

The purpose of this study is to articulate a higher standard for free trade and to measure the performance of the most recent Congress according to that standard.

Introduction

American trade policy needs fresh thinking, beginning with the definition of “free trade.” Traditionally, free trade has meant the lowering and eventual elimination of barriers to trade between nations. People who favor free trade are characterized as internationalists, who want to lower trade barriers to promote U.S. engagement in the global economy. Pulling U.S. policy in the opposite direction are the protectionists, sometimes known as isolationists, who want to raise or at least maintain trade barriers and oppose trade expansion. But that simple, one-dimensional analysis disguises the true nature of the trade debate.

As the new 109th Congress begins to shape U.S. trade policy, the choice before its members will be not between engagement and isolation but between the free market and government intervention. The guiding question should be whether U.S. policy favors a free international market by advancing free trade and rejecting government intervention, such as export and agricultural subsidies, or whether it favors intervention by maintaining and raising not only barriers to trade but also various subsidies.

Thus the real policy choices before Congress are not the two traditional paths of engagement or isolation but four paths. Through their votes on legislation, members of Congress can

1. oppose both trade barriers and trade subsidies,
2. oppose barriers and favor subsidies,
3. favor barriers and oppose subsidies, or
4. favor both barriers and subsidies.

By considering those four policy alternatives, this study offers a more accurate and useful way of measuring how Congress as a whole and its individual members vote on issues affecting American involvement in the global economy. It analyzes 12 major votes in the House during the recently concluded 108th Congress and another 11 in the Senate affecting both trade barriers and trade subsidies. It

then classifies members of Congress according to their degree of support for an international market free from the distorting effects of barriers and subsidies.

The purpose of the study is to articulate a higher standard for free trade and to measure the performance of the most recent Congress according to that standard.

How Government Distorts International Trade and Investment

Despite all the hype about globalization and the supposed universal triumph of free-market policies, governments around the world continue to intervene in the flow of goods, services, people, and capital across international borders. That widespread intervention takes two basic forms: tax and regulatory barriers aimed at discouraging certain types of commerce and direct taxpayer subsidies aimed at encouraging or discouraging other types of commerce.

Trade Barriers

Trade barriers reduce global wealth by denying people and nations the ability to specialize in what they do best. Barriers protect higher-cost domestic producers from lower-cost competition abroad, raising domestic prices and drawing capital and labor away from industries that would be more competitive in global markets. Barriers to trade across international borders prevent producers from realizing the full benefits of economies of scale. By reducing competition, they stymie innovation and technological advances, reducing an economy’s long-term growth.

Global tariff and nontariff barriers have fallen remarkably in the last 50 years, first among the richer, industrialized countries and more recently among those that are less developed. China is the most spectacular example of the latter. But barriers remain stubbornly high worldwide against free trade in agricultural products, textiles and clothing, and many basic services such as insurance and air travel. Those

barriers cost hundreds of billions of dollars a year in lost wealth and keep hundreds of millions of people in poverty.¹

U.S. trade barriers continue to impose real costs on the U.S. economy despite postwar progress toward liberalization. The U.S. government maintains high anti-consumer barriers to trade against such manufactured products as shoes, clothing, watches, tableware, and textiles and farm goods such as sugar, peanuts, cotton, dairy products, beef, canned tuna, and frozen fruit and fruit juices. Other import barriers impose higher costs on U.S. producers, such as those against shipbuilding, softwood lumber, ball and roller bearings, pressed and blown glass, and coastal maritime shipping (through the Jones Act), jeopardizing jobs and production in import-consuming industries. The U.S. International Trade Commission estimated conservatively that those barriers impose an annual collective drag on the U.S. economy of more than \$14 billion.² Meanwhile, discriminatory antidumping laws “protect” consumers and import-using industries from the benefits of competition and lower prices.

Trade Subsidies

Global commerce is further distorted by widespread use of subsidies aimed at promoting certain kinds of trade, investment, and domestic production. Those subsidies encourage overproduction of domestic agricultural products, through farm price supports, and exports and overseas investment in less-developed countries, through such agencies as the Overseas Private Investment Corporation and the Export-Import Bank. Indeed, many supporters of lower trade barriers look kindly on such subsidies because they seem to promote economic activity at home and “engagement” in the global economy. But both kinds of intervention—barriers and subsidies—reduce our national welfare and curb the freedom of Americans to spend and invest their resources as they see fit.

