, Tom	54		YEA	YEA	YEA
MN	R	Coleman, Norm	54		YEA	YEA	YEA
MN	D	Klobuchar, Amy	54	Yes	YEA	YEA	YEA
NH	R	Gregg, Judd	54		NAY	NAY	YEA
NH	R	Sununu, John	54		YEA	YEA	YEA
VA	R	Warner, John	53		NO VOTE	YEA	YEA
VA	D	Webb, Jim	53		YEA	YEA	YEA
FL	R	Martinez, Mel	51		NAY	NAY	YEA
FL	D	Nelson, Bill	51		YEA	YEA	YEA
OH	D	Brown, Sherrod	51		YEA	YEA	YEA
OH	R	Voinovich, George	51		NAY	YEA	YEA
IN	D	Bayh, Evan	50		YEA	YEA	YEA
IN	R	Lugar, Richard	50		YEA	YEA	YEA
NC	R	Burr, Richard	50		NAY	NAY	YEA
NC	R	Dole, Elizabeth	50	Yes	NAY	YEA	YEA
MO	R	Bond, Kit	49		YEA	NAY	YEA
MO	D	McCaskill, Claire	49	Yes	YEA	YEA	YEA
GA	R	Chambliss, Saxby	47		NAY	YEA	YEA
GA	R	Isakson, John	47		NAY	YEA	YEA

MT	D	Baucus, Max	47		YEA	YEA	YEA
MT	D	Tester, Jon	47		YEA	YEA	YEA
AZ	R	Kyl, Jon	45		NAY	NAY	NO VOTE
AZ	R	McCain, John	45		NO VOTE	NAY	YEA
ND	D	Conrad, Kent	45		YEA	YEA	NAY
ND	D	Dorgan, Byron	45		YEA	YEA	YEA
SC	R	DeMint, Jim	45		NAY	NAY	YEA
SC	R	Graham, Lindsey	45		NAY	YEA	YEA
SD	D	Johnson, Tim	45		YEA	NO VOTE	NAY
SD	R	Thune, John	45		NAY	YEA	YEA
TX	R	Cornyn, John	44		NAY	YEA	YEA
TX	R	Hutchison, Kay	44	Yes	YEA	YEA	YEA
MS	R	Cochran, Thad	43		NAY	YEA	YEA
MS	R	Lott, Trent	43		NAY	NO VOTE	YEA
WV	D	Byrd, Robert	43		YEA	YEA	YEA
WV	D	Rockefeller, Jay	43		YEA	YEA	YEA
NE	R	Hagel, Chuck	42		NAY	NAY	YEA
NE	D	Nelson, Ben	42		YEA	YEA	YEA
TN	R	Alexander, Lamar	42		YEA	YEA	YEA
TN	R	Corker, Bob	42		YEA	YEA	YEA
KS	R	Brownback, Sam	41		NAY	NO VOTE	YEA
KS	R	Roberts, Pat	41		YEA	NAY	YEA
KY	R	Bunning, Jim	41		NAY	NAY	YEA
KY	R	McConnell, Mitch	41		NAY	NAY	YEA
LA	D	Landrieu, Mary	40	Yes	YEA	YEA	YEA
LA	R	Vitter, David	40		NAY	NAY	YEA
AL	R	Sessions, Jeff	39		NAY	YEA	YEA
AL	R	Shelby, Richard	39		NAY	YEA	YEA
AR	D	Lincoln, Blanche	39	Yes	YEA	YEA	YEA
AR	D	Pryor, Mark	39		YEA	YEA	YEA
AK	R	Murkowski, Lisa	38	Yes	YEA	YEA	YEA
AK	R	Stevens, Ted	38		YEA	YEA	YEA
ID	R	Craig, Larry	36		NAY	NAY	YEA
ID	R	Crapo, Michael	36		NAY	NAY	YEA
OK	R	Coburn, Thomas	34		NAY	NAY	YEA
OK	R	Inhofe, Jim	34		NAY	NAY	YEA
UT	R	Bennett, Robert	34		NAY	YEA	NAY
UT	R	Hatch, Orrin	34		YEA	YEA	NO VOTE
WY	R	Barrasso, John	33		NAY	YEA	YEA
WY	R	Enzi, Michael	33		NAY	YEA	YEA

State	Party	Member	Female?	Gore 2000 (% by state)	S. 3	H.R. 1997	H.R. 1350	H.R. 1
RI	R	Chafee, Lincoln		61	NAY	NAY	YEA	YEA
RI	D	Reed, John		61	NAY	NAY	YEA	NAY
MA	D	Kennedy, Ted		60	NAY	NAY	YEA	YEA
MA	D	Kerry, John		60	NO VOTE	NAY	NO VOTE	NO VOTE
NY	D	Clinton, Hillary	Yes	60	NAY	NAY	YEA	NAY
NY	D	Schumer, Chuck		60	NAY	NAY	YEA	YEA
MD	D	Mikulski, Barbara	Yes	57	NAY	NAY	YEA	YEA
MD	D	Sarbanes, Paul		57	NAY	NAY	YEA	NAY
CT	D	Dodd, Christopher		56	NAY	NAY	YEA	YEA
CT	D	Lieberman, Joseph		56	NAY	NAY	YEA	NO VOTE
HI	D	Akaka, Daniel		56	NAY	NAY	YEA	YEA
HI	D	Inouye, Daniel		56	NAY	NAY	YEA	YEA
NJ	D	Corzine, Jon		56	NAY	NAY	YEA	YEA
NJ	D	Lautenberg, Frank		56	NAY	NAY	YEA	YEA
DE	D	Biden, Joseph		55	NO VOTE	NAY	YEA	YEA
DE	D	Carper, Thomas		55	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
IL	D	Durbin, Richard		55	NAY	NAY	YEA	YEA
IL	R	Fitzgerald, Peter		55	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
CA	D	Boxer, Barbara	Yes	53	NAY	NAY	YEA	YEA
CA	D	Feinstein, Dianne	Yes	53	NAY	NAY	YEA	YEA
MI	D	Levin, Carl		51	NAY	NAY	YEA	NAY
MI	D	Stabenow, Debbie	Yes	51	NAY	NAY	NAY	YEA
PA	R	Santorum, Rick		51	YEA	YEA	YEA	NAY
PA	R	Specter, Arlen		51	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
VT	I	Jeffords, Jim		51	NAY	NAY	NAY	YEA
VT	D	Leahy, Patrick		51	YEA	NAY	NAY	YEA
WA	D	Cantwell, Maria	Yes	50	NAY	NAY	YEA	YEA
WA	D	Murray, Patty	Yes	50	NAY	NAY	YEA	YEA
FL	D	Graham, Bob		49	NAY	NAY	YEA	NAY
FL	D	Nelson, Bill		49	NAY	NAY	YEA	YEA
IA	R	Grassley, Chuck		49	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
IA	D	Harkin, Tom		49	NAY	NAY	YEA	NAY
ME	R	Collins, Susan	Yes	49	NAY	YEA	YEA	YEA
ME	R	Snowe, Olympia	Yes	49	NAY	NAY	YEA	YEA
MN	R	Coleman, Norm		48	YEA	YEA	NO VOTE	YEA
MN	D	Dayton, Mark		48	NAY	YEA	YEA	YEA
NM	D	Bingaman, Jeff		48	NAY	YEA	YEA	YEA
NM	R	Domenici, Pete		48	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
WI	D	Feingold, Russell		48	NAY	NAY	YEA	YEA
WI	D	Kohl, Herb		48	NAY	NAY	YEA	NAY
MO	R	Bond, Kit		47	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA

MO	R	Talent, Jim		47	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
NH	R	Gregg, Judd		47	YEA	NO VOTE	YEA	NAY
NH	R	Sununu, John		47	YEA	YEA	YEA	NAY
OR	R	Smith, Gordon		47	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
OR	D	Wyden, Ron		47	NAY	NAY	YEA	YEA
TN	R	Alexander, Lamar		47	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
TN	R	Frist, Bill		47	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
AR	D	Lincoln, Blanche	Yes	46	YEA	NAY	YEA	YEA
AR	D	Pryor, Mark		46	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
NV	R	Ensign, John		46	YEA	YEA	YEA	NAY
NV	D	Reid, Harry		46	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
OH	R	DeWine, Mike		46	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
OH	R	Voinovich, George		46	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
WV	D	Byrd, Robert		46	YEA	NAY	YEA	NAY
WV	D	Rockefeller, Jay		46	NAY	YEA	YEA	NAY
AZ	R	Kyl, Jon		45	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
AZ	R	McCain, John		45	YEA	YEA	YEA	NAY
LA	D	Breaux, John		45	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
LA	D	Landrieu, Mary	Yes	45	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
VA	R	Allen, George		44	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
VA	R	Warner, John		44	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
GA	R	Chambliss, Saxby		43	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
GA	D	Miller, Zell		43	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
NC	R	Dole, Elizabeth	Yes	43	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
NC	D	Edwards, John		43	NO VOTE	NAY	YEA	NAY
AL	R	Sessions, Jeff		42	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
AL	R	Shelby, Richard		42	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
CO	R	Allard, Wayne		42	YEA	YEA	YEA	NAY
CO	R	Campbell, Ben		42	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
IN	D	Bayh, Evan		41	YEA	NAY	YEA	YEA
IN	R	Lugar, Richard		41	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
KY	R	Bunning, Jim		41	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
KY	R	McConnell, Mitch		41	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
MS	R	Cochran, Thad		41	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
MS	R	Lott, Trent		41	YEA	YEA	YEA	NAY
SC	R	Graham, Lindsey		41	YEA	YEA	YEA	NAY
SC	D	Hollings, Fritz		41	YEA	NAY	YEA	NAY
OK	R	Inhofe, Jim		38	YEA	YEA	YEA	NO VOTE
OK	R	Nickles, Don		38	YEA	YEA	YEA	NAY
SD	D	Daschle, Tom		38	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
SD	D	Johnson, Tim		38	YEA	NAY	YEA	YEA
TX	R	Cornyn, John		38	YEA	YEA	YEA	NAY
TX	R	Hutchison, Kay	Yes	38	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
KS	R	Brownback, Sam		37	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
KS	R	Roberts, Pat		37	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
MT	D	Baucus, Max		33	NAY	NAY	YEA	YEA
MT	R	Burns, Conrad		33	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA

