

THE IMPACT OF WOMEN IN PUBLIC OFFICE

VOICES, VIEWS, VOTES:

*The Impact of Women in the
103rd Congress*

CENTER FOR THE AMERICAN WOMAN AND POLITICS

THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW JERSEY
RUTGERS

EAGLETON INSTITUTE OF POLITICS

VOICES, VIEWS, VOTES:

The Impact of Women in the 103rd Congress

by

Debra L. Dodson

Susan J. Carroll

Ruth B. Mandel

Katherine E. Kleeman

Ronnee Schreiber

Debra Liebowitz

Center for the American Woman and Politics (CAWP)

Eagleton Institute of Politics

Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey

Table of Contents

i	Preface
2	Introduction
2	Ways Women Matter
3	The Legislation We Studied and the Roles Women Played
3	Women's Health
4	Abortion
6	Health Care Reform
6	Crime Bill
7	North American Free Trade Agreement
8	Major Themes and Findings
8	Women and Men in Congress Vote Differently
9	Women Make a Difference Beyond the Numbers
10	Expanding the Agenda
11	Helping to Shape the Content of Legislation
12	Expanding the Terms of the Debate over Legislation
13	Influencing the Fate of Legislation
15	Women in Congress Feel a Special Responsibility to Represent Women
16	Women in Congress Advance a Collective Agenda
16	The Extent to Which Women Organized to Exert Pressure
17	The Way Issues Were Framed
18	Support from Influential Male Colleagues
19	The Ability of Subgroups of Women Members to Work Together Around Common Interests
22	Women's Positions In Congress and the Political Context Affect Impact
22	Women's Positions within the Congressional Structure
23	Windows of Opportunity Created by Timing and Political Context
24	Conclusion
25	Glossary
26	Appendix: Methodology
27	Footnotes
28	Women in the U.S. Congress 1917-1995

Preface

The Center for the American Woman and Politics (CAWP) is in its third decade of conducting research about women's political participation. In its early research, CAWP counted and described the women in public office, examined the barriers which impeded women's access, and assessed the kinds of attitudes and experiences women bring to public life. Since the late 1980s, with CAWP's landmark study on the impact of women in state legislatures and the related studies of women in public office conducted by other scholars with grants from CAWP, the Center has begun to explore what happens to policies, processes and institutions when more women hold office.

CAWP has, since its founding, advanced the idea that bringing more women into public office would be beneficial; that premise has been the basis for numerous CAWP programs. The Center has long contended that increasing the number of women in elective and appointive offices was a matter of fairness and equity, and that failing to draw the nation's leaders from the full range of potential candidates, women and men of every race and ethnicity, meant that our nation used only a portion of its talent and resources to seek solutions to pressing economic and social problems. Moreover, early anecdotal evidence from CAWP studies as well as later, more systematic empirical evidence suggested that the underrepresentation of women within the ranks of our nation's leaders had profound policy consequences. CAWP's research findings showed that "women make a difference"—that women bring to public life distinctive perspectives and experiences, and that women officeholders in the aggregate hold different views and function differently in office from the way their male counterparts do.

CAWP's research in the late 1980s found that women state legislators not only held more liberal and more feminist attitudes than their male colleagues, but that women and men also differed in their priorities. Within each party, women legislators were more likely than their male colleagues to give top priority to women's rights policies and to public policies related to women's traditional roles as caregivers in the family and in society more generally—issues associated with children, families and health care.

The past studies clearly paved the way for the project to study the impact of women in the 103rd Congress, the research which we summarize here. Further information and a more in-depth analysis of our findings will be presented in a full-length volume being prepared by CAWP.

This research could not have been undertaken without the generous support of the Charles H. Revson Foundation. The Revson Foundation's singular encouragement and critical support for research about women and politics has ensured that the public and a wide range of political leaders understand the consequences of depriving the nation of its full leadership potential. Revson Foundation president Eli Evans and vice president Lisa Goldberg have an unusually strong understanding of the importance of studying women's changing political roles and their growing impact within governing institutions from which they were long absent. They know that this is not a topic for a day, but rather a long-term test of the quality of democracy; they also know that true comprehension requires the patience to go beyond the headlines to examine painstakingly the full record of actions taken, and especially to talk with individuals who took part in those actions. We are also grateful for their flexibility and tolerance for

the pace of scholarly research. Everyone at CAWP is proud and gratified to have had the Charles H. Revson Foundation's interest and support for more than a decade and a half.

This project has been a team effort, conceived and developed by Debra Dodson, Susan Carroll, and Ruth B. Mandel. Members of the research team whose case study analyses are the foundation on which this report is based are: Debra Dodson (abortion and health care reform); Susan Carroll (crime); Ronnee Schreiber (women's health); and Debra Liebowitz (NAFTA).

The project efforts were helped enormously by the work of others as well. Katherine Kleeman has done a remarkable job of sifting through a mass of materials and distilling a variety of sources to write and produce this overview of research findings for distribution to a wide audience. Debbie Walsh read and commented on several drafts of our study. Lucy Baruch added substantive and stylistic improvements in the final stages. Alan Rosenthal and Ross Baker generously gave of their time in reviewing some of the interview materials and serving as sounding boards for ideas. Tobi Walker conducted a portion of the crime bill and NAFTA interviews. Joining the effort late in the game, Liz Felter has been helpful

with finishing touches on the research effort. Miranda Lynch, an undergraduate intern, did many things, including an excellent job of setting up appointments with overworked staffers, lobbyists, and members. Vinita Jethwani, also an undergraduate intern, provided valuable research assistance. Many other students participated in the project in important ways. Our thanks to: Jennifer Fabius, Kathy Finney, Lisa Rossi, Michelle Cohen, Sarah Edelman, Sarah Stucker, Pamela Karwasinski, Claudia Reis, and Nicole Gunn. Secretarial support provided by Michele Treadwell and Linda Phillips was invaluable throughout the effort. Alice Kleeman transcribed most of the interviews and did a superb job with speed and accuracy. Marion Brady did last-minute editing, and Mary Ellen Muzio designed the report. We are grateful for the assistance of all these people.

Most of all, we thank those without whom there would have been no study—the women members of Congress who gave generously of their time to participate in interviews and the lobbyists and Congressional staff who agreed to speak with members of our research team, notwithstanding the changes in their lives in the wake of the 1994 elections and their impossible work schedules during the first hundred days of the 104th Congress.

Debra L. Dodson, Susan J. Carroll, Ruth B. Mandel



Major Themes and Findings

1 WOMEN AND MEN IN CONGRESS VOTE DIFFERENTLY

Women in the 103rd Congress, as a group, voted differently from their male colleagues on numerous bills, including some of those CAWP studied.

2 WOMEN MAKE A DIFFERENCE BEYOND THE NUMBERS

The voting patterns of women in Congress tell only a small part of the story about women's impact. The women members of the 103rd Congress also made a difference by:

- ✓ expanding the congressional agenda, insisting on attention to new issues
- ✓ helping to shape the content of legislation
- ✓ expanding the terms of the debate over legislation
- ✓ influencing the fate of legislation.

3 WOMEN IN CONGRESS FEEL A SPECIAL RESPONSIBILITY TO REPRESENT WOMEN

Most of the women in the 103rd Congress felt a special responsibility to represent women, particularly to represent the life experiences of women which might otherwise have been overlooked. They undertook this additional responsibility while first and foremost, like all members of Congress, representing their own districts.

4 WOMEN IN CONGRESS ADVANCE A COLLECTIVE AGENDA

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
- ✓ the way issues were framed
- ✓ support from influential male colleagues
- ✓ the ability of subgroups of women members—women of color, women in each party, freshman women—to work together around common interests not necessarily shared by all women members.

5 WOMEN'S POSITIONS IN CONGRESS AND THE POLITICAL CONTEXT AFFECT IMPACT

The nature and extent of women's political impact was influenced by:

- ✓ women's positions within the congressional structure—e.g. committee assignments, seniority, and presence in leadership roles
- ✓ windows of opportunity created by timing and political context.



Introduction

Election year 1992 marked a turning point for U.S. women's political participation at the national level, with unprecedented attention focused on women running for Congress. That year a number of factors converged to create an unusually hospitable climate for women candidates. Among these circumstances were:

- ✓ *political opportunities, including the availability of large numbers of open seats due both to redistricting in the wake of reapportionment and an unusually large number of retirements;*
- ✓ *the Clarence Thomas/Anita Hill hearings, which reminded women that the Senate was still largely a white male preserve where women's concerns were often trivialized or ignored;*
- ✓ *the shift in policy focus with the end of the Cold War, allowing new attention to be focused on domestic issues traditionally associated with women, such as jobs and family security, education, and health care;*
- ✓ *a desire for change, with the electorate eager for outsiders and women perceived as fresh faces with new solutions to vexing policy problems.*

When the elections were over, women had almost

I think that's something that sets women apart—they're more oriented to policy as it affects people.

Congresswoman Leslie Byrne (D-VA)

doubled their numbers in Congress. The number of women in the House rose from 28 (6.4 percent) to 47 (10.8 percent); in the Senate, the number of

women increased from two (two percent) to six (six percent).¹ For the first time, the number of women in Congress was large enough to examine systematically their roles both as individuals and as a group.

Therefore, with funding provided by the Charles H. Revson Foundation, CAWP undertook the first major, multifaceted analysis of the impact of women members of Congress. This overview previews the key themes and selected findings from this research; more detailed analyses will be presented in a forthcoming book. Based largely on interviews and analysis of documents, the overall study explores whether and how women made a difference across a variety of policy issues, ranging from those commonly perceived as "women's issues" to those perceived as gender-neutral to those which have traditionally been viewed as belonging to men's domain, where women are assumed to have little or no expertise. We examine women's impact on legislation in five different issue areas: women's health, abortion, health care reform, the Crime Bill, and the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA).²

WAYS WOMEN MATTER

In earlier CAWP research, women state legislators within each party were found to be more feminist and more liberal than men of the same party in their policy attitudes and more likely to give priority to women's rights policies and to policies related to women's traditional roles as caregivers in the family and in society. In that research, we drew conclusions about women's impact based on differences between women's and men's attitudes and their policy prior-

ities. This research takes the examination of women's impact a step further by focusing on women's actual behavior within a legislative context.

In examining congresswomen's impact, it is critical to note that women members of the 103rd Congress—including those who might share the self-description "feminist"—could and did differ on key issues such as those studied here. Pro-choice women members, like pro-choice groups, divided over the Freedom of Choice Act (FOCA); women members differed on the issue of universal access to health care; and women held varying opinions on the value of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) for women. Thus it would be misleading to suggest that there was always one "women's position" or even one "feminist position" on these or any other issues.

First and foremost, women members of Congress, like the men there, represent the interests of their districts and define for themselves what interests they will represent and how best to represent them.

Nevertheless, gender differences in life experiences and identification with women may lead women members to take common positions and to act in ways that are different in the aggregate from the positions and actions of their male colleagues. This report focuses primarily on the ways these gender differences in life experiences were reflected in the actions of women members of the 103rd Congress.

Because each congresswoman may define "women's interests" differently, members on opposite sides of an issue may believe with equal fervor that they are acting on behalf of women. Recognition of the complexity of women's concerns can help us understand how ideological differences can lead congresswomen to address seemingly similar priorities through different policy choices.