Subsidies reduce national welfare by directing resources to less-efficient uses, substituting the judgment of government officials for that of private actors in the marketplace. Export subsi-

dies such as those extended by the U.S. Export-Import Bank can raise demand for exports produced by the small number of U.S. multinational companies that benefit from its loans. But the increased production spurred by the extra exports raises costs for other, less-favored export industries competing for the same labor, capital, and intermediate inputs. They also crowd out unsubsidized exporters as foreign buyers bid up the price of U.S. dollars on foreign exchange markets to buy the more attractive, subsidized U.S. exports. Export subsidies also impose a higher burden on taxpayers.³

Like trade barriers, export subsidies favor the few at the expense of the many, make our economy less efficient, and reduce total national welfare. Output is focused not where returns are highest but where political clout is greatest. As a Congressional Research Service report concluded, “At the national level, subsidized export financing merely shifts production among sectors within the economy, rather than adding to the overall level of economic activity, and subsidizes foreign consumption at the expense of the domestic economy.”⁴

Equally damaging to global trade and welfare are domestic subsidies to agriculture. Those subsidies encourage overproduction and the flooding of world markets with commodities sold at below their actual cost of production. Artificially lower world prices then discourage production in countries, typically the less-developed ones, where the costs of production are naturally lower. The biggest losers from the subsidies are taxpayers and consumers in rich countries and producers in poor countries.

Subsidies further undermine an efficient and open global economy by tainting the cause of liberalized trade. Advocates of subsidies imply that American companies can compete in an open global economy only if the playing field is “leveled” by aggressive export promotion programs aimed at huge multinational corporations—as if free trade were inherently unfair unless offset by selective subsidies. Support for subsidies reinforces mistrust of the free market, reducing rather than encouraging support for free trade. International economic subsidies feed suspicions on the left and the right that

Like trade barriers, export subsidies favor the few at the expense of the many, make our economy less efficient, and reduce total national welfare.

free trade is just another form of corporate welfare.

Trade restrictions and subsidies are prompted by the same basic assumption: that Americans acting freely in the global marketplace cannot be trusted to spend their money in ways most beneficial to our national interest. That misconception leads to the policy error of thinking that government must therefore intervene, through either subsidies or restrictions, to produce an outcome different from what the market would create if left alone.

The Free-Trade Matrix: No Barriers, No Subsidies

True supporters of free trade and free markets oppose not only protection but also market-distorting subsidies. That means the choice for policymakers is not merely between engagement in the global economy, subsidies and all, and isolation from it. The real choice is among four contrasting approaches to international economic policy: lower trade barriers without subsidies, lower barriers with subsidies, higher barriers with subsidies, and higher barriers without subsidies.

Combining trade barriers and trade subsidies as measures of free trade creates a two-

dimensional matrix for evaluating public policy toward the free market and the international economy. That matrix allows the voting record of a member of Congress to be classified in one of four broad categories rather than on the simplistic one-dimensional scale with free trade at one pole and protectionism at the other (Figure 1).

According to the matrix, members of Congress can be classified in one of four categories:

Free Traders

Free traders consistently vote against both trade barriers and international economic subsidies. The end result of their votes is to enhance the free market and the ability of Americans to decide for themselves how to spend their money in the global marketplace. This group opposes legislation restricting the choice of goods and services Americans may buy voluntarily—whether apparel from Guatemala, shoes from Vietnam, trucking services from Mexico, or vacations in Cuba—and opposes the forced expatriation of tax dollars through export subsidies, overseas investment guarantees, and government-to-government bailouts. Members of this group can lay rightful claim to the title of free traders because they support trade that is free of all types of government intervention, whether in the form of barriers or of subsidies.

Internationalists

Members of this group generally vote for trade liberalization but also support subsidies that they believe promote the same end. Their touchstone is not economic freedom but U.S. participation in the global economy through both expanded trade and direct government participation in the form of export subsidies and government-to-government loans. Internationalists are pro-trade, favoring the reduction of import barriers as generally good for the economy and even world peace, but they also believe the global economic system cannot work in America's interest without U.S. taxpayer subsidies.