NE	R	Hagel, Chuck		33	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
NE	D	Nelson, Ben		33	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
ND	D	Conrad, Kent		33	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
ND	D	Dorgan, Byron		33	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
AK	R	Murkowski, Lisa	Yes	28	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
AK	R	Stevens, Ted		28	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
ID	R	Craig, Larry		28	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
ID	R	Crapo, Michael		28	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
WY	R	Enzi, Michael		28	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
WY	R	Thomas, Craig		28	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
UT	R	Bennett, Robert		26	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
UT	R	Hatch, Orrin		26	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA

103rd

State	Party	Member	Female?	Clinton 92 (% by State)	H.R. 6	S. 636	H.R. 1	H.R. 1804	H.R. 2884
AR	D	Bumpers, Dale		53	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
AR	D	Pryor, David		53	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
NY	R	D'Amato, Alfonse		50	YEA	NAY	YEA	NAY	YEA
NY	D	Moynihan, Daniel		50	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
MD	D	Mikulski, Barbara	Yes	50	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
MD	D	Sarbanes, Paul		50	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
IL	D	Moseley Braun, Carol	Yes	49	YEA	YEA	YEA	NO VOTE	NO VOTE
IL	D	Simon, Paul		49	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
WV	D	Byrd, Robert		48	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	NAY
WV	D	Rockefeller, Jay		48	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	NO VOTE
MA	D	Kennedy, Ted		48	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
MA	D	Kerry, John		48	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
HI	D	Akaka, Daniel		48	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
HI	D	Inouye, Daniel		48	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
TN	D	Mathews, Harlan		47	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
TN	D	Sasser, James		47	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
RI	R	Chafee, John		47	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	NO VOTE
RI	D	Pell, Claiborne		47	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
VT	R	Jeffords, Jim		46	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
VT	D	Leahy, Patrick		46	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
NM	D	Bingaman, Jeff		46	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
NM	R	Domenici, Pete		46	YEA	YEA	NAY	YEA	NAY
LA	D	Breaux, John		46	YEA	NAY	YEA	YEA	NO VOTE
LA	D	Johnston, John		46	YEA	NAY	YEA	NO VOTE	NO VOTE
CA	D	Boxer, Barbara	Yes	46	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
CA	D	Feinstein, Dianne	Yes	46	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
PA	R	Specter, Arlen		45	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA

PA	D	Wofford, Harris		45	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
KY	D	Ford, Wendell		45	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
KY	R	McConnell, Mitch		45	YEA	YEA	NAY	NAY	NAY
MO	R	Bond, Kit		44	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
MO	R	Danforth, John		44	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
MN	R	Durenberger, David		44	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
MN	D	Wellstone, Paul		44	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
MI	D	Levin, Carl		44	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
MI	D	Riegle, Donald		44	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
WA	R	Gorton, Slade		43	YEA	YEA	NAY	YEA	NAY
WA	D	Murray, Patty	Yes	43	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
OR	R	Hatfield, Mark		43	YEA	NAY	YEA	YEA	YEA
OR	R	Packwood, Robert		43	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
NJ	D	Bradley, Bill		43	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
NJ	D	Lautenberg, Frank		43	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
NC	R	Faircloth, Lauch		43	NAY	NAY	NAY	NAY	NAY
NC	R	Helms, Jesse		43	NAY	NAY	NAY	NAY	NAY
IA	R	Grassley, Chuck		43	YEA	NAY	NAY	NAY	NAY
IA	D	Harkin, Tom		43	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
GA	R	Coverdell, Paul		43	YEA	NAY	NAY	NAY	NAY
GA	D	Nunn, Samuel		43	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
DE	D	Biden, Joseph		43	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
DE	R	Roth, William		43	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	NAY
CT	D	Dodd, Christopher		42	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
CT	D	Lieberman, Joseph		42	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
WI	D	Feingold, Russell		41	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
WI	D	Kohl, Herb		41	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
VA	D	Robb, Charles		41	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
VA	R	Warner, John		41	YEA	NAY	NAY	NAY	NAY
MS	R	Cochran, Thad		41	YEA	NAY	NAY	YEA	YEA
MS	R	Lott, Trent		41	YEA	NAY	NAY	NAY	NAY
SC	D	Hollings, Fritz		40	YEA	YEA	NAY	YEA	YEA
SC	R	Thurmond, Strom		40	YEA	NAY	NO VOTE	YEA	YEA
OH	D	Glenn, John		40	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
OH	D	Metzenbaum, Howard		40	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
CO	R	Brown, Hank		40	NAY	YEA	NAY	NAY	NAY
CO	R	Campbell, Ben		40	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
AL	D	Heflin, Howell		40	YEA	NAY	NAY	YEA	YEA
AL	D	Shelby, Richard		40	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
NH	R	Gregg, Judd		39	YEA	NAY	NAY	NAY	NAY
NH	R	Smith, Bob		39	NAY	NAY	NAY	NAY	NAY
ME	R	Cohen, William		39	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
ME	D	Mitchell, George		39	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
FL	D	Graham, Bob		39	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
FL	R	Mack, Connie		39	YEA	NAY	NAY	NAY	NAY
MT	D	Baucus, Max		38	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
MT	R	Burns, Conrad		38	YEA	NAY	YEA	NAY	NAY

TX	R	Gramm, Phil		37	YEA	NAY	NAY	NO VOTE	NO VOTE
TX	D	Kay Hutchison	Yes	37	YEA	YEA	YEA	NO VOTE	NO VOTE
SD	D	Daschle, Tom		37	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
SD	R	Pressler, Larry		37	YEA	NAY	NAY	NAY	NAY
NV	D	Bryan, Richard		37	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
NV	D	Reid, Harry		37	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
IN	R	Coats, Daniel		37	YEA	NAY	YEA	NAY	NAY
IN	R	Lugar, Richard		37	YEA	NAY	NAY	NAY	NAY
AZ	D	DeConcini, Dennis		37	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
AZ	R	McCain, John		37	YEA	NAY	YEA	NAY	NAY
WY	R	Simpson, Alan		34	YEA	YEA	NAY	YEA	NAY
WY	R	Wallop, Malcolm		34	NAY	NAY	NO VOTE	NAY	NAY
OK	D	Boren, David		34	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
OK	R	Nickles, Don		34	NAY	NAY	NAY	NAY	NAY
KS	R	Dole, Robert		34	YEA	YEA	NAY	NAY	NAY
KS	R	Kassebaum, Nancy	Yes	34	YEA	YEA	NAY	YEA	NAY
ND	D	Conrad, Kent		32	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
ND	D	Dorgan, Byron		32	YEA	NO VOTE	YEA	YEA	YEA
AK	R	Murkowski, Frank		30	YEA	NAY	YEA	NAY	NAY
AK	R	Stevens, Ted		30	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	NAY
NE	D	Exon, James		29	YEA	NAY	YEA	YEA	YEA
NE	D	Kerrey, Robert		29	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA	YEA
ID	R	Craig, Larry		28	YEA	NAY	NAY	NAY	NAY
ID	R	Kempthorne, Dirk		28	YEA	NAY	NAY	NAY	NAY
UT	R	Bennett, Robert		25	YEA	NAY	NAY	NAY	NAY
UT	R	Hatch, Orrin		25	YEA	NAY	NAY	NAY	NAY

102nd

State	Party	Member	Female?	Clinton 92 (% by state)	S. 2	S. 838	S. 1241
AR	D	Bumpers, Dale		53	YEA	YEA	YEA
AR	D	Pryor, David		53	YEA	YEA	NO VOTE
MD	D	Mikulski, Barbara	Yes	50	YEA	YEA	YEA
MD	D	Sarbanes, Paul		50	YEA	YEA	YEA
NY	R	D'Amato, Alfonse		50	YEA	YEA	YEA
NY	D	Moynihan, Daniel		50	YEA	YEA	NAY
IL	D	Dixon, Alan		49	YEA	YEA	YEA
IL	D	Simon, Paul		49	YEA	YEA	NAY
HI	D	Akaka, Daniel		48	YEA	YEA	YEA
HI	D	Inouye, Daniel		48	YEA	YEA	YEA