Women's impact may be evident not only in gender differences in vote counts, but also in other ways: the greater energy that women devote to an

issue; the behind-the-scenes activities they undertake; the critical moments when women step in to carry the ball. With a flexible and institutionally sensitive view of the congressional policymaking process, our research explores the varied and nuanced ways in which women's presence mattered in the 103rd Congress.

THE LEGISLATION WE STUDIED AND THE ROLES WOMEN PLAYED

We selected legislation to study based on two criteria. First, we chose to examine areas of legislation that were major concerns in the 103rd Congress. Second, we selected a mix of issues ranging from those commonly perceived as women's issues to those that were seemingly gender neutral

Women just are not usually thought about here. It's more nonfeasance in many instances than malfeasance, but that voice is just usually not heard.

Congresswoman Patricia Schroeder (D-CO)

to those traditionally viewed as belonging to men's domain, where women had traditionally been perceived as lacking expertise. The bills on which we focused made it through various stages of the legislative process. Some were enacted into law, while others never got that far. Some were considered defeats for women, others were victories, and still others could be declared neither since women themselves were very much divided.

WOMEN'S HEALTH

In 1993 the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues (CCWI) introduced its third Women's Health Equity Act (WHEA), a package of bills containing 32 separate provisions which addressed deficiencies in the treatment of women's health in three crucial areas: research, services and prevention. WHEA was first introduced by the CCWI's co-chairs Congresswomen Patricia Schroeder (D-CO) and (now

Senator) Olympia Snowe (R-ME) in 1990 in response to the growing concern over lack of research and attention to women's health issues. Since the package contained so many bills, not all saw congressional action, but most of those which did had bipartisan support. While many of these issues were ultimately supported by most members of Congress, women were responsible for bringing them to the agenda.

Women's efforts led to new or added funding for women's health concerns. Congresswoman Carrie Meek (D-FL) successfully targeted appropriations for lupus, a disease more common among African-American women than among other populations.

I'm a breast cancer survivor, so certainly I worked hard for the funding for all the women's health programs.

Congresswoman Marilyn Lloyd (D-TN)

The addition of Congresswomen Nancy Pelosi (D-CA), Nita Lowey (D-NY) and Rosa DeLauro (D-CT) to the House Labor, Health and Human Services (LHHS) Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee resulted in the appropriation of more than \$600 million for breast cancer research programs as well as funding for breast and cervical cancer prevention programs and ovarian cancer research. Their Senate counterparts, Barbara Mikulski (D-MD), Patty Murray (D-WA) and Dianne Feinstein (D-CA) lobbied their colleagues on the Appropriations Committee to ensure inclusion of these issues. Women such as breast cancer survivors Congresswomen Barbara Vucanovich (R-NV) and Marilyn Lloyd (D-TN) sponsored hearings and lobbied other members to ensure that legislation was authorized as well as funded. In addition, Congresswoman Constance Morella (R-MD) made certain that issues of concern to women with HIV/AIDS were included in the House Appropriations subcommittee report.

Women also directed attention to the needs of mil-

itary women, including the authorization of primary and preventive health care services for women at military hospitals and clinics. Congresswoman Patricia Schroeder (D-CO) secured the support of colleagues to put these concerns on the congressional agenda.

Women also called for the official authorization of the Office of Research on Women's Health at the National Institutes of Health (NIH). Congresswomen Schroeder and Snowe first proposed such an office in 1990.

ABORTION

Abortion, like women's health, is generally considered a "women's issue," but it stands apart from other elements of a women's health agenda because it is more controversial, with well-entrenched lobbies working on both sides. While the 103rd Congress dealt with abortion in a variety of different bills, CAWP's research focused on the four abortion-related bills/amendments most prominent within that Congress.

The Freedom of Access to Clinic Entrances Bill (FACE) made it a federal crime to obstruct access to abortion clinics or to harass workers at these clinics. The legislation passed both houses of Congress by substantial margins. Pro-choice women members of the House played critical roles on this bill in three ways: 1) Congresswoman Constance Morella (R-MD) was a chief co-sponsor of the bill; 2) women members of the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues continually pushed to move the bill through the process; 3) and women members like Congresswomen Patricia Schroeder (D-CO), Jolene Unsoeld (D-WA), Barbara Kennelly (D-CT), and Louise Slaughter (D-NY) used their official positions as committee members, whips, or members of the leadership to keep the bill moving.

The ban on Medicaid funding of abortion (the Hyde Amendment) had been added since 1976 to the Labor, Health and Human Services appropriation bill.

This amendment banned Medicaid funding of abortions except in cases of threat to the life of the woman and, in 1993 and 1994, in cases of rape and incest. In 1993, the amendment was passed in the House, and a Senate motion to strip the language from the bill failed. Pro-choice women in both chambers took the lead in battling this amendment, but it was primarily the women members serving on the LHHS subcommittees in each chamber who led the charge and strategized for the pro-choice side. The battle over Hyde was memorable as well for the unusually acrimonious floor debate between Congressman Henry Hyde (R-IL) and Congresswoman Cardiss Collins (D-IL), and ultimately between Congressman Hyde and several African-American women members who came to her defense. Although men led the effort to pass the Hyde amendment, Congresswomen Deborah Pryce (R-OH) and Tillie Fowler (R-FL) worked with Congressman Hyde to convince him to add the rape and incest exception to his amendment, which broadened the range of conditions under which Medicaid funding of abortions would be permitted.

The Freedom of Choice Act (FOCA) was an attempt to codify the Supreme Court's 1973 decision in *Roe v. Wade*. FOCA would have overturned most state regulation of abortion, and hence reversed Supreme Court decisions that weakened abortion rights. Although House and Senate committees approved the bill, it never reached the floor of either chamber. Women began the 103rd Congress as a powerful bloc behind the Freedom of Choice Act, but they lacked the position or power to shape the content of FOCA; that was in the hands of more senior male members. Controversy over whether the absence of protections for poor women and young women in the bill made it worth supporting ultimately fragmented women's strong initial support for FOCA. Other abortion-related bills

(such as abortion funding, FACE, and reproductive health coverage in health care reform) came to take priority over FOCA.

Abortion coverage under the Federal Employees Health Benefit Program (FEHBP) had been banned since the 1983 Treasury-Postal appropriations bill first included language barring abortion coverage in the federal system. This language was quietly omitted from the bill on the House side and somewhat less quietly omitted from the Senate bill. Women played very different roles in the two chambers. Senator Barbara Mikulski (D-MD) took the lead on the Senate side from the subcommittee level and succeeded in using procedural tools to remove in full committee the anti-abortion amendment that had been added in subcommittee. When the bill reached the floor, Senator Mikulski successfully argued that abortion restrictions were not germane

My line in the sand was, if [health care reform] didn't cover abortion, I was not going to support it.... Even [for] men who are abortion-rights supporters, who say they are pro-choice...it was not a line in the sand for them; it was not a priority upon which they would say, "I will not vote for this. I will simply say no, because this is so fundamental to my value system and my beliefs."

Congresswoman Lynn Schenk (D-CA)

on an appropriations bill. The Democratic women were credited with the narrow Senate victory that reversed a more than decade-old policy of banning abortion coverage through the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program. Women members of the House were less involved in this matter until the very end. In the last few hours prior to the vote on the conference report, they found that the pro-life side had undertaken an eleventh-hour lobbying effort. Had the women members not rushed to the floor to whip for passage of the bill containing the language on FEHBP (which was also vulnerable because of Republican disputes with the Democratic

administration), the bill, which passed by a mere one vote margin, would almost certainly have been defeated.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

Probably no issue dominated the 103rd Congress more than health care reform. While dozens of bills were submitted, only the Clinton health care plan had any realistic chance of passage in the

There are women sitting out there who are victims of domestic abuse who are saying, "Why can't you change the system for me? Don't you understand a little bit better than the guy that you're sitting next to?"

Congresswoman Susan Molinari (R-NY)

Democratic-controlled Congress. After that plan was declared dead, subsequent efforts to draft a compromise plan failed as well in the highly partisan environment.

Women in Congress contributed to the health care reform debate in part by creating a political environment in which women's health and reproductive health provisions could not be ignored, a goal facilitated by previous work on the Women's Health Equity Act and by the possibility that women (or at least Democratic women) would vote as a bloc. The Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues on the House side, and the collective efforts of women senators—particularly Democratic women senators in a effort led by Senator Barbara Mikulski (D-MD)—kept the issue of women's health before the public. In addition, some Republican women in the House worked together to oppose the Clinton health plan in part on the grounds that they saw it as bad for women.

Women also took advantage of committee positions (particularly in the more hierarchically structured House) to strengthen women's health provisions dealing with mammography, pap smears, abortion, and access to obstetrician/gynecologists. Sometimes women worked behind the scenes to

influence committee chairs as they were assembling their versions of the bill, and other times women members offered amendments in committee.

In addition, women used their places at the table to advocate strongly for the interests of their own districts (e.g. provisions to protect major employers in their districts, exempt states or districts from coverage under national health insurance, or avoid an employer mandate they felt would hurt the economic base of their districts). Furthermore, women such as Congresswoman Nancy Johnson (R-CT), an acknowledged expert on the issue and a visible participant in the debate, shared their knowledge accumulated over the years about the health care system with colleagues, both female and male, who were approaching the issue for the first time.

CRIME BILL

On September 13, 1994, President Clinton signed into law a \$30.2 billion Omnibus Crime Bill, following adoption by the House and Senate of the conference report just a few weeks earlier. The bill included a mixture of initiatives aimed at strengthening both punishment and prevention of crime. It authorized \$8.8 billion to hire new police officers, \$7.9 billion to construct prisons and boot camps, and \$6.9 billion for various prevention programs, including \$1.6 billion for the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA). Also included in the Crime Bill was a ban on assault weapons.

Women members of Congress had an impact on the Crime Bill both collectively and as individuals. Collectively, women members worked together to get the Violence Against Women Act out of the House Judiciary Committee and onto the floor for a vote, where it passed unanimously. Once the Crime Bill had reached conference, they also were successful in their individual and collective efforts: to persuade conferees to preserve provisions of the Violence

Against Women Act (included in the Senate but not the House bill) to make crimes motivated by gender a violation of federal civil rights law; to retain a provision, included in the House but not the Senate bill, that enabled abused immigrant spouses of U.S. citizens to apply for legal resident status on their own behalf; and to preserve the higher level of funding for the Violence Against Women Act authorized in the Senate version of the bill.

Women members of Congress also played key roles in the assault weapons ban. Senator Dianne Feinstein (D-CA) was the architect and chief sponsor of the assault weapons ban in the Senate. She worked tirelessly to make sure she had the votes to add it to the Senate version of the Crime Bill. On the House side, women were disproportionately represented among members who helped to whip votes in favor of the ban.

Senator Feinstein also was responsible for an amendment to the Crime Bill imposing stiffer penalties for violations of federal laws involving hate crimes. In addition to Senator Feinstein, a number of women made important individual contributions to the Crime Bill. Senator Carol Moseley-Braun (D-IL) offered a package of amendments dealing with juveniles and crime; the one that received the most attention and was included in the final bill permits juveniles age 13 and older to be tried as adults when they commit certain violent federal crimes. Senator Kay Bailey Hutchison (R-TX) sponsored an amendment added to the bill which prohibited inmates from obtaining Pell grants to pay for their college educations. Senator Barbara Boxer (D-CA) sponsored a successful amendment to help protect women from stalkers by barring states from releasing personal information provided on motor vehicle records.