Isolationists

This category includes members of Congress who tend to vote against reducing trade barriers

Figure 1
Who Supports Free Trade?

Opposes Subsidies	Yes	Isolationists	Free Traders
	No	Interventionists	Internationalists
		No	Yes
		Opposes Trade Barriers	

and also oppose international economic subsidies. They can reasonably be called isolationists because they tend to oppose expanded American involvement in the global economy, whether through voluntary transactions or taxpayer subsidies. Isolationists show respect for their constituents as taxpayers by resisting tax-financed subsidies, but they question their judgment as consumers by restricting their freedom to buy, sell, and invest freely in the global marketplace.

Interventionists

Members of this group consistently support government intervention at the expense of the free market—favoring both subsidies and trade barriers. They tend to oppose bills and amendments that would lower trade barriers, as well as those that would cut or eliminate trade and investment subsidies. Interventionists reject the judgment of Americans twice, first by denying them full liberty to spend their private dollars beyond our borders and then by seeking to divert public tax dollars for export promotion and government-to-government bailout packages.

How the 108th Congress Voted on Trade

During the 108th Congress, members had numerous opportunities to vote to reduce trade barriers but only two opportunities to reduce trade subsidies. In the House, members voted on 11 bills and amendments with a direct impact on the freedom of Americans to trade with people in the rest of the world, and one amendment directly affected the level of subsidies doled out by the federal government to promote exports. In the Senate, this study identified 10 key bills and amendments that directly affected barriers to international commerce and one “vote” (a signed letter) that involved subsidies for domestic producers facing international competition.

Not all of those votes offer a pure test of support for free trade. By its nature, the legislative process produces compromise legislation that, while aimed primarily at reducing or

increasing barriers or subsidies to trade, can also contain relatively minor provisions that would have an ambiguous or contrary impact on free trade.

Each of the bills and amendments and the letter described below represents a reasonably clear attempt to either expand or restrict the freedom to trade. The descriptions are not intended to provide a definitive argument for or against the legislation; their intent is only to explain why, from a free-market perspective, the vote either hinders or promotes free trade as defined above. Where available, studies and articles providing more detailed arguments have been cited. To further illustrate congressional attitudes toward trade barriers and subsidies, some comments made by members of Congress during floor debates appear in the accompanying boxes.

Votes on Trade Barriers

Miscellaneous Tariff Reductions and Laos NTR. The Miscellaneous Trade and Technical Corrections Act of 2004 is the kind of unilateral free trade Congress should practice more often. It suspends duties on hundreds of specific imported goods, including chemicals and dyes, textile machinery, railway passenger cars, and “a replica of the Liberty Bell imported from the Whitechapel Bell Foundry of London, England, by the Liberty Memorial Association of Green Bay and Brown County, Wisconsin,” while refunding duties paid on certain previously imported goods. It also establishes “normal trade relations” with Laos, allowing imports from that small Southeast Asian country to enter the United States under the same duties that apply to all but two other countries.⁵

On March 5, 2003, the House voted 415 to 11 (Roll Call Vote 45) to pass the Miscellaneous Trade and Technical Corrections Act. On November 19, 2004, the Senate approved a final version of the bill by a vote of 88 to 5 (Roll Call Vote 214).

Computer Export Controls. Since 1998 Congress has imposed export controls on so-called supercomputers, defined as those that process above a certain speed, measured in mil-

Interventionists reject the judgment of Americans twice, first by denying them liberty to spend their private dollars beyond our borders and then by seeking to divert public tax dollars for export promotion.

A better approach to promoting human rights in such countries as Cuba, China, and Burma would be to encourage more trade and economic liberalization.

lions of theoretical operations per second (MTOPS). An amendment was offered in the House that would have made it easier for the administration to raise the MTOPS ceiling to reflect the ever-changing definition of a super-computer. Industry critics of the existing rules claim that the limits are too restrictive and succeed only at hindering U.S. computer exports to countries such as China. Meanwhile, the controls do nothing to protect our national security because computing power has become such a low-cost commodity in the global economy.

On May 22, 2003, the House voted 207 to 217 (Roll Call Vote 219) to reject an amendment by Reps. David Dreier (R-CA) and Zoe Lofgren (D-CA) that would have relaxed restrictions on computer exports and directed the administration to find an alternative to using MTOPS as the criterion.