MA	D	Kennedy, Ted		48	YEA	YEA	NAY
MA	D	Kerry, John		48	YEA	YEA	YEA
WV	D	Byrd, Robert		48	YEA	YEA	YEA
WV	D	Rockefeller, Jay		48	YEA	YEA	YEA
RI	R	Chafee, John		47	YEA	YEA	YEA
RI	D	Pell, Claiborne		47	YEA	YEA	YEA
TN	D	Gore, Albert		47	YEA	YEA	YEA
TN	D	Sasser, James		47	YEA	YEA	YEA
CA	D	Cranston, Alan		46	YEA	NO VOTE	NAY
CA	R	Seymour, John		46	YEA	YEA	YEA
LA	D	Breaux, John		46	YEA	YEA	NAY
LA	D	Johnston, John		46	YEA	YEA	NAY
NM	D	Bingaman, Jeff		46	YEA	YEA	YEA
NM	R	Domenici, Pete		46	YEA	YEA	YEA
VT	R	Jeffords, Jim		46	YEA	YEA	YEA
VT	D	Leahy, Patrick		46	YEA	YEA	NAY
KY	D	Ford, Wendell		45	YEA	YEA	YEA
KY	R	McConnell, Mitch		45	YEA	YEA	YEA
PA	R	Specter, Arlen		45	YEA	YEA	NO VOTE
PA	D	Wofford, Harris		45	YEA	YEA	YEA
DE	D	Biden, Joseph		44	YEA	YEA	YEA
DE	R	Roth, William		44	YEA	YEA	YEA
GA	D	Fowler, Wyche		44	YEA	YEA	YEA
GA	D	Nunn, Samuel		44	YEA	YEA	YEA
MI	D	Levin, Carl		44	YEA	YEA	YEA
MI	D	Riegle, Donald		44	YEA	YEA	YEA
MN	R	Durenberger, David		44	YEA	YEA	NAY
MN	D	Wellstone, Paul		44	YEA	YEA	NAY
MO	R	Bond, Kit		44	YEA	YEA	NAY
MO	R	Danforth, John		44	YEA	YEA	YEA
IA	R	Grassley, Chuck		43	YEA	YEA	YEA
IA	D	Harkin, Tom		43	NO VOTE	NO VOTE	YEA
NJ	D	Bradley, Bill		43	YEA	YEA	NO VOTE
NJ	D	Lautenberg, Frank		43	YEA	YEA	YEA
NC	R	Helms, Jesse		43	NAY	YEA	NAY
NC	D	Sanford, James		43	YEA	YEA	YEA
OR	R	Hatfield, Mark		43	YEA	YEA	NAY
OR	R	Packwood, Robert		43	YEA	YEA	YEA
WA	D	Adams, Brock		43	YEA	YEA	YEA
WA	R	Gorton, Slade		43	YEA	YEA	YEA
CT	D	Dodd, Christopher		42	YEA	YEA	YEA
CT	D	Lieberman, Joseph		42	YEA	YEA	YEA
AL	D	Heflin, Howell		41	YEA	YEA	YEA
AL	D	Shelby, Richard		41	YEA	YEA	YEA
MS	R	Cochran, Thad		41	YEA	YEA	YEA
MS	R	Lott, Trent		41	YEA	YEA	YEA
VA	D	Robb, Charles		41	YEA	YEA	YEA

VA	R	Warner, John		41	YEA	YEA	YEA
WI	R	Kasten, Robert		41	YEA	YEA	YEA
WI	D	Kohl, Herb		41	YEA	YEA	YEA
CO	R	Brown, Hank		40	YEA	YEA	YEA
CO	D	Wirth, Timothy		40	YEA	YEA	YEA
OH	D	Glenn, John		40	YEA	YEA	YEA
OH	D	Metzenbaum, Howard		40	YEA	YEA	NAY
SC	D	Hollings, Fritz		40	YEA	YEA	YEA
SC	R	Thurmond, Strom		40	YEA	YEA	YEA
FL	D	Graham, Bob		39	YEA	YEA	YEA
FL	R	Mack, Connie		39	YEA	YEA	YEA
ME	R	Cohen, William		39	YEA	YEA	YEA
ME	D	Mitchell, George		39	YEA	YEA	YEA
NH	R	Rudman, Warren		39	YEA	YEA	YEA
NH	R	Smith, Bob		39	NAY	YEA	NAY
MT	D	Baucus, Max		38	YEA	YEA	YEA
MT	R	Burns, Conrad		38	YEA	YEA	NAY
AZ	D	DeConcini, Dennis		37	YEA	YEA	YEA
AZ	R	McCain, John		37	YEA	YEA	NAY
IN	R	Coats, Daniel		37	YEA	YEA	YEA
IN	R	Lugar, Richard		37	YEA	YEA	YEA
NV	D	Bryan, Richard		37	YEA	YEA	YEA
NV	D	Reid, Harry		37	YEA	YEA	YEA
SD	D	Daschle, Tom		37	YEA	YEA	YEA
SD	R	Pressler, Larry		37	YEA	YEA	NAY
TX	D	Bentsen, Lloyd		37	YEA	YEA	YEA
TX	R	Gramm, Phil		37	YEA	YEA	YEA
KS	R	Dole, Robert		34	YEA	YEA	YEA
KS	R	Kassebaum, Nancy	Yes	34	YEA	YEA	YEA
OK	D	Boren, David		34	YEA	YEA	YEA
OK	R	Nickles, Don		34	YEA	YEA	YEA
WY	R	Simpson, Alan		34	YEA	YEA	NAY
WY	R	Wallop, Malcolm		34	NAY	YEA	NAY
ND	D	Burdick, Quentin		32	YEA	YEA	NAY
ND	D	Conrad, Kent		32	YEA	YEA	YEA
AK	R	Murkowski, Frank		30	YEA	YEA	NAY
AK	R	Stevens, Ted		30	YEA	YEA	NAY
NE	D	Exon, James		29	YEA	YEA	YEA
NE	D	Kerrey, Robert		29	NO VOTE	NO VOTE	YEA
ID	R	Craig, Larry		28	NAY	YEA	NAY
ID	R	Symms, Steven		28	NAY	YEA	NAY
UT	R	Garn, Jake		25	NAY	YEA	NAY
UT	R	Hatch, Orrin		25	YEA	NO VOTE	NAY

Appendix B- Regression Analysis Data

Member	Party	Pres Ratio 111th	Pres Ratio 110th	Pres Ratio 108th	Pres Ratio 103rd	Pres Ratio 102nd	Ratio Average	Female?	Total Votes	% Liberal Votes
Adams, Brock	1					1.34	1.34	0	3	1.00
Akaka, Daniel	1	3.02	3.02	1.47	1.30	1.12	1.99	0	21	0.90
Alexander, Lamar	0	0.74	0.74	0.92			0.80	0	13	0.46
Allard, Wayne	0		1.23	0.82	1.11		1.05	0	7	0.29
Allen, George	0			0.83			0.83	0	9	0.00
Barrasso, John	0	0.54	0.54				0.54	0	9	0.44
Baucus, Max	1	0.94	0.94	0.57	1.09	1.09	0.92	0	21	0.90
Bayh, Evan	1	1.02	1.02	0.72			0.92	0	13	0.77
Begich, Mark	1	0.62					0.62	0	6	1.00
Bennet, Michael	1	2.28					2.28	0	6	1.00
Bennett, Robert	0	0.54	0.54	0.39	0.57		0.51	0	18	0.17
Bentsen, Lloyd	1					0.90	0.9	0	3	1.00
Biden, Joseph	1		1.68	1.31	1.26	1.26	1.38	0	14	0.86
Bingaman, Jeff	1	1.36	1.36	1.00	1.24	1.24	1.24	0	21	0.90
Bond, Kit	0	0.98	0.98	0.94	1.29	1.29	1.10	0	19	0.53
Boren, David	1				0.79	0.79	0.79	0	8	1.00
Boxer, Barbara	1	2.57	2.57	1.26	1.39		1.95	1	18	0.89
Bradley, Bill	1				1.05	1.05	1.05	0	7	1.00
Breaux, John	1			0.85	1.12	1.12	1.03	0	11	0.45
Brown, Hank	0					1.11	1.11	0	8	0.50
Brown, Sherrod	1	1.11	1.11				1.11	0	9	1.00
Brownback, Sam	0	0.74	0.74	0.64			0.70	0	11	0.18
Bryan, Richard	1				1.06	1.06	1.06	0	8	1.00
Bumpers, Dale	1				1.47	1.47	1.47	0	8	1.00
Bunning, Jim	0	0.71	0.71	0.72			0.71	0	12	0.08
Burdick, Quentin	1					0.73	0.73	0	3	0.67
Burns, Conrad	0			0.57	1.09	1.09	0.92	0	12	0.33
Burr, Richard	0	1.02	1.02				1.02	0	9	0.33
Burris, Roland	1	1.68					1.68	0	6	1.00
Byrd, Robert	1	0.77	0.77	0.88	1.37	1.37	1.03	0	20	0.85
Campbell, Ben	0			0.82	1.11		0.97	0	9	0.56
Cantwell, Maria	1	1.41	1.41	1.11			1.31	1	13	0.85
Cardin, Benjamin	1	1.68	1.68				1.68	0	9	1.00
Carper, Thomas	1	2.61	2.61	1.31	1.26		1.95	0	12	0.67
Casey, Bob	1	1.25	1.25				1.25	0	9	1.00
Chafee, John	0				1.62	1.62	1.62	0	7	1.00
Chafee, Lincoln	0			1.91			1.91	0	4	0.50
Chambliss, Saxby	0	1.99	1.99	0.78			1.59	0	13	0.23
Clinton, Hillary	1		1.75	1.71			1.73	1	6	0.83
Coats, Daniel	0				0.86	0.86	0.86	0	8	0.63
Coburn, Thomas	0	0.52	0.52				0.52	0	9	0.11
Cochran, Thad	0	0.77	0.77	0.71	0.82	0.82	0.78	0	21	0.48
Cohen, William	0				1.30	1.30	1.3	0	8	1.00