On the House side, two of the most important contributions were made by Congresswomen Susan Molinari (R-NY) and Jennifer Dunn (R-WA), who

were able to add provisions to the Crime Bill when the Democratic leadership was forced to negotiate with moderate Republicans to obtain final approval. Congresswoman Molinari was responsible for a provision that allows evidence of a defendant's prior sex offenses to be admitted in federal sex crime trials, and Congresswoman Dunn was instrumental in adding a provision that requires registration of released sex offenders and allows police to notify communities of their presence.

NORTH AMERICAN FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Of all the foreign policy issues facing the 103rd Congress, trade was arguably the most significant. On December 17, 1992, U.S. President George Bush signed the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), with Mexico, Canada and the United States agreeing to eliminate all tariff barriers to trade among the three countries within a 15-year period. Although NAFTA was signed by President

I am very interested in looking at the conditions of working women. Not that I'm not interested in the conditions of working men—I am. But the women's story is generally not told.

Congresswoman Marcy Kaptur (D-OH)

Bush and subsequently supported with reservations by President Bill Clinton, the agreement had to be brought to a vote in the 103rd Congress because of the extensive changes in U.S. law which compliance with NAFTA necessitated.

Women as a group were not particularly visible in the debates over the North American Free Trade Agreement. This was especially true in the Senate, where a staffer commented, "I can't think of a female Senator who is actively involved" on trade issues. In fact, no women sat on the Finance Committee, which had primary responsibility for the legislation in the Senate. Women's participation on NAFTA followed a similar pattern in the House, where very few women were active on the agree-

ment. The most notable exception was Congresswoman Marcy Kaptur (D-OH), who was among Congress's most vocal opponents of the agreement.

Given generally low levels of involvement by women in Congress on NAFTA, one would not expect to find evidence to suggest that women's contributions influenced the contours of the debate surrounding the issue. Since women's organizations in the U.S. did not mobilize around NAFTA or articulate a collective position on the agreement, the issue was not presented or perceived in Congress as having a distinctive or important impact on women. Yet some women, particularly Congresswoman Kaptur, sought to focus attention on the

impact that NAFTA would have on women and families in the U.S. and Mexico. The most important instance of women's collective organizing around NAFTA was a four-day fact-finding trip to Mexico, organized by Congresswoman Kaptur. The eight congresswomen who went on the trip focused their attention on what they called "The Human Face of Trade."

The fight over congressional approval of the North American Free Trade Agreement was tumultuous and the verdict, especially in the House, remained uncertain until the final votes were cast. Ultimately both houses approved the agreement, and it went into effect on January 1, 1994.



Major Themes and Findings

1 WOMEN AND MEN IN CONGRESS VOTE DIFFERENTLY

Women in the 103rd Congress, as a group, voted differently from their male colleagues on numerous bills, including some of those CAWP studied.

When scholars have looked for gender differences in the impact of lawmakers, most commonly they have turned to roll call voting data. Although women and men within each party often vote similarly, a breakdown by party and sex of selected roll call votes from the 103rd Congress reveals numerous instances of gender differences, especially among Republicans. When there were differences, women members of Congress usually cast more liberal and/or more feminist votes than their male colleagues. (See table on page 9.)

On the House side, majorities of Republican women and men opposed one another on high profile issues such as the National Institutes of Health reauthorization, the Crime Bill, the assault weapons

ban, the Freedom of Access to Clinic Entrances bill, the Brady bill, and a requirement that the military ask recruits whether they are homosexual or bisexual. Although Republican men voted overwhelmingly against the Family and Medical Leave Act and for the Hyde Amendment, half of the Republican women voted against the majority position of their party on each of these bills.

Although they took opposing stands (in the floor votes we examined) less frequently than their GOP counterparts, majorities of Democratic women and men in the House voted differently from each other on a couple of high profile bills: fast track extension of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) and a version of the Clinton "Don't ask, don't tell" policy on gays and lesbians in the military. Never-

theless, Democrats had gender gaps of ten percentage points or more in numerous roll call votes during the 103rd Congress, including on seven of the eight issues noted above on which Republican women and men divided: the Crime Bill, the Freedom of Access to Clinic Entrances Bill, the Brady Bill, the assault

weapons ban, the requirement to ask military recruits whether they are homosexual, the Family and Medical Leave Act, and the Hyde Amendment. These differences suggest that gender is related to policy stands in the Democratic party, but evidently to a lesser extent than in the Republican party.



2 WOMEN MAKE A DIFFERENCE BEYOND THE NUMBERS

The voting patterns of women in Congress tell only a small part of the story about women's impact. The women members of the 103rd Congress also made a difference by:

- ✓ expanding the congressional agenda, insisting on attention to new issues
- ✓ helping to shape the content of legislation
- ✓ expanding the terms of the debate over legislation
- ✓ influencing the fate of legislation.

Women's impact on legislation has typically been assessed by looking at concrete measures such as bill sponsorship, reported legislative priorities, or roll call votes. Important as such approaches are, they offer only a partial picture of

an extremely complex process. Women members of Congress can influence the nature of the debate, the policy agenda, or the content of bills. Women can also influence the fate of legislation by blocking a bill in committee, extricating it from committee,

Selected Votes of Male and Female House Members in the 103rd Congress				
	REPUBLICAN MEN	REPUBLICAN WOMEN	DEMOCRATIC MEN	DEMOCRATIC WOMEN
For NIH Authorization Conference Report	30%	83%	93%	100%
For Crime Bill	23	67	72	89
For Assault Weapons Ban	19	58	66	91
For FACE Conference Report	20	75	80	97
For Brady Bill	30	67	70	89
Against Amendment to Ask Recruits if Gay, Bisexual	32	67	87	100
For Family and Medical Leave Act	21	50	87	100
Against Hyde Amendment	6	50	58	86
Against GATT Fast Track Extension	12	25	39	59
Against Version of Don't Ask, Don't Tell	6	17	41	78

forcing a vote on a bill, participating in a "whipping" plan to muster votes, holding press conferences to influence public perception of a bill, meeting with leadership to express a collective point of view, or getting added to a bill certain provisions their male colleagues might not have considered. Women in the 103rd Congress took all these steps,

If it weren't for the [Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues], the women members acting together and with the support of the staff, we wouldn't have women's health on the agenda.

a House staff member

thereby exerting important influences in addition to any impact to be discerned through analysis of their voting behavior or bill sponsorship.

EXPANDING THE AGENDA

Congresswomen added issues to the congressional agenda that had rarely, if ever, been addressed.

CASE IN POINT: *While women and men usually supported women's health legislation, and while women members were often quick to praise their male colleagues for their support, it was the women who played key roles in focusing attention on gender inequality in medical research and services. Then-Congresswoman (now Senator) Olympia Snowe (R-ME) described how women in Congress seized on the issue of women's health beginning in the 101st Congress and made it a priority:*

What happened was, we discovered that the National Institutes of Health...was not enforcing its own policy of clinical study trials; they were excluding women and minorities.... We were absolutely appalled and aghast that this could be so in today's society. The more we delved into the issue, the more we realized how egregious it all was.... Then we looked at the federal dollars, and what percentage was going to women's health issues, and...as we got into it more and more, we

realized that this was a horrendous oversight, and clearly was having an effect on the well-being of women in the country....

So that's how we began the whole process. We then decided to carry this out as a major priority for the [Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues] and we decided to have an all-inclusive Women's

Health Equity Act, and to compile all the issues of importance to women's health. My legislation [set out] to create an Office of Women's Health; Pat Schroeder had a requirement that the National Institutes of Health would include

women and minorities in its clinical study trials. And then we decided to obligate certain funds, specific funding, for breast, cervical and ovarian cancer, plus osteoporosis.... That's how we started.

Congresswoman Rosa DeLauro (D-CT) indicated how the increased number of women in the 103rd Congress, specifically on the Labor, Health and Human Services Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, played a role in keeping these issues on the agenda:

...We were able...for the first time, to put a real emphasis [on women's health] because [of the] changing nature of the [Appropriations] subcommittee. For the first time...there were four women on that committee, when there were none before.

CASE IN POINT: *Health care reform was not placed on the congressional agenda by women; it moved to the top of the agenda because it was a presidential priority. But women members of the House and Senate insisted that the debate over health care reform must be expanded to include women's health issues, which they had already been articulating, and that women's needs must be adequately addressed in any reform legislation. A House staff member said:*

Women in general...had a major impact [on health care reform] in...making sure that women's health wasn't relegated to the kind of back-bench status that it had received in previous years...and in just

raising awareness about women's health issues, too, in terms of preventive services. I'm not just talking about access to abortion, but I'm talking about mammograms and pap smears...raising the level of understanding of how important and how critical those things were.

When asked about her role in raising women's health issues in the debate over health care reform in the Labor and Human Resources Committee, Senator Barbara Mikulski (D-MD) explained:

Before health insurance reform, I had laid the groundwork on the whole issue of women's health. It was a continuation of the work that I had done in the House... as part of the congresswomen's caucus.... When health insurance came along, we knew...the whole issue of women's health research was important.... There were those concerns about our access to ... mammograms, pap smears, the regularity and the frequency of them.... At the same time, we also were paying particular attention to the needs of older women....

HELPING TO SHAPE THE CONTENT OF LEGISLATION

Women members of Congress brought to the table their distinctive life experiences and perspectives as women, and these were reflected in bills they introduced and provisions they attempted to add to bills.

CASE IN POINT: Congresswoman Susan Molinari (R-NY) devoted her energies to including a provision in the Crime Bill altering rules of evidence to allow information about prior sex offenses to be admitted in federal criminal trials—a provision she saw as especially important for women. When asked why she chose to focus her energies on this provision, rather than others, she explained:

It's because you look for gaps. So when it came time for things like prison construction, or some-

thing Republicans have always fought for, we had 100 advocates out there....You sit back during the course of a day and you say, "Here are my [ten] concerns. Well, seven people on the committee are championing these [seven] concerns" ...so you're going to work on the other three, and they're going to become your projects, not because you feel any more strongly about prior rules of evidence than you do truth in sentencing, but [because] someone else is handling truth in sentencing, so this will be mine. And I really think that for the women, that just became the natural evolution....Frankly, dealing with things concerning violence against women and a 1-800 number and being able to send money to the state so that judges and police can be trained in dealing with this, these are rather novel ideas, so the time was right to bring them up, and we were just all there.

CASE IN POINT: Senators Kay Bailey Hutchison (R-TX) and Barbara Mikulski (D-MD) drafted legislation, which was introduced by five of the seven women Senators in the 103rd Congress, to allow homemakers to establish Individual Retirement Accounts on the same terms as paid workers. As Hutchison commented:

My bill to create IRA's for homemakers.... is something that women can understand—that homemakers

You'll always have voices to speak on behalf of more prison construction, but it's a little tougher to find somebody who is willing to be fighting for tougher rape laws.... They just don't seem to have that constituency built in. So women sort of take that cause on for personal reasons, and also because no one is fighting those battles for us if it's not us.