Coleman, Norm	0		1.23	1.04			1.14	0	6	0.50
Collins, Susan	0	1.45	1.45	1.11			1.34	1	13	0.69
Conrad, Kent	1	0.85	0.85	0.55	0.73	0.73	0.74	0	21	0.76
Corker, Bob	0	0.74	0.74				0.74	0	9	0.67
Cornyn, John	0	0.80	0.80	0.64			0.75	0	13	0.38
Corzine, Jon	1			1.40			1.40	0	4	0.50
Coverdell, Paul	0				1.02		1.02	0	5	0.20
Craig, Larry	0		0.59	0.42	0.67	0.67	0.59	0	15	0.20
Cranston, Alan	1					1.39	1.39	0	2	0.50
Crapo, Michael	0	0.59	0.59	0.42			0.53	0	13	0.23
D'Amato, Alfonse	0				1.47	1.47	1.47	0	8	0.75
Danforth, John	0				1.29	1.29	1.29	0	8	1.00
Daschle, Tom	1			0.63	0.90	0.90	0.81	0	12	0.67
Dayton, Mark	1			1.04			1.04	0	4	0.25
DeConcini, Dennis	1				0.95	0.95	0.95	0	8	1.00
DeMint, Jim	0	0.83	0.83				0.83	0	9	0.11
DeWine, Mike	0			0.92			0.92	0	4	0.00
Dixon, Alan	1					1.44	1.44	0	3	1.00
Dodd, Christopher	1	2.57	2.57	1.47	1.17	1.17	1.79	0	20	0.90
Dole, Elizabeth	0		1.02	0.77	0.98		0.92	1	7	0.29
Dole, Robert	0				0.87	0.87	0.87	0	8	0.63
Domenici, Pete	0		1.36	1.00	1.24	1.24	1.21	0	15	0.60
Dorgan, Byron	1	0.85	0.85	0.55	0.73		0.74	0	13	0.85
Durbin, Richard	1	1.68	1.68	1.28			1.54	0	8	0.88
Durenberger, David	0				1.38	1.38	1.38	0	3	0.67
Edwards, John	1			0.77			0.77	0	4	0.00
Ensign, John	0	1.28	1.28	0.92			1.16	0	13	0.31
Enzi, Michael	0	0.54	0.54	0.41			0.50	0	13	0.38
Exon, James	1					0.62	0.62	0	8	0.75
Faircloth, Lauch	0				1.00		1	0	5	1.00
Feingold, Russell	1	1.30	1.30	1.00	1.11		1.18	0	18	0.78
Feinstein, Dianne	1	2.57	2.57	1.26	1.39		1.95	1	18	0.89
Fitzgerald, Peter	0			1.28			1.28	0	4	0.50
Ford, Wendell	1				1.10	1.10	1.1	0	8	0.88
Fowler, Wyche	1					1.02	1.02	0	3	1.00
Franken, Al	1	1.23					1.23	0	2	1.00
Frist, Bill	0			0.92			0.92	0	4	0.00
Garn, Jake	0					0.58	0.58	0	3	0.33
Gillibrand, Kirsten	1	1.75					1.75	1	5	1.00
Glenn, John	1					1.05	1.05	0	7	0.86
Gore, Albert	1					1.12	1.12	0	3	1.00
Gorton, Slade	0				1.34	1.34	1.34	0	8	1.00
Graham, Bob	1			1.00	0.95	0.95	0.97	0	12	10.12
Graham, Lindsey	0	0.83	0.83	0.72			0.79	0	13	0.23
Gramm, Phil	0					0.90	0.9	0	8	0.63
Grassley, Chuck	0	2.28	2.28	1.02	1.16	1.16	1.16	0	21	0.52
Gregg, Judd	0	1.20	1.20	0.98	1.03		1.10	0	18	0.56

Hagan, Kay	1	1.02					1.02	1	6	0.83
Hagel, Chuck	0		0.74	0.53			0.63	0	7	0.43
Harkin, Tom	1	2.28	2.28	1.02	1.16	1.16	1.58	0	21	0.62
Hatch, Orrin	0	0.54	0.54	0.39	0.57	0.57	0.52	0	20	0.20
Hatfield, Mark	0				1.30	1.30	1.3	0	8	1.00
Heflin, Howell	1					0.85	0.85	0	3	1.00
Helms, Jesse	0			1.00	1.00	1.00	1	0	8	0.38
Hollings, Fritz	1			0.72	0.83	0.83	0.79	0	12	0.33
Hutchison, Kay	0	0.80	0.80	0.64			0.75	1	13	0.54
Inhofe, Jim	0	0.52	0.52	0.63			0.56	0	13	0.23
Inouye, Daniel	1	3.02	3.02	1.47	1.30	1.30	2.02	0	21	0.90
Isakson, John	0	1.99	1.99				1.99	0	9	0.33
Jeffords, Jim	0			1.24	1.53	1.53	1.44	0	12	0.67
Johanns, Mike	0	0.74					0.74	0	6	0.50
Johnson, Tim	1	0.85	0.85	0.63			0.78	0	12	0.58
Johnston, John	1					1.12	1.12	0	7	0.71
Kassebaum, Nancy	0				0.87	0.87	0.87	1	8	0.63
Kasten, Robert	0					1.11	1.11	0	3	1.00
Kaufman, Edward	1	2.61					2.61	0	6	1.00
Kempthorne, Dirk	0				0.67		0.67	0	4	0.00
Kennedy, Ted	1		1.72	1.88	1.66	1.66	1.73	0	14	0.93
Kerrey, Robert	1				0.62	0.62	0.62	0	8	0.88
Kerry, John	1	1.72	1.72	1.88	1.66	1.66	1.73	0	17	0.82
Kirk, Paul	1	1.72					1.72	0	6	1.00
Klobuchar, Amy	1	1.23	1.23				1.23	1	9	1.00
Kohl, Herb	1	1.30	1.30	1.00	1.11	1.11	1.16	0	21	0.90
Kyl, Jon	0		0.83	0.88	0.95		0.89	0	13	0.46
Landrieu, Mary	1	0.68	0.68	0.85			0.74	1	13	0.54
Lautenberg, Frank	1	1.36	1.36	1.40	1.05	1.05	1.24	0	20	0.90
Leahy, Patrick	1	2.19	2.19	1.24	1.53	1.53	1.74	0	21	0.95
LeMieux, George	0	2.16					2.16	0	6	0.67
Levin, Carl	1	1.39	1.39	1.11	1.22	1.22	1.27	0	21	0.90
Lieberman, Joseph	1	2.57	2.57	1.47	1.17	1.17	1.79	0	20	0.90
Lincoln, Blanche	1	1.91	1.91	0.90			1.57	1	13	0.62
Lott, Trent	0		0.77	0.71	0.82	0.82	0.78	0	15	0.53
Lugar, Richard	0	1.02	1.02	0.72	0.86	0.86	0.86	0	21	0.62
Mack, Connie	0				0.95	0.95	0.95	0	8	1.00
Martinez, Mel	0		1.06				1.06	0	2	1.00
Mathews, Harlan	1				1.12		1.12	0	5	1.00
McCain, John	0		0.83	0.88	0.95	0.95	0.90	0	20	0.50
McCaskill, Claire	1	0.98	0.98				0.98	1	9	0.89
McConnell, Mitch	0	0.71	0.71	0.72	1.07	1.07	0.86	0	21	0.48
Menéndez, Bob	1	1.36	1.36				1.36	0	9	1.00
Merkley, Jeff	1	1.39					1.39	0	6	1.00
Metzenbaum, Howard	1				1.05	1.05	1.05	0	8	1.00