Congresswoman Ileana Ros-Lehtinen (R-FL)

do not have retirement security, and that was not a fair representation of their contribution to society.

CASE IN POINT: In the House Ways and Means Committee, the chairman's version of the health care reform bill provided biennial mammogram coverage for women in their 40s and women over 65, with

annual coverage only for women between the ages of 50 and 64. The coverage for women over 65 matched current Medicare provisions but conflicted with the latest medical standards. Congresswoman Barbara Kennelly (D-CT), one of only two women on the committee, offered an amendment, passed by voice vote, to provide women 65 and older with annual mammography coverage. Congresswoman Kennelly's victory on the \$40 million amendment was not a foregone conclusion. As one staffer put it, "It's a rather contentious issue. She had to come up with funding to do it, which was extremely difficult."

EXPANDING THE TERMS OF THE DEBATE OVER LEGISLATION

Sometimes women members of Congress made a distinctive contribution simply by expanding the ways an issue was viewed and discussed; without necessarily altering the outcome, women challenged

human concerns," and "women's presence in the debate gave these issues more credibility." Although women members on both sides of the NAFTA debate talked about the human side of the trade issue, this focus was central to the trip that NAFTA opponent Congresswoman Marcy Kaptur (D-OH) organized for a delegation of eight women members. As Congresswoman Kaptur explained:

We called [the NAFTA trip] "The Human Face of Trade." ...the women could come back and they could talk about what they saw. Many women ...with us were interested in environmental questions. But it became more personal when you stood in the shanty of a woman and her family, and you saw what her check bought her, and you saw the conditions in which she was living. All of a sudden, a lot of things came together. It wasn't just environment, it wasn't just education—it was standard of living and making a living.

CASE IN POINT: *Sensitive to the issue of sexual harassment, all seven women in the Senate—the five Democrats and the two Republicans—joined in opposing a deal which allowed Admiral Frank Kelso 2nd, the Chief of Naval Operations, to retire from the Navy with the rank and pension of a four-star officer. The women felt that Kelso should have been held responsible for*

I felt women [visiting Mexico to assess the potential impact of NAFTA]... would see things differently.... I don't ever want to suggest that men can't see things just as sensitively as women. But... as our overall mission we wanted to see how people lived, wanted to talk in a personal way. So it made sense to go with other people who... had similar outlooks. We didn't all agree on ideology, but I think we looked at it collectively in a more humanistic, more personal, more family-oriented way.

Congresswoman Eva Clayton (D-NC)

their colleagues to think about issues in new ways by bringing their distinctive experiences as women to bear.

CASE IN POINT: *Women members of Congress were not, with few exceptions, very active on either side of NAFTA. To the extent that they became involved with the issue, they focused more of their attention and energies on the social and economic effects that NAFTA would have on women and families in both the U.S. and Mexico. As a House staff member noted, women were more focused on "general*

the Tailhook scandal, in which naval aviators who attended a convention were accused of sexual harassment, and that he should be given only the pension of a two-star officer; the Pentagon's civilian leadership had arranged the deal under which he would step down quietly in exchange for the full pension of a four-star admiral. Although the Senate voted 54 - 43 to allow Kelso to retire as a four-star admiral, the final vote was much closer and more contested than anyone had anticipated, and the women Senators' collective voice made clear that sexual harassment was a very serious

issue which could no longer be quietly ignored in the chambers of the Senate.

INFLUENCING THE FATE OF LEGISLATION

Women members of the 103rd Congress influenced the fate of some of the legislation examined in our study. On some occasions they affected the fate of non-gender-related legislation as individual members of Congress, just as their male colleagues might have done. On other occasions they affected the fate of gender-related legislation, either individually or collectively, by acting on behalf of women's interests as they perceived them.

The number of bills passed which dealt with issues of particular importance to women provides some indirect evidence of women's gender-related impact on the fate of legislation in the 103rd Congress. According to an analysis by the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues, the 103rd Congress passed a record number of bills of concern to women and their families—66 such pieces of legislation, or more than half again as much as the previous record set by the 102nd Congress.³

CASE IN POINT: *Senator Carol Moseley-Braun (D-IL), as the only African-American in the Senate, was able to reverse what, in her absence, might well have been a routine vote. In July 1993, a bill sponsored by Senator Jesse Helms (R-NC) came before the Senate. The legislation would have renewed the patent of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, who historically have held a patent on the Confederate flag insignia. Senator Moseley-Braun spoke passionately on the Senate floor, arguing that Congress should not grant exclusive rights to a logo that symbolizes slavery for African-Americans, and she managed to persuade the Senate to deny the patent renewal. Almost all observers agreed that had Senator Moseley-Braun not been there, the patent would have been approved readily.*

CASE IN POINT: *Senator Dianne Feinstein (D-CA) had a deep personal commitment to banning assault weapons, and she was determined to have such a ban included in the Crime Bill. Even when the odds appeared stacked against her, she pushed ahead. As Senator Carol Moseley-Braun (D-IL) described the effort:*

[Senator Feinstein] hounded everyone, she talked to every member, she talked to every member's

All economic issues are women's issues as well, and certainly if jobs are there and the economy is going well, there are jobs for women as well as for men. And if they're not, women will be the first ones cut out.

Congresswoman Helen Bentley (R-MD)

mother, she talked to everyone, but she worked that bill, she really worked that bill. And...I'd say that the assault weapons ban is a testimony to her hard work and just doggedness, because at a time when I and every other member of the [Judiciary] Committee had concluded that this was a symbolic thing and there was no way we were going to get the votes, Dianne went out and worked and got the votes.

CASE IN POINT: *Senator Nancy Kassebaum (R-KS), in the words of one staffer, was "the critical person in terms of the actual final ability to get the [Crime] Bill passed" through the Senate. She became a key player in August 1994 at the end of the process when Senator Robert Dole (R-KS) threatened to subject the bill to a budgetary point of order. Senator Kassebaum, along with Senators John Danforth (R-MO) and John Chafee (R-RI)—all supporters of the crime bill—signed a letter threatening the point of order to give Senator Dole an opportunity to negotiate with Majority Leader George Mitchell. Although Senator Dole rejected all of Senator Mitchell's offers, Senator Kassebaum was satisfied that Senator Dole had had his chance and that Senator Mitchell had responded in good faith. When Senator Dole called for a vote on the budgetary point of*

order, Senator Kassebaum and her two moderate colleagues voted against him, paving the way for final passage of the amended conference report on the bill. A staff member explained that she "took a lot of heat" from her colleagues for her decision: "She came down to the floor and was sitting at her desk, and nobody came up to talk to her. It was almost like she was being given the cold shoulder." However, another staffer spoke admiringly of her actions:

Senator Kassebaum is someone who routinely is willing to put party politics aside to stand up for principle and to do what she considers to be good policy. That is a trait that is in short supply in Congress.

CASE IN POINT: *Women members of the House played critical roles in getting the Freedom of Access to Clinic Entrances Bill (FACE) through the process and to a final vote. Although the bill ultimately passed by a wide margin, the real issue was whether it would ever get through the process and to the floor for a final vote before the end of the session. Commenting that "Women were absolutely critical on [FACE]," one House staff member explained:*

All the women were going to [Judiciary Committee chairman] Jack Brooks (D-TX) and to [Crime and Criminal Justice Subcommittee chairman] Chuck Schumer (D-NY) and over to the Senate side as well, saying, "You must pass this. You must do it quickly. We cannot afford to wait recess after recess." ... There was just this dogged persistence on this issue. I think it was the women together as a force that really made the difference.

The sole female member of the Judiciary Committee, Congresswoman Patricia Schroeder (D-CO), whom Congressman Schumer had outmaneuvered to claim sponsorship of the bill, played a particularly important role, taking responsibility for getting the

bill through conference committee. As one staffer explained:

The women were united on making sure things happened on time in conference committee.... Brooks was in a markup on telecommunications or the Crime Bill.... So Pat Schroeder offered to go ahead and... manage it.

Another added, "[Congressman Brooks] gave her the ball and let her run with it." However, Congresswoman Schroeder was not alone in her effort to get FACE through the process. Congresswomen Jolene Unsoeld (D-WA), Barbara Kennelly (D-CT), and Louise Slaughter (D-NY) were all critical in influencing the bill's fate. A staff member described Congresswoman Unsoeld's role:

...it was a female deputy whip who took charge of the whip count, Jolene Unsoeld. The whip counts are such an important part of the process. And she clearly worked so tremendously hard in that. This was more a crusade to them. This was not just another boring bill.

A pro-choice advocate commented on the role played by Congresswoman Kennelly:

...it was also important to have people like Barbara Kennelly in the leadership to be able to work closely with [in] trying to figure out a strategy—"This is what we need to do, I'll do this, you go do that" kind of thing. We worked a lot with Barbara in that way.

Finally, the pro-choice effort was strengthened by having Congresswoman Slaughter as a member of the critical Rules Committee. As a staffer explained:

We were trying to get [FACE] to the floor to be conferenced ... before the end of the session. And Louise worked with us to try to figure out how to make that happen. The Rules Committee, in and of itself, was not pro-choice.... So it was important to have Louise there.



3] WOMEN IN CONGRESS FEEL A SPECIAL RESPONSIBILITY TO REPRESENT WOMEN

Most of the women in the 103rd Congress felt a special responsibility to represent women, particularly to represent the life experiences of women which might otherwise have been overlooked. They undertook this additional responsibility while first and foremost, like all members of Congress, representing their own districts.

Congresswomen, like congressmen, bring to Washington the specific concerns of their districts along with their individual experiences and perspectives. But almost without exception, the women—regardless of party—also take special responsibility for addressing the concerns of women as they perceive them. As Congresswoman Lynn Woolsey (D-CA) explained:

Women are on...every single committee, and carrying the water, as are the other representatives. But at the same time, we carry the responsibility to women and children—we just do. Because if we don't, it's not going to happen.

CASE IN POINT: *Congresswoman Nydia Velazquez (D-NY) described why she feels an obligation to represent women's interests:*

Before I came here, I worked for a Congressman. And while I worked for him, I saw that women's issues were not part of the national agenda. And that is...true today. It hasn't changed. So it is our responsibility to participate in every single issue that we have here, and every debate that we have here, but I understand that if we don't force others to focus on women's issues, then it will not be a part of the debate. And that is a responsibility that all of us share, especially women.

CASE IN POINT: *As a member of the Democratic leadership, Congresswoman Barbara Kennelly (D-CT) sees raising awareness of the differential impact of policies on women as part of her responsibility:*

You can't be a one-note all the time because there's so much going on. But I've tried to always say, "How does this affect women? Let's see if we

can do better. Let's look at it from a woman's point of view. Have you thought about this, this, and this?"

CASE IN POINT: *Congresswoman Nancy Johnson (R-CT) believes she has special responsibilities as a woman in Congress:*

I didn't really want to be stereotyped as the woman legislator....I wanted to deal with things like banking and finance. But I learned very quickly that if the women like me in Congress were not going to attend to some of these family concerns, whether it was jobs or children, pension equity or whatever, then they weren't going to be attended to. So I quickly shed those biases that I had and said, "Well, nobody else is going to do it; I'm going to do it."