Mikulski, Barbara	1	1.68	1.68	1.43	1.36	1.36	1.50	1	21	0.90
Miller, Zell	1			0.78			0.78	0	4	0.00
Mitchell, George	1				1.30	1.30	1.30	0	8	1.00
Moseley Braun, Carol	1				1.44		1.44	1	5	1.00
Moynihan, Daniel	1				1.47	1.47	1.47	0	8	0.75
Murkowski, Frank	0				0.75	0.75	0.75	0	7	1.00
Murkowski, Lisa	0	0.62	0.62	0.47			0.57	1	13	0.31
Murray, Patty	1	1.41	1.41	1.11	1.34		1.32	1	18	0.78
Nelson, Ben	1	0.74	0.74	0.53			0.67	0	13	0.54
Nelson, Bill	1	2.16	2.16	1.00			1.77	0	13	0.77
Nickles, Don	0			0.63	0.79	0.79	0.74	0	11	0.73
Nunn, Samuel	1				1.02	1.02	1.02	0	8	0.50
Obama, Barack	1		1.68				1.68	0	3	1.00
Packwood, Robert	0				1.30	1.30	1.3	0	8	0.75
Pell, Claiborne	1				1.62	1.62	1.62	0	7	1.00
Pressler, Larry	0				0.90	0.90	0.9	0	8	1.00
Pryor, David	1				1.47	1.47	1.47	0	8	1.00
Pryor, Mark	1	1.91	1.91	0.90			1.57	0	13	0.77
Reed, John	1	1.80	1.80	1.91			1.84	0	13	0.85
Reid, Harry	1	1.28	1.28	0.92	1.06	1.06	1.12	0	21	0.76
Riegle, Donald	1				1.22	1.22	1.22	0	8	1.00
Risch, James	0	0.59					0.59	0	6	0.33
Robb, Charles	1				0.91	0.91	0.91	0	8	1.00
Roberts, Pat	0	0.74	0.74	0.64			0.71	0	12	0.17
Rockefeller, Jay	1	0.77	0.77	0.88	1.37	1.37	1.03	0	20	0.85
Roth, William	0				1.26	1.26	1.26	0	8	1.00
Rudman, Warren	0					1.05	1.05	0	3	1.00
Salazar, Ken	1		1.20				1.2	0	3	0.33
Sanders, Bernie	1	2.19	2.19				2.19	0	9	1.00
Sanford, James	1					1.00	1	0	3	0.33
Santorum, Rick	0			1.11			1.11	0	4	0.75
Sarbanes, Paul	1			1.43	1.39	1.39	1.40	0	12	0.83
Sasser, James	1				1.12	1.12	1.12	0	8	1.00
Schumer, Charles	1	1.75	1.75	1.71			1.74	0	12	0.92
Sessions, Jeff	0	0.64	0.64	0.74			0.67	0	12	0.42
Seymour, John	0					1.39	1.39	0	2	0.50
Shaheen, Jeanne	1	1.20					1.2	1	6	1.00
Shelby, Richard	0	0.64	0.64	0.74	0.85	0.85	0.74	0	21	0.48
Simon, Paul	1				1.44	1.44	1.44	0	6	1.00
Simpson, Alan	0				0.85	0.85	0.85	0	8	0.63
Smith, Bob	0				1.03	1.03	1.03	0	8	0.50
Smith, Gordon	0		1.39	1.00			1.20	0	7	0.57
Snowe, Olympia	0	1.45	1.45	1.11			1.34	1	13	0.69
Specter, Arlen	1	1.25	1.25	1.11	1.25	1.25	1.22	0	21	0.86
Stabenow, Debbie	1	1.39	1.39	1.11			1.30	1	13	0.92
Stevens, Ted	0		3.02	0.47	0.75	0.75	1.25	0	15	0.47
Sununu, John	0		1.20	0.98			1.09	0	6	0.33

Symms, Steven	0					0.67	0.67	0	3	0.33
Talent, Jim	0			0.94			0.94	0	4	0.00
Tester, Jon	1	0.94	0.94				0.94	0	9	1.00
Thomas, Craig	0			0.41			0.41	0	4	0.00
Thune, John	0	0.85	0.85				0.85	0	8	0.38
Thurmond, Strom	0				0.83	0.83	0.83	0	8	0.88
Udall, Mark	1	2.28					2.28	0	6	1.00
Udall, Tom	1	1.36					1.36	0	6	1.00
Vitter, David	0	0.68	0.68				0.68	0	9	0.67
Voinovich, George	0	1.11	1.11	0.92			1.05	0	13	0.46
Wallop, Malcolm	0				0.85	0.85	0.85	0	8	0.63
Warner, John	0		1.13	0.83	0.91	0.91	0.95	0	15	0.73
Warner, Mark	1	2.19					2.19	0	6	1.00
Webb, Jim	1	2.19	2.19				2.19	0	8	1.00
Wellstone, Paul	1				1.38	1.38	1.38	0	8	0.88
Whitehouse, Sheldon	1	1.80	1.80				1.80	0	9	1.00
Wicker, Roger	0	0.77					0.77	0	6	0.33
Wirth, Timothy	1					1.11	1.11	0	3	1.00
Wofford, Harris	1				1.25	1.25	1.25	0	7	1.00
Wyden, Ron	1	1.39	1.39	1.00			1.26	0	13	0.69

Appendix C- Sponsorship Data

111th

Women's Issue Bills

Bill	Sponsor	Party	Female?	Type of Women's Bill	Action
A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the Women Airforce Service Pilots ("WASP").	Senator Kay Hutchison	R	Yes	Female soldiers' honor	Law
CAPTA Reauthorization Act of 2010	Senator Chris Dodd	D		Child abuse	Law
Domestic Minor Sex Trafficking Deterrence and Victims Support Act of 2010	Senator Ron Wyden	D		Abuse and children	Passed House
FDA Food Safety Modernization Act	Senator Richard Durbin	D		Nutrition	Passed Senate
Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010	Senator Blanche Lincoln	D	Yes	Children's health	Law
Helping Families Save Their Homes Act of 2009	Senator Chris Dodd	D		Families	Law
Human Rights Enforcement Act of 2009	Senator Richard	D		Child soldiers	Law

	Durbin				
Improving Assistance to Domestic and Sexual Violence Victims Act of 2009	Senator Patrick Leahy	D		Sexual violence	Introduced
International Adoption Simplification Act	Senator Amy Klobuchar	D	Yes	Childcare	Law
International Protecting Girls by Preventing Child Marriage Act of 2010	Senator Richard Durbin	D		Int. women	Failed House
Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act of 2009	Senator Barbara Mikulski	D	Yes	Fair pay for women	Law
Paycheck Fairness Act	Senator Harry Reid	D		Women's employment	Introduced
Protecting Incentives for the Adoption of Children with Special Needs Act of 2009	Senator Max Baucus	D		Children	Law
Saving Kids From Dangerous Drugs Act of 2010	Senator Dianne Feinstein	D	Yes	Children	Passed Senate
Steelwork Enhancement Act of 2010	Senator Daniel Akaka	D		Help for working women	Passed Senate
Early Hearing Detection and Intervention Act of 2010	Senator Olympia Snowe	R	Yes	Elder health	Law
Rosa's Law	Senator Barbara Mikulski	D	Yes		Law

Bills Sponsored by Women

Female Sponsor	Bill	Women's Bill?	Women's Issue	Action
Boxer	Reduction of Lead in Drinking Water Act			Law
	A bill to grant the congressional gold medal, collectively, to the 100th Infantry Battalion and the 442nd Regimental Combat Team, United States Army, in recognition of their dedicated service during...			Law
	A bill to modify the date on which the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and applicable States may require permits for discharges from certain vessels.			Law
	A bill to redesignate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2777 Logan Avenue in San Diego, California, as the "Cesar E. Chavez Post Office".			Law
Cantwell	Longline Catcher Processor Subsector Single Fishery Cooperative Act			Law

	A bill to amend the Act of August 9, 1955, to modify a provision relating to leases involving certain Indian tribes.			Law
	Coast Guard Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 2010 and 2011			Introduced
Collins	Federal Acquisition Institute Act of 2010			Passed Sen
	Federal Agency Energy Efficiency Improvement Act of 2009			Introduced
	A bill to provide additional personnel authorities for the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction.			Law
Feinstein	A bill for the relief of Shigeru Yamada.			Private Law
	A bill for the relief of Shigeru Yamada.			Passed Sen
	Social Security Number Protection Act of 2010			Law
	Cell Phone Contraband Act of 2010			Law
	Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010			Passed Sen
	Saving Kids From Dangerous Drugs Act of 2010	Yes	Protecting children	Passed Sen
	Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010			Passed Sen
	Combat Methamphetamine Enhancement Act of 2009			Passed Sen
	A bill to amend the Omnibus Indian Advancement Act to modify the date as of which certain tribal land of the Lytton Rancheria of California is deemed to be held in trust and to provide for the...			Passed Sen
	A bill to prohibit the sale and counterfeiting of Presidential inaugural tickets.			Passed Sen
Gillibrand	A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 23 Genesee Street in Hornell, New York, as the "Zachary Smith Post Office Building".			Passed Sen
Hutchison	Satellite Television Extension and Localism Act of 2010			Passed Sen
	Safe Prisons Communications Act of 2009			Passed Sen
	A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the Women Airforce Service Pilots ("WASP").	Yes	Female soldiers	Law
Klobuchar	International Adoption Simplification Act			Law
	Secure and Responsible Drug Disposal Act of 2010			Law
	Formaldehyde Standards for Composite Wood Products Act			Law
Landrieu	SBIR/STTR Reauthorization Act of 2010			Passed Sen
	A bill to provide for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes.			Law
	A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2000 Louisiana Avenue in New Orleans, Louisiana, as the "Roy Rondeno, Sr. Post Office Building".			Passed Sen