Congresswoman Marge Roukema (R-NJ)

We need to integrate the perspective of women into the policy-making process, just as we have now successfully integrated the perspective of environmental preservation, the perspective of worker safety.... Now, whenever something comes up, we automatically think, "Gee, how will this affect the environment? How will this affect the working people at the work site?" But we don't really think, "How is this going to affect women who work at home? Women in the workplace with home responsibilities? Women who are single parents?" And so I do feel a special responsibility to participate in the public policy process in a way that assures that where something is going to affect women as well as men, that I think through how will this affect women who are at home taking care of children who need to re-enter the workforce later on? How does this affect women who didn't get to go beyond high school because

their family thought only boys should go to college, and now they're stuck? I know a lot more about the shape of women's lives and the pattern

of women's lives, so I need to look and see how the public policy will affect those patterns, and how it will help or hurt.



4 WOMEN IN CONGRESS ADVANCE A COLLECTIVE AGENDA

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
- ✓ the way issues were framed
- ✓ support from influential male colleagues
- ✓ the ability of subgroups of women members—women of color, women in each party, freshman women—to work together around common interests not necessarily shared by all women members.

The vehicle through which women were most visibly and formally organized within the Congress was the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues (CCWI), whose membership included almost all of the Democratic women and seven of the twelve Republican women in the 103rd Congress. The Caucus played a significant role, offering packages of legislation, publicizing its positions, and promoting bills using a variety of strategies. In addition, women members and staff worked together informally outside the CCWI when the need arose. External women's organizations and coalitions of women's organizations and other sympathetic groups also contributed importantly to legislative efforts, particularly around "women's issues" such as women's health, the Violence Against Women Act, and reproductive rights. By way of contrast, in the case of NAFTA, where women's groups did not mobilize, women's concerns were not emphasized except by those few Congresswomen who took on the issue.

THE EXTENT TO WHICH WOMEN ORGANIZED TO EXERT PRESSURE BOTH INSIDE AND OUTSIDE OF CONGRESS

Where women inside and outside Congress had come together around issues, they were prepared to mobilize

when action was required. Because they had discussed issues in advance and knew who their allies were, they could work together efficiently and effectively.

CASE IN POINT: *In a striking instance where congresswomen were organized to take collective action, they saved legislation important to them. A congressional staffer related the details. She explained that the longstanding ban on abortion coverage in the Federal Employees' Health Benefit Program (FEHBP) was absent from the conference report on the huge Treasury/Postal Appropriations Bill. Ordinarily, a vote on a conference report is a relatively routine matter. On the day the conference report reached the House floor, the subcommittee chairman, Congressman Steny Hoyer (D-MD), unaware of the impending challenge, assured pro-choice congresswomen that there would be no abortion-related challenge to the bill. (The real worry for Democrats was that the bill would be in trouble because of conflict between Republicans and the White House over White House staffing issues.) Late that day, the office of a pro-choice congresswoman was contacted by a pro-choice staff member who worked for a pro-life member; the staffer's boss was getting whip calls from pro-life members, and it appeared that the bill might be ambushed by a last-minute pro-life whipping effort. The pro-choice congresswoman's staff notified the Congressional Caucus*

for Women's Issues, whose staff quickly faxed all pro-choice women members, alerting them to the potential crisis and urging them to report to the House floor immediately. There, the congresswomen calmly signalled their Democratic colleagues that this was a routine conference report and they should vote "Yes." Without this quick mobilization, the bill (which passed by one vote) would have been defeated.

CASE IN POINT: In addition to the influence which women members and women staff had on the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA), the women's community outside Congress seems to have had considerable impact in generating support for VAWA among members of Congress. The feminist group which clearly supported VAWA from the beginning and was responsible for organizing much of the external pressure for it was the NOW Legal Defense and Education Fund (NOW LDEF). NOW LDEF organized a task force of groups interested in VAWA—the Violence Against Women Task Force—which included unions, churches, domestic violence organizations, and nurses. In the words of one staffer:

The women's community...running battered women's shelters, running violence hot lines, running rape crisis shelters, the women who are in the prosecutors' offices dealing with domestic violence and rape, and the victim services people—these are the women out there who understood the importance of the legislation and who really rallied behind it at a very grassroots level.... Senators don't care what [a leader of a national women's organization] says because she is not a constituent of theirs. They care nonetheless what...their local community groups are saying.... The grassroots concern for the bill ultimately is what turned people around.

THE WAY ISSUES WERE FRAMED

Members of Congress, ever mindful of the next election and the interests of their constituents, pre-

fer to cast votes which are non-controversial or seem likely to garner widespread support in their districts. In developing strategies for moving their collective agenda, women sometimes sought to frame issues to make them broadly appealing and difficult to oppose. In some cases, the most effective framing presented itself in the form of the day's headlines, and women members of Congress took advantage of this.

CASE IN POINT: Women chose the title "Women's Health Equity Act" to underscore the desire for equity, rather than new rights or privileges. Their case was fueled by a General Accounting Office (GAO) report showing that women were routinely excluded from

I think that the Breast Cancer Coalition followed the model of AIDS—strong grassroots organization, strong lobbying efforts from people's districts directly to their members...They did so successfully...There is a realization that if you want to be a priority, you have to bang hard at the door.

Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi (D-CA)

medical research conducted or funded by the National Institutes of Health; the report painted a picture of women's health concerns' being ignored or trivialized. As one congressional staff member explained regarding the report:

This was confirmation, affirmation of what almost every woman at some time has encountered when she goes to her doctor and is given no information or little information, patted on the head and told, "Let me worry about that. Don't worry your pretty head about this, dear."

The Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues (CCWI) chose to focus attention primarily on gender disparities in research, presenting them as a clear-cut case of inequality. When women's health was framed in this way, it became, in the words of a lobbyist, a "mom and apple pie" issue which few members of Congress wanted to be seen as opposing. As one staff member suggested:

It was the one issue Republicans could really deal with on women. It was their one safe area. And for... most of the Democrats, it's gender politics—women elect them and they know that.

CASE IN POINT: *If framed as an abortion issue, access to clinics where abortions are performed could be a difficult proposition to sell, particularly to members of Congress who oppose abortion. In the wake of attacks on women's clinics and abortion providers, the Freedom of Access to Clinic Entrances bill was presented as having to do with public safety*

We worked quite effectively to reach out to men and get them to be supportive...Lots and lots of the senior, more powerful committee chairmen had had personal experiences with their wives having cancer and even their daughters having cancer...There was a lot of support.

Congresswoman Karen Shepherd (D-UT)

and property rights. It passed by a wide margin. The legislation drew support from people who opposed crime and wished to protect property rights, even if they were unenthusiastic about the abortion clinics protected by it. Congresswoman Patricia Schroeder (D-CO) believed that she had a specific task for ensuring that FACE passed:

...constantly keeping it in front of the members on our side, to say this is not a choice issue—this is really a crime issue.... We continually reminded them that they had passed, just two years before, protection for animal clinics from protestors. So if you're going to protect a property right federally, to not protect life and limb when it's being challenged would really look bad.

SUPPORT FROM INFLUENTIAL MALE COLLEAGUES

While women in the 103rd Congress were more visible than ever before, they remained a distinct minority who, for the most part, had little seniority. Not one woman chaired a committee in the 103rd

Congress. As a result, women's successes in advancing their collective agenda depended on collaboration with male colleagues.

Sometimes the men who proved to be allies were moved by personal experience; many, for example, had wives or sisters who had suffered from breast cancer, and they were immediately sympathetic to the idea of increasing funding for research on the disease. In other cases, the motivation of male allies was more political—appearing supportive of women for purposes of future campaigns or gathering chits from congresswomen for the return of a favor later on another issue. Whatever the impetus, the congresswomen were most effective in advancing their collective agenda when they attracted powerful male colleagues to their causes.

CASE IN POINT: *The Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues worked hard to ensure that women's health concerns were included in any health care reform package. In testimony before the House Ways and Means Subcommittee on Health, Congresswoman Olympia Snowe (R-ME), co-chair of the CCWI, stated:*

More than anything else, we want to ensure that women are included at the outset in the health care reform proposal and during the debate that will emerge during this Congress.

The chairman's version of the bill in the Education and Labor Committee came much closer than did the Ways and Means version to the women's health coverage standards called for by CCWI. The chairman's version included: annual mammograms for women over 50 and biennial mammograms for women 40-49; annual pap smears for women of child bearing age; no co-payments for cervical cancer screening and family planning visits; and free contraceptives for women with family incomes equal to or less than 200 percent of poverty level. These enhanced women's health provisions were there in part because of the responsiveness

of Congressman Pat Williams (D-MT), chairman of the Labor-Management Subcommittee of the Education and Labor Committee, to the concerns of women committee members. His support decreased the likelihood that the women would have to struggle to get numerous women's health amendments added to the bill in committee; this made women's health a more secure part of the bill. Congresswoman Lynn Woolsey (D-CA) characterized the situation by noting that the Democratic women on the committee, in an effort led by Congresswoman Patsy Mink (D-HI), talked to Congressman Williams and watched him "go through a catharsis." She observed that the issue had not been "on his radar screen," but that once it did appear he consistently brought it forward as the first or second item in his plan. "It was a real accomplishment and [that's] why [the subcommittee version] was different from the other [health care bills]," she concluded.

CASE IN POINT: *Although women members played critical roles in moving the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) through the House, the fate of VAWA on the Senate side was very much influenced by the support of powerful male allies. Senator Joseph Biden (D-DE), chairman of the Judiciary Committee, was not only the initial sponsor of VAWA in the Senate but also the person who originated the idea for the bill. As one congressional staff member observed:*

I think Biden, from a women's standpoint, was just as good as if he were a woman. I think his gender was irrelevant. He was carrying the cause 100 percent.

Less predictable, perhaps, was the support of Senator Orrin Hatch (R-UT), ranking minority member of the Judiciary Committee. Senator Hatch became a champion of VAWA both in the Senate and in the conference committee, helping to make sure that it was protected and well-funded. Congresswoman Constance Morella (R-MD) observed:

[Hatch] just thought this was an issue that affected all women, one he could easily pick up on...and carry through and feel that he was helping all women. And I think that once he got involved, he believed in it.

A lobbyist elaborated on the concerns in Hatch's state that prompted his support:

It was very hard for Mormon women to talk about being victims of violence.... He went out and had a conference in Salt Lake City, thinking it would be a moderate little conference, thinking that nobody would care about the bill and he'd find the opposition. And instead almost a thousand people

I had a saying here...that though I was all by myself, I was never alone, because I really did have good guys.... And what was an enormous relief to me when I came to the Senate was that men who had been working on issues affecting women and families didn't say, "Wow, Barb is here, let's give it to her."

Senator Barbara Mikulski (D-MD)

showed up.... And he came back born again. He said to his staff, "Call Joe Biden—we're going to pass this bill."

THE ABILITY OF SUBGROUPS OF WOMEN MEMBERS TO WORK TOGETHER AROUND COMMON INTERESTS

On certain issues and concerns, most women in Congress are able to transcend their differences and work together. But in other cases, it is not feasible for all or most women members to work collectively, either because they represent different constituencies or parties, because they see issues and agendas through different lenses, or because they have particular interests that may not be shared by all of their female colleagues. However, in such situations, women frequently work together in subgroups to promote shared concerns.

CASE IN POINT: *The members of the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues sometimes differed with*

one another over priorities. African-American women in Congress, for example, placed higher priority on lifting the Hyde Amendment (restricting federal funds for abortion for low-income women) and on abortion-related funding issues in general than on pushing for the Freedom of Choice Act. As one staffer put it:

Some thought that we had to push right away to get the Freedom of Choice Act passed, and then others thought that the most important thing was funding—repealing the Hyde Amendment and

I think maybe the public has a perception that we ought to always be lockstep, and that doesn't happen. Everybody represents a district. And so you have an interest and you work with whomever you can on those interests.

Congresswoman Eddie Bernice Johnson (D-TX)

making sure that poor women had access. That is where you saw a little bit of difference based on what kind of a district the members represented. My boss has a lot of poor African-American women in her district, so there was strong feeling...in some of the groups that were more closely aligned with that population that FOCA should not be the first thing up, because if we couldn't make sure that all women had access to [abortions], then it was meaningless.

Shared concern about access of poor women to abortion services was a common bond among the African-American women members. According to Congresswoman Cynthia McKinney (D-GA), African-American women collaborated constructively and positively on issues of reproductive rights, and funding in particular:

[This] was something that we could do that would positively affect our constituents and that also...built our camaraderie with each other. So it was good on many different levels.... What we had done to augment what the overall women's caucus did prove to be very effective.... When the debate [over the Hyde Amendment] came on the floor,

there was such solidarity.... It was not just white women, but black women were an integral part of the working of the women's caucus, because now we had come on board with the pre-eminent issue in a way that black women had not been...previously [involved].

CASE IN POINT: *Despite their ideological differences, the three Latina members serving in the 103rd Congress (Congresswoman Nydia Velazquez [D-NY],*

Congresswoman Lucille Roybal-Allard [D-CA], and Congresswoman Ileana Ros-Lehtinen [R-FL]) attempted to work together around common concerns in the area of health care reform. As Congresswoman Velazquez explained:

One of the areas that represents a real problem in our

community, particularly for Latina women, is access to health care. So the three of us have been working together. In fact, during the whole welfare debate process, we met and we made sure that the health-care needs of the Latinas in this country are addressed, that people have to understand that compared to any other ethnic group, access to health care is a real problem in our community for women and children. So we conducted a hearing on health care.... We also organized a summit on health care for Latina women and children. And we met with the First Lady.... For the first time, experts in the field of Latina health care were able to come together to Capitol Hill and participate in a meeting with the First Lady.... When it comes to women's issues, and when it comes to health-care issues for women, for Latina women, we find common ground, and that's important.

CASE IN POINT: *Republican women, led by Congresswomen Jennifer Dunn (R-WA) and Deborah Pryce (R-OH), opposed the Clinton health care plan in general, but they sought in particular to point out ways they thought the plan would affect women negatively. Although Congresswoman Pryce declined to*

describe this as a highly organized endeavor (remark- ing that “being in the minority, nothing was ever really organized”), they encouraged other members to make floor statements to that effect and used one-minute floor speeches, press conferences, and whatever other tactics they could find to convey their message. As Congresswoman Pryce described the effort:

With as few Republican women as there are, most of us felt very strongly that this was the right mes- sage and that we needed to help deliver the mes- sage. Whether or not women’s groups were lined up behind it, we were trying to reach the American people and influence their decision, and I think we were very effective.

CASE IN POINT: Senator Barbara Mikulski (D- MD) had been the sole Democratic woman in the Senate; when the 103rd Con- gress convened, to her delight, she suddenly had four new Democratic women colleagues. She was determined to give them the benefit of her experi- ence. She explained:

I had a series of empower- ment workshops for them on how to get started in the Senate, how to get committee assignments, and how they could move to be full partners in the Senate. And I took everything that I had learned in my first six years, and really condensed it into a series of memos and then a workshop....I was determined as the dean of the Democratic women that [Democratic] women, once they came, would be able to make their mark very quickly. And I believe we were successful at that when you look at the committee assignments that the women did get.

CASE IN POINT: The women who were first elected to Congress in 1992—the freshman class— worked together, both across party lines and within partisan groups, around common concerns. In December 1992, even before they were sworn in, the freshman women held a bipartisan press conference

to announce four initiatives on which they agreed and for which they, as a class, intended to push: full funding for Head Start, family and medical leave, freedom of choice on abortion, and the extension to Congress of laws prohibiting sexual harassment. Congresswoman Deborah Pryce (R-OH) described how this happened:

At the orientation all the women got together... across party lines, and we put together an agenda of four items that we... all supported 100 per cent. And we did it in a half hour. And we all knew that we didn’t necessarily agree on the means to the end, but we agreed on the end....

When the freshmen gathered to elect class officers, Congresswoman Pryce was selected as interim presi- dent of the Republican class and Congresswoman Eva

I jokingly use the old Popeye [line], “I am what I am.” And that means I’m an African-American, I’m a female; neither of those particular constituencies has traditionally had much of a voice here in the United States Senate, particularly with regard to policymaking and lawmaking. So to the extent that I bring those experiences to the mix, I think that not only does that help and enhance the effectiveness—the efficacy of women in our policy- making process—but it also helps the body as a whole.

Senator Carol Moseley-Braun (D-IL)

Clayton (D-NC) was chosen as the Democratic class president. Congresswoman Clayton described the role other freshman women played in her election:

Three women approached me about considering running for the freshman class [presidency]....The women were very active in talking with others....It was women’s leadership that did it.

Because the newly-elected Democratic women were well organized, they not only helped to elect Con- gresswoman Clayton as class president, but also helped to elect women to several other key positions. As Congresswoman Leslie Byrne (D-VA) explained:

EMILY’s List [a funding group for Democratic women candidates] did an orientation for women

legislators prior to the formal freshman orientation. And it's not by accident that, if you look at most of the slots in the freshman class organization, they are held by women. We came in with a base of 21 votes, having talked about what we wanted to do and who was interested in what position, having established this relationship before we had to make decisions.

Cooperation among the freshman women did not end as the 103rd Congress progressed. Freshman women worked together at the end of the term, just as

they had at the beginning. As they approached the 1994 elections, many of the freshman Democratic women formed a congresswomen's road show, traveling into each other's districts as a group to appear at campaign fundraising events. The traveling road show helped to raise funds for several congresswomen, most of whom faced tough races for re-election, including Congresswomen Maria Cantwell (D-WA), Lynn Woolsey (D-CA), Leslie Byrne (D-VA), Karen Shepherd (D-UT), Elizabeth Furse (D-OR), Eva Clayton (D-NC), and Lynn Schenk (D-CA).



5 WOMEN'S POSITIONS IN CONGRESS AND THE POLITICAL CONTEXT AFFECT IMPACT

The nature and extent of women's political impact was influenced by:

- ✓ women's positions within the congressional structure—e.g. committee assignments, seniority, and presence in leadership roles
- ✓ windows of opportunity created by timing and political context.

WOMEN'S POSITIONS WITHIN THE CONGRESSIONAL STRUCTURE

No woman chaired a full committee in the 103rd Congress; nonetheless, women were well-positioned in many cases to influence critical legislation, a few as members of the party leadership structures and more as members of key committees. Women's opportunities to influence legislation were profoundly constrained or enhanced by the committees on which they sat and by their seniority, although committee assignments and seniority were less important in affecting the impact of women in the Senate than in the House. Women in the House had few opportunities to shape legislation other than that considered by committees on which they served, although they could try to persuade colleagues who served on other committees and speak on the floor. The influence of women members of the House, half of whom were freshmen, was also greatly limited by their relative lack of seniority. By contrast, in the Senate, where members have more individual influence because of their smaller num-

bers and because more of the action takes place on the floor, there were more opportunities for women members, even freshmen, to have a say.

CASE IN POINT: *Women on key House committees advanced, promoted and preserved women's health legislation—on the full Appropriations Committee; on the Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services (LHHS); and on the Energy and Commerce Committee. Women in these positions acted as leaders and watchdogs—guarding provisions in danger of being cut out, pressing for increased funding, and lobbying for women's concerns. As Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi (D-CA) explained, it mattered that more women than ever before were serving on the LHHS subcommittee:*

It helps a great deal to have women at the table when the pie is being carved up. I think that [women members'] presence there made a tremendous difference in the breast cancer money. As a staffer described that difference:

It really takes...a woman there monitoring it....I mean it's hard for [a member] to say, "I'm offering

an amendment to cut \$300 million from breast cancer." But they can say, "On line 19M, strike the figure \$500 million and put in the figure \$300 million," and unless somebody is paying attention to what that is, nobody knows what it is. Particularly in appropriations, it is easy to do things that don't immediately hit you as to what's happening, so somebody has got to be keeping an eye on it.

CASE IN POINT: *Senator Barbara Mikulski (D-MD) was best positioned of all the female senators to influence health care reform. She served on the Labor and Human Resources Committee and chaired one of its subcommittees. In addition, because of her years of service in both the Senate and the House, she brought to the debate knowledge about the health care industry, understanding of the politics of the Senate, the respect of her colleagues, and a good relationship with the Majority Leader, Senator George Mitchell (D-ME). Thus, when it became clear that the Senate's Health Care Reform Bill would be written by Senator Mitchell and that it would be a compromise between the Labor and Human Resources bill (on which Senator Mikulski had worked and which contained strong women's health provisions) and the bill produced by the Senate Finance Committee (which contained weaker women's health provisions), she pulled together the four freshman Democratic women senators to lobby the Majority Leader. A staff member explained what happened:*

[Senator] Mikulski came to [Senator Mitchell] and said, "We got this stuff in the Labor Committee Bill. I want it to remain in your bill...." Senator Mitchell had several meetings with the Democratic women senators. They all came in here and made certain demands of him. Some of those demands were around reproduction; some of them were around things like mammography. But they clearly banded together...and to the extent that he could, he accommodated them.

WINDOWS OF OPPORTUNITY CREATED BY TIMING AND POLITICAL CONTEXT

The political context of the 103rd Congress was shaped in part by 1992 having been labeled "the

Year of the Woman" and by the widespread perception that women formed a significant voting bloc that had to be considered. In addition, a Democratic, pro-choice president was in place ready to sign legislation, such as the Family and Medical Leave Act, which previously had been politically untenable. Events of the day also affected the political context and helped to facilitate the passage of key bills of importance to women members of Congress.

CASE IN POINT: *When the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) was brought to a vote on the House floor in November 1993, it passed unanimously. As one staff member suggested, the strong support for VAWA "had a lot to do with the politics from the previous year [1992, the so-called "Year of the Woman"], and a lot of men were looking for a good women's issue to be on the right side on." Once the bill reached conference, the publicity which domestic violence received as a result of the O.J. Simpson case helped to ensure that VAWA would receive a substantial level of funding. As Congresswoman Nydia Velazquez (D-NY) explained:*

Violence, domestic violence, is a real issue, especially in communities of color. But after the incident with O.J. Simpson, it seems like it helped—and this is sad to say—but it helped to create the type of awareness that is needed so that legislators understand that this is not a women's issue, but this is America's issue.

The "Year of the Woman" and the O.J. Simpson case combined to create a situation where, in the words of a staff member, any appearance of opposition to VAWA would have been "a total loser for any politician."