	A bill to provide for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes.			Law
	A bill to provide for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes.			Law
	A bill to provide for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes.			Law
	SBIR/STTR Reauthorization Act of 2009			Introduced
Lincoln	Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010	Yes	Children	Law
	Mandatory Price Reporting Act of 2010			Law
McCaskill	A bill to require reports on the management of Arlington National Cemetery.			Law
	Special Inspector General for the Troubled Asset Relief Program Act of 2009			Law
Mikulski	Rosa's Law	Yes	Fair pay	Law
	Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act of 2009	Yes		Law
Murkowski	Mount Stevens and Ted Stevens Icefield Designation Act			Law
	A bill to amend the National Law Enforcement Museum Act to extend the termination date.			Law
Murray	Airline Flight Crew Technical Corrections Act			Law
	A bill to authorize a major medical facility project at the Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center, Walla Walla, Washington, and for other purposes.			Law
Snowe	Early Hearing Detection and Intervention Act of 2010	Yes	Childhood health	Law
Stabenow	Medicare Physician Fairness Act of 2009			Introduced

110th

Women's Issue Bills

Bill	Sponsor	Party	Female?	Women's Bill?	Women's Issue	Action
PROTECT Our Children Act of 2008	Senator Joe Biden	D		Yes	Child exploitation	Law
KIDS Act of 2008	Senator Chuck Schumer	D		Yes	Sex offenders	Law
Prenatally and Postnatally Diagnosed Conditions Awareness Act	Senator Sam Brownback	R		Yes	Pregnancy	Law
Reconnecting Homeless Youth Act of 2008	Senator Patrick	D		Yes	Children	Law

	Leahy						
Healthy Start Reauthorization Act of 2007	Senator Sherrod Brown	D			Yes	Children's health	Law
Trafficking in Persons Accountability Act of 2008	Senator Richard Durbin	D			Yes	Women	Passed Sen
A bill to temporarily extend the programs under the Higher Education Act of 1965.	Senator Ted Kennedy	D			Yes	Education	Law
Health Care Safety Net Act of 2007	Senator Ted Kennedy	D			Yes	Healthcare	Passed Sen
A bill to temporarily extend the programs under the Higher Education Act of 1965.	Senator Ted Kennedy	D			Yes	Education	Passed Sen
Protecting Children in the 21st Century Act	Senator Ted Stevens	R			Yes	Online safety for children	Passed Sen
A bill to temporarily extend the programs under the Higher Education Act of 1965.	Senator Ted Kennedy	D			Yes	Education	
Newborn Screening Saves Lives Act of 2007	Senator Chris Dodd	D			Yes	Children's health	Law
A bill to provide for the extension of transitional medical assistance (TMA) and the abstinence education program through the end of fiscal year 2007, and for other purposes.	Senator Max Baucus	D			Yes	Sex edu	Law
Indian Child Protection and Family Violence Prevention Act Amendments of 2007	Senator Byron Dorgan	D			Yes	Child protection	passed Sen
A bill to authorize the transfer of certain funds from the Senate Gift Shop Revolving Fund to the Senate Employee Child Care Center.	Senator Mary Landrieu	D	Yes		Yes	Child care	Law
Telework Enhancement Act of 2007	Senator Ted Stevens	R			Yes	Women working	Introduced
Helping Families Save Their Homes in Bankruptcy Act of 2008	Senator Richard Durbin	D			Yes	Families	Introduced
Pregnant Women Support Act	Senator Robert Casey	D			Yes	Pregnancy	Introduced
Kids First Act	Senator Mitch McConnell	R			Yes	Child health	Introduced
National Breast and Cervical Cancer Early Detection Program Reauthorization Act of 2007	Senator Barbara Mikulski	D	Yes		Yes	Women's health	Introduced
Head Start for School Readiness Act	Senator Ted Kennedy	D			Yes	Education	Introduced
Executive Branch Family Leave Act	Senator Ted Stevens	R			Yes	Paid family leave	Introduced
Children and Media Research Advancement Act	Senator Joe Lieberman	D			Yes	Child protection	Introduced
No Child Left Behind Flexibility and Improvements Act	Senator Susan Collins	R	Yes		Yes	Education	Introduced

Bills Sponsored by Women

Female Sponsor	Bill	Women's Bill?	Women's Issue	Action
Boxer	An original bill to designate a portion of the Rappahannock River in the Commonwealth of Virginia as the "John W. Warner Rapids".			Law
	Lieberman-Warner Climate Security Act of 2008			Introduced
	Gulf of the Farallones and Cordell Bank National Marine Sanctuaries Boundary Modification and Protection Act			Introduced
	A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 16731 Santa Ana Avenue in Fontana, California, as the "Beatrice E. Watson Post Office Building".			Passed Sen
	A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 118 Minner Avenue in Bakersfield, California, as the "Buck Owens Post Office".			Introduced
	A bill to designate a United States courthouse located in Fresno, California, as the "Robert E. Coyle United States Courthouse".			Law
Cantwell	Yakima-Tieton Irrigation District Conveyance Act of 2007			Introduced
	Integrated Deepwater Program Reform Act			Passed Sen
	Animal Fighting Prohibition Enforcement Act of 2007			Introduced
Clinton	A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 245 North Main Street in New City, New York, as the "Kenneth Peter Zebrowski Post Office Building".			Passed Sen
	A bill to designate a portion of United States Route 20A, located in Orchard Park, New York, as the "Timothy J. Russert Highway".			Law
	Hudson-Fulton-Champlain Quadricentennial Commemoration Commission Act of 2007			Introduced
Collins	A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide for a one-year extension of other transaction authority.			Passed Sen
	Acadia National Park Improvement Act of 2007			Introduced
	Accountability in Government Contracting Act of 2007			Passed Sen
	A bill to amend chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, to make individuals employed by the Roosevelt Campobello International Park Commission eligible to obtain Federal health insurance.			Law
	No Child Left Behind Flexibility and Improvements Act	Yes	Education	Introduced

Feinstein	Ryan Haight Online Pharmacy Consumer Protection Act of 2008			Passed Sen
	A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to expand passenger facility fee eligibility for certain noise compatibility projects.			Law
	A bill to authorize the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program at fiscal year 2006 levels through 2012.			Law
	A bill to provide for certain Federal employee benefits to be continued for certain employees of the Senate Restaurants after operations of the Senate Restaurants are contracted to be performed by a...			Law
	Combat Methamphetamine Enhancement Act of 2007			Passed Sen
	A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 427 North Street in Taft, California, as the "Larry S. Pierce Post Office".			Law
	A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to extend the authority of the United States Postal Service to issue a semipostal to raise funds for breast cancer research.			Law
	A bill to provide technical corrections to Public Law 109-116 (2 U.S.C. 2131a note) to extend the time period for the Joint Committee on the Library to enter into an agreement to obtain a statue of...			Law
	A bill to amend the Omnibus Indian Advancement Act to modify the date as of which certain tribal land of the Lytton Rancheria of California is deemed to be held in trust and to provide for the...			Passed Sen
	Gang Abatement and Prevention Act of 2007			Passed Sen
	A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to make technical corrections to the new border tunnels and passages offense.			Passed Sen
	Preserving United States Attorney Independence Act of 2007			Law
	Preserving Crime Victims' Restitution Act of 2007			Introduced
Hutchison	DTV Border Fix Act of 2008			Passed Sen
	A bill to award a congressional gold medal to Michael Ellis DeBakey, M.D.			Law
	A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 103 South Getty Street in Uvalde, Texas, as the "Dolph S. Briscoe, Jr. Post Office Building".			Introduced
Klobuchar	A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2523 7th Avenue East in North Saint Paul, Minnesota, as the Mayor William "Bill" Sandberg Post Office Building.			Passed Sen

	A bill to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse and customhouse located at 515 West First Street in Duluth, Minnesota, as the "Gerald W. Heaney Federal Building and United...			Law
Landrieu	A bill to provide that the great hall of the Capitol Visitor Center shall be known as Emancipation Hall.			Passed Sen
	A bill to authorize the transfer of certain funds from the Senate Gift Shop Revolving Fund to the Senate Employee Child Care Center.	Yes		Law
Lincoln	Wolf House Study Act of 2008			Introduced
McCaskill	Special Inspector General for the Troubled Asset Relief Program Act of 2008			Passed Sen
	A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1700 Cleveland Avenue in Kansas City, Missouri, as the "Reverend Earl Abel Post Office Building".			Law
	Inspector General Reform Act of 2008			Passed Sen
Mikulski	Kendell Frederick Citizenship Assistance Act			Law
	National Breast and Cervical Cancer Early Detection Program Reauthorization Act of 2007	Yes		Introduced
Murkowski	A bill to clarify the circumstances during which the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and applicable States may require permits for discharges from certain vessels, and to require...			Law
	Alaska Water Resources Act of 2007			Introduced
Murray	Poison Center Support, Enhancement, and Awareness Act of 2008			Law
	Ban Asbestos in America Act of 2007			Passed Sen
Snowe	DTV Transition Assistance Act			Law
	Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act of 2007			Introduced
Stabenow	A bill to designate the Department of Veterans Affairs clinic in Alpena, Michigan, as the "Lieutenant Colonel Clement C. Van Wagoner Department of Veterans Affairs Clinic".			Law

108th

Women's Issue Bills

Bill	Sponsor	Party	Female?	Women's Issue	Action
CHEER Act	Senator Chris Bond	R		Children's hospitals	Passed Sen
Family Smoking Prevention and Tobacco Control Act	Senator Mike DeWine	R		Family safety	Passed Sen

Dylan Lee James Act	Senator Chuck Grassley	R		Children	Passed Sen
Pregnancy and Trauma Care Access Protection Act of 2004	Senator Judd Gregg	R		Pregnancy	Introduced
Healthy Mothers and Healthy Babies Access to Care Act of 2003	Senator Judd Greg	R		Babies	Introduced
Mammography Quality Standards Reauthorization Act of 2004	Senator Barbara Mikulski	D	Yes	Breast health	Passed Sen
Pediatric Research Equity Act of 2003	Senator Mike DeWine	R		Children's health	Law
Birth Defects and Developmental Disabilities Prevention Act of 2003	Senator Chris Bond	R		Babies	Law
A bill to amend title XXI of the Social Security Act to extend the availability of allotments for fiscal years 1998 through 2001 under the State Children's Health Insurance Program.	Senator John Rockefeller	D		Children's insurance	Passed Sen
Missing Child Cold Case Review Act of 2004	Senator Patrick Leahy	D			Passed Sen
Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act of 2003	Senator Rick Santorum	R			Law
Runaway, Homeless, and Missing Children Protection Act	Senator Orrin Hatch	R			Passed Sen
PROTECT Act	Senator Orrin Hatch	R			Law
National AMBER Alert Network Act of 2003	Senator Kay Hutchison	R	Yes		Passed Sen
Women's Sustainability Recovery Act of 2004	Senator Olympia Snowe	R	Yes		Passed Sen
Women's Business Centers Preservation Act of 2003	Senator Olympia Snowe	R	Yes		Passed Sen
National Women's History Museum Act of 2003	Senator Susan Collins	R	Yes		Passed Sen
Prevention of Child Abduction Partnership Act	Senator Orrin Hatch	R			Law
A bill to revise and extend the Boys and Girls Clubs of America.	Senator Orrin Hatch	R			Law
Keeping Children and Families Safe Act of 2003	Senator Judd Gregg	R			Law
Caring for Children Act of 2003	Senator Judd Gregg	R			Introduced
Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2003	Senator Judd Gregg	R			Introduced
Unaccompanied Alien Child Protection Act of 2004	Senator Diane Feinstein	D	Yes		Passed Sen
A bill to extend the special postage stamp for breast cancer research for 2 years.	Senator Diane Feinstein	D	Yes		Passed Sen

Bills Sponsored by Women

Female sponsor	Bill	Women's Bill?	Women's Issue	Action
----------------	------	---------------	---------------	--------

Boxer	Sudden Oak Death Syndrome Control Act of 2004			Passed Sen
	A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to provide for secondary containment to prevent methyl tertiary butyl ether and petroleum contamination.			Introduced
Cantwell	Spokane Tribe of Indians of the Spokane Reservation Grand Coulee Dam Equitable Compensation Settlement Act			Passed Sen
	Upper White Salmon Wild and Scenic Rivers Act			Passed Sen
	Lewis and Clark National Historical Park Act of 2004			Passed Sen
Clinton	Kate Mull any National Historic Site Act			Law
	Caribbean National Forest Act of 2004			Passed Sen
	A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 555 West 180th Street in New York, New York, as the "Sergeant Rayon A. Teed Post Office".			Passed Sen
	225th Anniversary of the American Revolution Commemoration Act			Passed Sen
	Lifespan Respite Care Act of 2003			Passed Sen
Collins	Federal Employee Dental and Vision Benefits Enhancement Act of 2004			Law
	Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004			Law
	HIPAA Recreational Injury Technical Correction Act			Passed Sen
	A bill to establish an intergovernmental grant program to identify and develop homeland security information, equipment, capabilities, technologies, and services to further the homeland security...			Passed Sen
	National Intelligence Reform Act of 2004			Introduced
	Emergency Food and Shelter Act of 2004			Passed Sen
	Thrift Savings Plan Open Elections Act of 2004			Passed Sen
	Homeland Security Grant Enhancement Act of 2003			Introduced
	Homeland Security Technology Improvement Act of 2004			Passed Sen
	National Women's History Museum Act of 2003	Yes		Passed Sen
	District of Columbia Budget Autonomy Act of 2003			Passed Sen
	A bill to preserve existing judgeships on the Superior Court of the District of Columbia.			Passed Sen
	Postal Civil Service Retirement System Funding Reform Act of 2003			Law
	A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to increase the amount of the death gratuity payable with respect to deceased members of the Armed Forces.			Passed Sen
Dole	A bill to replace certain Coastal Barrier Resources System maps.			Law
	A bill to award a congressional gold medal to Prime Minister Tony Blair.			Law
Feinstein	A bill for the relief of Denes and Gyorgyi Fulop.			Passed Sen
	Redwood National Park Boundary Adjustment Act of 2004			Passed Sen

	Unaccompanied Alien Child Protection Act of 2004	Yes		Passed Sen
	Rim of the Valley Corridor Study Act			Passed Sen
	A bill to extend the special postage stamp for breast cancer research for 2 years.	Yes		Passed Sen
	State Criminal Alien Assistance Program Reauthorization Act of 2003			Passed Sen
	A bill for the relief of Esidronio Arreola-Saucedo, Maria Elena Cobian Arreola, Nayely Bibiana Arreola, and Cindy Jael Arreola.			Passed Sen
	Identity Theft Penalty Enhancement Act			Passed Sen
	Rancho Corral de Tierra Golden Gate National Recreation Area Boundary Adjustment Act			Passed Sen
Hutchison	El Camino Real de los Tejas National Historic Trail Act			Law
	Military Construction Appropriations Act, 2005			Introduced
	A bill to correct a technical error from Unit T-07 of the John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System.			Law
	Military Construction Appropriations Act, 2004			Introduced
	Air Cargo Security Improvement Act			Passed Sen
	National AMBER Alert Network Act of 2003	Yes		Passed Sen
Landrieu	Jean Lafitte National Historical Park and Preserve Boundary Adjustment Act of 2004			Passed Sen
	Atchafalaya National Heritage Area Act			Passed Sen
	SEARCH Act of 2004			Passed Sen
	Buffalo Soldiers Commemoration Act of 2003			Passed Sen
Lincoln	A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell or exchange all or part of certain administrative sites and other land in the Ozark-St. Francis and Ouachita National Forests and to use funds...			Law
	A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey to the New Hope Cemetery Association certain land in the State of Arkansas for use as a cemetery.			Law
	Working Taxpayer Fairness Restoration Act			Introduced
Mikulski	National Great Black Americans Commemoration Act of 2004			Law
	Mammography Quality Standards Reauthorization Act of 2004	Yes	Breast health	Passed Sen
Murkowski	Alaska Land Transfer Acceleration Act of 2003			Law
	Alaska Native Allotment Subdivision Act			Law
	Craig Recreation Land Purchase Act			Law
	A bill to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project in the State of Alaska.			Passed Sen
	A bill to authorize the exchange of lands between an Alaska Native Village Corporation and the Department of the Interior, and for other purposes.			Law
Murray	Wild Sky Wilderness Act of 2003			Passed Sen
Snowe	Harmful Algal Bloom and Hypoxia Amendments Act of 2004			Law

	A bill to amend section 33(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U. S. C. 657c(a)) to clarify that the National Veterans Business Development Corporation is a private entity.			Passed Sen
	A bill to provide an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 through September 17, 2004, and for other purposes.			Passed Sen
	Women's Sustainability Recovery Act of 2004	Yes	Women in business	Passed Sen
	Ocean and Coastal Observation Systems Act			Passed Sen
	A bill to temporarily extend the programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 through March 15, 2004, and for other purposes.			Law
	Harmful Algal Bloom and Hypoxia Amendments Act of 2003			Passed Sen
	Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act of 2003			Passed Sen
	Small Business Administration 50th Anniversary Reauthorization Act of 2003			Passed Sen
	Women's Business Centers Preservation Act of 2003	Yes	Business	Passed Sen
	A bill to improve the calculation of the Federal subsidy rate with respect to certain small business loans, and for other purposes.			Law