CASE IN POINT: *Another tragedy had a similarly salutary effect on the Freedom of Access to Clinic Entrances Bill women were promoting. In the words of a House staffer:*

This is a terrible thing to say, but if Dr. Gunn [a Florida doctor who performed abortions] had not been shot.... We introduced that bill, let's say in February, and I think about six weeks later he was shot, and it really got everything going. It picked up speed enormously afterwards because people

finally realized that this was not just the wailings of a bunch of fanatical female "feminazis," as we are labeled, but that it was getting a bit serious now.... We were able to get the support of some pro-life members, and particularly those that ride the middle. They were having incidents of violence and blockades and so forth in their districts, and they really saw it as a problem. They were hearing from their people in the district, and the women just came marching in and said, "Look, this is outrageous! If this were happening to men, it would not be tolerated. And this has been tolerated for far too long." And I think people [in Congress] really said, "Yeah, you're right."

Violence notwithstanding, the fact that a pro-choice President was in the White House made passage of the bill (as well as passage of other pro-choice legislation) a realistic possibility. As the House staff member went on to explain:

With Bill Clinton coming in as President, I think there was a real feeling that we were going to be able to make some strides on the issue of abortion in general.

CASE IN POINT: *The course of events within the Congress could also boost women's chances of moving their favored provisions within legislation. When the rule on the Crime Bill was defeated in the House⁴ and efforts to persuade a sufficient number of Democrats to switch their votes failed, the Clinton administration and House leadership were forced to negotiate with moderate Republicans who had voted against the rule but might be persuaded to vote affirmatively if some changes were made in the bill. This situation provided opportunities for Republicans like Congresswomen Susan Molinari (R-NY) and Jennifer Dunn (R-WA) to come forward with proposals for changes or additions to the bill. Congresswoman Molinari was responsible for a provision that would allow evidence of a defendant's prior sex offenses to be admitted in federal criminal trials, while Congresswoman Dunn was able to get a provision added that requires registration of and allows for community notification regarding released sex offenders. Because the Democratic leadership needed the votes of moderate Republicans, these congresswomen were able to influence the content of the Crime Bill at the eleventh hour.*



Conclusion

Women members made a difference in the 103rd Congress. The voices, views and votes of the female Representatives and Senators who served from 1993 to 1995 made themselves heard and felt in the legislative debate and in the legislation passed. Even though they were a mere one-tenth of the membership, and slightly more than half of them were freshmen, the Congresswomen found ways to have an impact within an institution in which women's perspectives have seldom been recognized and where more senior and better positioned (almost always male) members often dominate.

Our findings underscore the importance of using a multi-faceted research approach such as that employed in this project for understanding women's behavior in public office. Although a simple review of floor votes reveals some measurable differences between female and male members of Congress, it provides a very incomplete picture of women's impact because it fails to examine behind-the-scenes actions and probe the legislative and political processes in which members function both individually and in groups. Our study found women making a difference by working within

their respective chambers to raise new issues within the Congress, to talk about old issues in new and different ways, to shape legislation so that it reflected this expanded range of concerns, and to influence the fate of legislation, in some cases by just making sure it got to the floor and in other cases by playing critical roles in its consideration on the floor. Women members also made a difference in legislation by doing what all members of Congress do first and foremost — looking out for the interests of their home districts.

The story of what happened in the 103rd Congress in any of the five areas of legislation examined in our research is a richly woven and textured fabric comprising the perspectives and experiences of members, staff, and activists. Many examples which are used to illustrate particular themes could well speak to several others. In highlighting themes and findings from our research, this report draws out and isolates certain threads from one or more of the cases to illustrate particular points. However, the separate strands will be woven back together in the full legislative case studies which will be presented in much greater detail in our forthcoming volume.

The 103rd Congress provides ample evidence that elected women make a difference, and we expect that most of our themes and findings about women's impact will hold true across different

Congresses. Nonetheless, as our research shows, political context matters. The 1994 elections ushered in dramatic changes in the Congress — in partisan balance, in ideological tenor, in leadership structure and processes, and, from early evidence, in the gender consciousness of women members, although not in the number of women. That political sea change provides an opportunity to examine the behavior and potential impact of congresswomen in an altered political environment. Rarely do social scientists have the opportunity to make such a comparison between two real-world situations which are so similar in many respects and yet so different in a few critical ways. Therefore, CAWP hopes to conduct a companion study which will examine the behavior of women in the 104th Congress and explore the impact of women's presence in the House and Senate in a very different congressional environment.

On its own, the present study of women in a single Congress makes an important contribution to our knowledge about why new voices and new faces are needed in our governing institutions. Our findings document for the first time women's distinctive contributions to the policymaking process in Congress and illustrate where and how those contributions are made. What we observed reconfirms our conviction that bringing more women into public office is a goal well worth pursuing.



Glossary

CAWP: Center for the American Woman and Politics
CCWI: Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues
FACE: Freedom of Access to Clinic Entrances
FEHBP: Federal Employees' Health Benefit Program
FOCA: Freedom of Choice Act

LHHS: Labor, Health and Human Services
NAFTA: North American Free Trade Agreement
NIH: National Institutes of Health
VAWA: Violence Against Women Act
WHEA: Women's Health Equity Act

Appendix

METHODOLOGY

This study followed women in the 103rd Congress from January 1993 through the end of 1994. It is based on an examination of a vast array of documents on the 103rd Congress, including media reports, published committee hearings, and transcripts of floor debates and statements. In addition, more than 250 in-depth, unstructured interviews were conducted with women members of the 103rd Congress, congressional staff (working for members or committees) and lobbyists. Our intent has been to provide a broad overview of women's roles and presence in the 103rd Congress as well as to use case studies for in-depth exploration of women's impact in that Congress.

At the beginning of this project, all 24 Congresswomen first elected to the House in the November 1992 election were interviewed during the spring of 1993. The interviews, which averaged about 20 minutes, gathered information about the goals and perceptions of women entering Congress for the first time in the aftermath of the landmark 1992 elections. During the summer of 1995, near the end of the project, CAWP contacted all women Representatives and Senators (both veterans and newcomers), requesting 30 minute interviews with each to discuss her experiences in the 103rd Congress and her involvement in shaping legislation pertaining to the policy issues on which the study focused. Post-103rd Congress interviews with all women serving in the House and Senate are still in progress; 42 of the 55 women have been interviewed. The interviews have ranged from 20 to 90 minutes, with most falling into the 25 to 35

minute range. The interviews with Congresswomen were taped and conducted on the record.

Staff and lobbyists provided behind-the-scenes insights into the actions of women members on selected legislation. These interviews were conducted between August 1994 and August 1995. To construct a list of congressional staff and lobbyists who worked on legislation in these policy areas, we began with several key staffers and lobbyists. From these people we solicited suggestions of other staff members and lobbyists involved with the issues. Each time we conducted an interview, we asked for names of other sources to add to our list of potential interviewees. Our goal has been to construct (to the extent possible) a list of the complete population of relevant, knowledgeable staffers and lobbyists, including Republicans and Democrats, feminists and non-feminists, liberals and conservatives, and allies and opponents of the women members on specific issues.

As of August, 1995, CAWP had interviewed 154 congressional staffers, 35 lobbyists, four policy analysts, and two executive branch appointees. Most of these interviews were conducted in person, although a few were conducted by phone. The interviews with staff and lobbyists, which have ranged from ten minutes to almost two hours, averaged about 45 to 50 minutes, and virtually all were taped. Participants were assured that their names would not be associated with their quotes and that they would be identified in only the most general terms (e.g. House staff member). Without such guarantees of anonymity, many of the staff and lobbyists who participated either would have declined to be interviewed or would have been far less candid.⁵

Footnotes

¹ The number of women in the House does not include Delegate Eleanor Holmes Norton (D), who represents the District of Columbia. Senator Kay Bailey Hutchison (R-TX) entered the 103rd Congress in June 1993 after winning a special election to fill a vacancy, thus increasing women's representation in the Senate to seven (seven percent). A table showing the numbers of women in every Congress since 1917 is appended to this report.

² A detailed description of our methodology is included as an appendix to this report.

³ Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues News Release, October 13, 1994.

⁴ A rule governs the provisions under which floor debate on legislation can take place. If the rule is defeated, the legislation cannot come to the House floor.

⁵ The number of interviews about each area of legislation varied:

POLICY AREA	STAFF	LOBBYISTS	OTHERS	TOTAL
Abortion	61	14	1	76
Crime Bill	40	3	2	45
Health Care Reform	16	58	4	78
Trade	23	7	1	31
Women's Health	49	15	0	64

Women in the U.S. Congress 1917-1957*

CONGRESS	DATES	WOMEN IN SENATE	WOMEN IN HOUSE	TOTAL WOMEN
65th	1917-1919	0 (0D, 0R)	1 (0D, 1R)	1 (0D, 1R)
66th	1919-1921	0 (0D, 0R)	0 (0D, 0R)	0 (0D, 0R)
67th	1921-1923	1 (1D, 0R)	3 (0D, 3R)	4 (1D, 3R)
68th	1923-1925	0 (0D, 0R)	1 (0D, 1R)	1 (0D, 1R)
69th	1925-1927	0 (0D, 0R)	3 (1D, 2R)	3 (1D, 2R)
70th	1927-1929	0 (0D, 0R)	5 (2D, 3R)	5 (2D, 3R)
71st	1929-1931	0 (0D, 0R)	9 (5D, 4R)	9 (5D, 4R)
72nd	1931-1933	1 (1D, 0R)	7 (5D, 2R)	8 (6D, 2R)
73rd	1933-1935	1 (1D, 0R)	7 (4D, 3R)	8 (5D, 3R)
74th	1935-1937	2 (2D, 0R)	6 (4D, 2R)	8 (6D, 2R)
75th	1937-1939	2 (1D, 1R) ¹	6 (5D, 1R)	8 (6D, 2R)
76th	1939-1941	1 (1D, 0R)	8 (4D, 4R)	9 (5D, 4R)
77th	1941-1943	1 (1D, 0R)	9 (4D, 5R)	10 (5D, 5R)
78th	1943-1945	1 (1D, 0R)	8 (2D, 6R)	9 (3D, 6R)
79th	1945-1947	0 (0D, 0R)	11 (6D, 5R)	11 (6D, 5R)
80th	1947-1949	1 (0D, 1R)	7 (3D, 4R)	8 (3D, 5R)
81st	1949-1951	1 (0D, 1R)	9 (5D, 4R)	10 (5D, 5R)
82nd	1951-1953	1 (0D, 1R)	10 (4D, 6R)	11 (4D, 7R)
83rd	1953-1955	2 (0D, 2R)	11 (5D, 6R) ²	13 (5D, 8R) ²
84th	1955-1957	1 (0D, 1R)	16 (10D, 6R) ²	17 (10D, 7R) ²

* Please note: table shows maximum number of women elected or appointed to serve in that Congress at one time. Some filled out unexpired terms and some were never sworn in.

¹ A total of three (2D, 1R) women served in the Senate in the 75th Congress, but no more than two served together at any one time. Part of the time two Democrats served together, and part of the time one Democrat and one Republican served together.

² Does not include a Republican Delegate to the House from pre-statehood Hawaii.