103rd

Women's Issue Bills

Bill	Sponsor	Party	Women's Issue	Action
Indian Child Protection and Family Violence Prevention Act Amendments of 1994	Senator John McCain	R	Child safety	Passed Sen
A bill to improve the administration of the Women's Rights National Historical Park in the State of New York, and for other purposes.	Senator Moynihan	D	Women's rights	Introduced
Improving America's Schools Act of 1994	Senator Ted Kennedy	D	Education	Introduced
Child Safety Protection Act	Senator Slade Gorton	R	Labeling on toys	Introduced
Women in the Armed Forces Commemorative Coins Act	Senator Frank Murkowski	R	Soldiers	Introduced
Freedom of Access to Clinic Entrances Act of 1994	Senator Ted Kennedy	D	Repro health	Law
Multifamily Housing Property Disposition Reform Act of 1994	Senator Donald Riegle	D	Housing	Law

Food Stamp Program Improvements Act of 1994	Senator Larry Pressler	R	Food	Law
Vietnam Women's Memorial Coin Act of 1994	Senator John Warner	R	Soldiers	Passed Sen
Higher Education Technical Amendments of 1993	Senator Claiborne Pell	D	Education	Law
Goals 2000: Educate America Act	Senator Ted Kennedy	D	Education	Introduced
School-to-Work Opportunities Act of 1993	Senator Paul Simon	D		Introduced
Comprehensive Child Immunization Act of 1993	Senator Ted Kennedy	D	Child health	Passed Sen
Early Detection and Preventive Health Act of 1993	Senator Ted Kennedy	D	Women's health	Introduced
Federal Employees Leave Sharing Amendments Act of 1993	Senator David Pryor	D	Women and work	Law
Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993	Senator Chris Dodd	D	Women and work	Introduced (but hr bill passed)

Bills Sponsored by Women

Female Sponsor	Bill	Women's Bill?	Women's Issue	Action
Boxer	A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to transfer to the Administrator of General Services the Old U.S. Mint in San Francisco, and for other purposes.			Passed Sen
	A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to permit the use of funds under the highway bridge replacement and rehabilitation program for seismic retrofit of bridges, and for other purposes.			Law
Feinstein	California Desert Protection Act of 1994			Law
	A bill to resolve the status of certain lands relinquished to the United States under the Act of June 1897 (30 Stat. 11, 36), and for other purposes.			Introduced
Hutchison	Satellite Home Viewer Act of 1994			Law
Kassebaum	South African Democratic Transition Support Act of 1993			Passed Sen
	General Aviation Revitalization Act of 1994			Law
Mikulski	Architect of the Capitol Human Resources Act			Introduced
	Liberty Ships Memorial Act of 1993			Passed Sen
Moseley-Braun	Full Faith and Credit for Child Support Orders Act			Law
	DOE Minority Bank Preservation Act of 1993			Passed Sen
Murray	Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation Grand Coulee Dam Settlement Act			Introduced

	A bill to provide early out authority for Forest Service Employees.			Passed Sen
	A bill to amend the definition of a rural community for eligibility for economic recovery funds, and for other purposes.			Law

102nd

Women's Issue Bills

Bill	Sponsor	Party	Female?	Women's Issue	Action
Children's Bicycle Helmet Safety Act of 1992	Senator Howard Metzenbaum	D		Child safety	Passed Sen
Child Support Recovery Act of 1992	Senator Richard Shelby	D		Child well-being	Law
Children's Nutrition Assistance Act of 1992	Senator Patrick Leahy	D		Childhood nutrition	Law
Health America: Affordable Health Care for All Americans Act	Senator George Mitchell	D		Family health	Introduced
National Child Protection Act of 1992	Senator Joe Biden	D		Child abuse and protection	Passed Sen
Women Veterans Health Programs Act of 1992	Senator Alan Cranston	D		Female soldiers and sexual health	Passed Sen
Biden-Thurmond Justice Improvements Act	Senator Joe Biden	D		Child protection, kidnapping	Passed Sen
National Institutes of Health Revitalization Amendments of 1992	Senator Ted Kennedy	D		Health	Introduced
Family Planning Amendments Act of 1992	Senator John Chafee	R		Repro health	Failed to pass over veto
Neighborhood Schools Improvement Act	Senator Ted Kennedy	D		Education	Resolving chamber differences
Family and Medical Leave Act of 1991	Senator Chris Dodd	D		Women and work	Failed to pass over veto
Child Nutrition Amendments of 1992	Senator Patrick Leahy	D		Nutrition	Law
Higher Education Amendments of 1992	Senator Claiborne Pell	D		Education	Law
Child Nutrition Improvements Act of 1992	Senator Patrick Leahy	D		Nutrition	Passed Sen
Child Abuse, Domestic Violence, Adoption and Family Services Act of 1992	Senator Chris Dodd	D		Families and safety	Law
Family Security Initiatives Act of 1992	Senator Lloyd Bentsen	D		Families	Introduced
Workers' Family Protection Act	Senator James Jeffords	R		Family safety	Passed Senate
Nontraditional Employment for Women Act	Senator Howard Metzenbaum	D		Women and work	Law

Commission on the Assignment of Women in the Armed Forces Act of 1991	Senator Sam Nunn	D		Female soldiers	Passed Sen
Drunk Driving Child Protection Act of 1991	Senator Joe Biden	D		Child safety	Passed Sen

Bill Sponsored By Women

Female Sponsor	Bill	Women's Issue?	Action
Mikulski	Scientific and Advanced-Technology Act of 1992		Law

Works Cited

- "The American Presidency Project." *The American Presidency Project*. University of California Santa Barbara, 2014. Web. 23 Mar. 2014
- Bratton, Kathleen A. "Critical Mass Theory Revisited: The Behavior and Success of Token Women in State Legislatures." *Politics & Gender* 1.01 (2005): 97-125. Web.
- Childs, Sarah, and Mona Lena Krook. "Analyzing Women's Substantive Representation: From Critical Mass to Critical Actors." *Government and Opposition* 44.2 (2009): 125-45. 2009. Web.
- Childs, Sarah, and Mona Lena Krook. "Critical Mass Theory and Women's Political Representation." *Political Studies* 56.3 (2008): 725-36. Print.
- Dahlerup, Drude. "From a Small to a Large Minority: Women in Scandinavian Politics." *Scandinavian Political Studies* 11.4 (1988): 275-98. 2006. Web.
- Dahlerup, Drude. "The Story of the Theory of Critical Mass." *Politics & Gender* 2.04 (2006): n. pag. Print.
- Dodson, Debra L., Susan J. Carroll, Ruth B. Mandel, Katherine E. Kleeman, Ronnee Schreiber, and Debra Liebowitz. "Voices, Views, Votes: The Impact of Women in the 103rd Congress." *Center for the American Woman and Politics* (1995): n. pag. 1995. Web.
- Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. *Men and Women of the Corporation*. New York: Basic, 1977. Print.
- Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. "Some Effects of Proportions on Group Life: Skewed Sex Ratios and Responses to Token Women." *American Journal of Sociology* 82.5 (1977): 965. *JSTOR*. Web.
- "Legislation." *THOMAS (Library of Congress)*. Library of Congress, 2014. Web. 23 Mar. 2014.
- "Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act." *National Women's Law Center*. N.p., 29 Jan. 2013. Web. 23 Mar. 2014.
- Pitkin, Hanna Fenichel. *The Concept of Representation*. Berkeley: University of California, 1967. Print.
- Reingold, Beth. *Representing Women: Sex, Gender, and Legislative Behavior in Arizona and California*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina, 2000. Print.
- Rovner, Julie. "U.s. Law 'Partial-Birth Abortion:' Separating Fact from Spin." *NPR*. NPR, 21 Mar. 2006. Web. 23 Mar. 2014.
- Sanbonmatsu, K., and K. Dolan. "Do Gender Stereotypes Transcend Party?" *Political Research Quarterly* 62.3 (2009): 485-94. Oct. 2008. Web.

Swers, Michele L. *The Difference Women Make: The Policy Impact of Women in Congress*. Chicago: U of Chicago, 2002. Print.

Tamerius, Karin L. "Sex, Gender and Leadership in the Representation of Women." *Gender Power, Leadership, and Governance*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1995. 93-112. Print.

Tremblay, M., and R. Pelletier. "More Feminists or More Women?: Descriptive and Substantive Representations of Women in the 1997 Canadian Federal Elections." *International Political Science Review* 21.4 (2000): 381-405. Print.

Vega, Arturo, and Juanity M. Firestone. "The Effects of Gender on Congressional Behavior and the Substantive Representation of Women." *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 20.2 (1995): 213-22. *JSTOR*. Web.

"Voting Records." *GovTrack.us*. Civic Impulse, 2014. Web. 21 Mar. 2014.