Women in the U.S. Congress 1957-1995*

CONGRESS	DATES	WOMEN IN SENATE	WOMEN IN HOUSE	TOTAL WOMEN
85th	1957-1959	1 (0D, 1R)	15 (9D, 6R)	16 (9D, 7R)
86th	1959-1961	2 (1D, 1R)	17 (9D, 8R)	19 (10D, 9R)
87th	1961-1963	2 (1D, 1R)	18 (11D, 7R)	20 (12D, 8R)
88th	1963-1965	2 (1D, 1R)	12 (6D, 6R)	14 (7D, 7R)
89th	1965-1967	2 (1D, 1R)	11 (7D, 4R)	13 (8D, 5R)
90th	1967-1969	1 (0D, 1R)	11 (6D, 5R)	12 (6D, 6R)
91st	1969-1971	1 (0D, 1R)	10 (6D, 4R)	11 (6D, 5R)
92nd	1971-1973	2 (1D, 1R)	13 (10D, 3R)	15 (11D, 4R)
93rd	1973-1975	0 (0D, 0R)	16 (14D, 2R)	16 (14D, 2R)
94th	1975-1977	0 (0D, 0R)	19 (14D, 5R)	19 (14D, 5R)
95th	1977-1979	2 (2D, 0R)	18 (13D, 5R)	20 (15D, 5R)
96th	1979-1981	1 (0D, 1R)	16 (11D, 5R)	17 (11D, 6R)
97th	1981-1983	2 (0D, 2R)	21 (11D, 10R)	23 (11D, 12R)
98th	1983-1985	2 (0D, 2R)	22 (13D, 9R)	24 (13D, 11R)
99th	1985-1987	2 (0D, 2R)	23 (12D, 11R)	25 (12D, 13R)
100th	1987-1989	2 (1D, 1R)	23 (12D, 11R)	25 (13D, 12R)
101st	1989-1991	2 (1D, 1R)	29 (16D, 13R)	31 (17D, 14R)
102nd	1991-1993	4 (3D, 1R) ³	28 (19D, 9R) ⁴	32 (22D, 10R) ⁴
103rd	1993-1995	7 (5D, 2R) ⁵	47 (35D, 12R) ⁴	54 (40D, 14R) ⁴
104th	1995-1997	8 (5D, 3R)	47 (30D, 17R) ⁴	55 (35D, 20R) ⁴

* Please note: table shows maximum number of women elected or appointed to serve in that Congress at one time. Some filled out unexpired terms and some were never sworn in.

³ On election day in 1992, three women served in the Senate; two were elected and one was appointed. On November 3rd, Dianne Feinstein (D-CA) won a special election to complete two years of a term; she was sworn in on November 10, 1992.

⁴ Does not include a Democratic Delegate to the House from Washington, DC.

⁵ Includes Kay Bailey Hutchison (R-TX), who won a special election on June 5, 1993 to serve out the remaining year and one half of a term.

Publications Available from CAWP

THE IMPACT OF WOMEN IN PUBLIC OFFICE: A SERIES OF REPORTS

Voices, Views, Votes: Women in the 103rd Congress (1995)

(Price \$8; for order of 20 copies or more, \$6 per copy)

Reshaping the Agenda: Women in State Legislatures (1991) This report examines gender differences between state legislators in their policy views, actions, and perspectives on the legislative process. Based on surveys of a national sample of state legislators, the research shows women's increased presence in state legislatures has had an impact, and this impact is evident regardless of party, ideology, feminist identification, constituency ideology, seniority, age, or political insider status. *(122 pages, Price \$15)*

Gender and Policymaking: Studies of Women in Office (1991) This report is a collection of eleven essays written by scholars who received grants from CAWP to investigate the impact of elected and appointed women officeholders at the local, state, and national levels. *(133 pages, Price \$15)*

The Impact of Women in Public Office: An Overview (1991) This report highlights and summarizes selected findings from CAWP's study of women state legislators and from the eleven CAWP-sponsored studies of women officeholders' impact conducted by individual scholars. It provides information useful to a broad audience interested in women in politics; it should be of particular interest to women running for public office and those who are concerned about bringing more women into public office. *(32 pages, Price \$8)*

BRINGING MORE WOMEN INTO PUBLIC OFFICE: A SERIES OF REPORTS

Bringing More Women into Public Office: Introductory Kit (1983) Nine fact sheets highlight the findings from CAWP's research about women's and men's routes into elective and appointive offices. (Free in limited quantities; call for information about bulk rates)

Women Make a Difference (1983) Selected findings from CAWP's studies are highlighted in this monograph. A key theme is the difference women can and do make as elected and appointed public officials. The report outlines steps which may be taken to expand women's participation in politics, focusing on those findings which are relevant and useful for women interested in seeking public office and for people who conduct programs to increase women's numbers in public life. *(48 pages, Price \$4)*

Women's Routes to Elective Office: A Comparison with Men's (1983) Based on data collected through surveys of women and men elected to state legislatures, county governing boards, and municipal offices, this report examines the factors which influence women's entry into elective offices. A major section focuses on black women's routes to elective office. *(225 pages, Price \$10)*

Women Appointed to the Carter Administration: A Comparison with Men (1983) This first-ever profile of women who have held high-level appointive offices at the federal level analyzes data about all the women and a sample of the men who served in high-level appointed positions under President Jimmy Carter. Women who served in selected positions on the president's and vice-president's staffs are also included. *(88 pages, Price \$6)*

Women Appointed to State Government: A Comparison with All State Appointees (1983) This study examines appointed state cabinet-level officials. Based on data collected through telephone surveys, it compares the first-ever national profile of women in state cabinets to a profile of a sample of all appointees. *(119 pages, Price \$6)*

Women's PACs (1983) This monograph is based on information gathered at a meeting with representatives of fourteen political action committees which solely or primarily support women candidates. It describes some of the key questions faced by such groups, and illustrates the varied ways in which they have answered these questions. A current list of women's PACs is included with each copy. *(28 pages, Price \$3)*

Political Women Tell What It Takes (1983) This report presents information CAWP gathered at six consultations held with women public leaders in 1981 and 1982. It focuses on the roles which political parties, women's organizations, and individual women have played in recruiting and supporting women candidates and appointees. (37 pages, Price \$3)

Getting Women Appointed: New Jersey's Bipartisan Coalition (1984) This monograph documents the formation and activities in 1981 and 1982 of New Jersey's Bipartisan Coalition for Women's Appointments, an ad hoc group organized after CAWP convened a meeting of politically active women to discuss how to get more women appointed to state-level posts. (20 pages, Price \$3)

Elected Women Organize: Statewide Associations (1986) This report examines the status of statewide associations of elected women in twelve states. The associations bring women together across party lines and from all levels of office. (40 pages, Price \$3)

ADDITIONAL CAWP PUBLICATIONS (partial listing)

For a complete list of CAWP publications, call (908) 828-2210, ext. 224.

Fact Sheets about Women Candidates and Officeholders CAWP regularly publishes fact sheets about women candidates and officeholders. These include current data (such as the number and percentage of women serving, state-by-state rankings, and party breakdowns) as well as historical information. Besides a summary fact sheet about women in elective office, CAWP issues fact sheets about women in the U.S. Congress, statewide elective offices, state legislatures, legislative leadership, as well as state-by-state fact sheets. Also available are a wide variety of fact sheets about women candidates, as well as women of color in elective office, sex differences in voter turnout, and the gender gap. New fact sheets are issued periodically. (Free in limited quantities; call for information about bulk rates.)

Subscriber Information Service (SIS) SIS subscribers receive three packets, each of which includes our newsletter, CAWP News & Notes, as well as fact sheets, reports, reprints of articles, and other timely information. (Price \$25 for three packets)

Equality Deferred (1994) This report by Richard and Katheryne McCormick explores the history of women's candidacies for the New Jersey Assembly and analyzes some of the reasons for the past and current status of women as office-seekers in the state. The monograph provides a thorough record and a valuable appraisal; it identifies signs of hope for the future as well as areas ripe for change. While highly specific to New Jersey, the report points the way for studies which could be conducted elsewhere. It provides a model which should inspire researchers elsewhere to undertake similar efforts to understand their own states and make recommendations for progressive change. (49 pages, Price \$8)

The 1992 Election and the Politics of Abortion: Lessons from the Past, Implications for the Future This report focuses on the race for President nationally as well as elections in California for President, U.S. Senate, and state assembly. It provides an in-depth look at the effects of the abortion issue on several election contests in order to explain the role it played in the electoral process and to speculate about what electoral politics may hold for abortion policy and cultural politics in the future. (92 pages, Price \$12)

Abortion Politics in State Elections: Comparisons Across States (1991) This report analyzes the role of the abortion issue in four states' gubernatorial elections: the 1989 New Jersey and Virginia races (the first two states to hold election following the Supreme Court's Webster decision) and the 1990 Michigan and Pennsylvania races (two states which passed new abortion restrictions prior to their 1990 elections). Using survey and interview information from voters, candidates, and activists, the report examines similarities and differences among these states and discusses the lessons that can be learned from these elections. The findings have important implications for future elections. (94 pages, Price \$12)

Election 1989: The Abortion Issue in New Jersey and Virginia (1990) This report contains findings from a study of the first two states to hold gubernatorial and state legislative elections after the Supreme Court's Webster v. Reproductive Health Services decision. Using survey and interview data from voters, candidates and activists, researchers at the Eagleton Institute of Politics looked at how the abortion issue played a role in the two states' elections. (183 pages, Price \$12)

The Center for the American Woman and Politics is a university-based research, education, and public service center. Its mission is to promote greater understanding and knowledge about women's relationship to politics and government and to enhance women's influence and leadership in public life. A unit of the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, CAWP is a leading authority in its field and a respected bridge between the academic and political worlds.

Before CAWP was founded in 1971, no organization or educational institution was compiling information about women in government and politics or studying and monitoring the status and prospects of those women. Today, CAWP has taken on the multiple roles of catalyst and resource, provider of data and analyses, interpreter and guide. CAWP raises and responds to emerging issues, working daily with women leaders as well as journalists, scholars, students, women's groups, governmental agencies, civic organizations, and political parties.

CAWP's major programs and activities include: a clearinghouse about women in politics and government; a data bank on women in public office; research about women in leadership; national surveys of elected and appointed women; an ongoing Program for Women Public Officials; a Subscriber Information Service and newsletter; a Young Women's Leadership Initiative to educate young women about politics and public leadership; conferences and seminars; consulting services; a specialized library collection about women in public life; and production of books, monographs, reports, fact sheets, and a documentary film.

The Eagleton Institute of Politics was established in 1956 as the result of a bequest from Florence Peshine Eagleton, a suffragist activist and founder of the New Jersey League of Women Voters. The Institute has built a national reputation for its education, research, and public service activities in the field of American politics. Eagleton offers a Master's level fellowship program in politics and public policy as well as an undergraduate associates program for Rutgers students. It houses two major centers (the Center for the American Woman and Politics and the Center for Public Interest Polling) and sponsors programs about American politics and the political process.

CAWP

CENTER FOR THE AMERICAN WOMAN AND POLITICS (CAWP)
Eagleton Institute of Politics
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
New Brunswick, NJ 08901
908/828-2210 • fax: 908/932-6778