Urge EU to End GMO Ban. For several years, the European Union has enforced an almost total ban on the importation of genetically modified foods (also known as genetically modified organisms, or GMOs). The EU justifies the ban on food safety grounds, even though GMO products grown and exported by American farmers have proven to be perfectly safe for human consumption and indeed have been consumed in the United States for a decade or more with no negative effects on public health. The EU's restrictions of GMOs hurt U.S. farm exporters and arguably violate World Trade

Organization agreements that prohibit members from using food safety rules as disguised trade barriers. The United States has filed a case in the WTO against the EU's restrictions on GMOs.⁶

On July 10, 2003, the House voted 339 to 80 (Roll Call Vote 256) in favor of a resolution urging the Bush administration to challenge the EU's trade-distorting restrictions on agricultural and food biotechnology.

Burma Trade Sanctions. The government of Burma is one of the most politically and economically oppressive regimes in the world. It has harassed, jailed, and killed political opponents and kept the country largely isolated from the world economy. To express its opposition to human rights abuses in Burma, the 108th U.S. Congress overwhelmingly approved targeted sanctions against Burma's rulers and a virtual ban on imports from Burma to the United States. Although well-meant, such sanctions seldom work. In fact, their impact will fall most heavily on the people we are trying to help by depriving them of what limited opportunity they may have had to earn higher wages by exporting to global markets or working for foreign-owned companies that typically pay higher wages and offer better working conditions. As oppressive as the current Burmese regime is, it poses no direct security threat to the United States. A better approach to promoting human rights in such countries as Cuba, China, and

Chile and Singapore Free-Trade Agreements

Sen. Max Baucus (D-MT): "On services, both agreements offer expanded market access for U.S. services providers and strong transparency rules for service regulations. . . . Enhanced market access for services is critical, because the service sector now provides the majority of American jobs. So expanding services trade means more job opportunities." *Congressional Record*, July 31, 2003, p. S10530.

Sen. Jon Corzine (D-NJ): "Beyond the enormity of the trade deficit, American businesses increasingly are shipping jobs overseas. Not just low-skilled jobs, but professional, highly skilled and well paid jobs. That is one reason the so-called economic recovery touted by the Bush administration has widely been characterized as a jobless recovery. In fact, it is worse than a jobless recovery, it is a job-killing recovery. And while workers in this country are losing jobs, our trade policy is helping to create jobs overseas." *Congressional Record*, July 31, 2003, p. S10587.

Lifting the Travel Ban to Cuba

Sen. Patrick Leahy (D-VT): “Of all the ridiculous, anachronistic, and self-defeating policies, this has got to be near the top of the list. [The U.S. government] is spending scarce funds to prosecute harmless, law-abiding, upstanding American citizens who want nothing more than to experience another culture, and in doing so, leave a bit of America behind. . . . Our policy is hypocritical, inconsistent, and contrary to our values as a nation that believes in the free flow of people and ideas. It is beneath us. It is impossible for anyone to make a rational argument that an American should be able to travel freely to North Korea, or Iran, but not to Cuba.” *Congressional Record*, October 23, 2003, pp. S13083–84.

Sen. John Ensign (R-NV): “The fact is, American tourists cannot change Cuba any more than Europeans or Canadians or Latin Americans have—because in Cuba you cannot do business with individual Cubans—you have to do business with Castro. . . . Tourists even fund Castro’s security apparatus when they stay in hotels owned by foreign investors. In Cuba, when a foreign investor comes to town, they do not hire or pay Cuban workers directly—only the Castro regime can legally employ a Cuban citizen. They pay Castro in hard currency for each worker—often as much as \$10,000 per employee. Castro then pays the workers in worthless Cuban pesos—the equivalent of \$15 or \$20 a month—and pockets the rest.” *Congressional Record*, October 23, 2003, p. S13086.

Burma would be to encourage more trade and economic liberalization.⁷

On July 15, 2003, the House voted 418 to 2 (Roll Call Vote 361) to approve the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003, which, among other things, prohibits the importation of any Burmese products to the United States. The next day, on July 16, 2003, the Senate voted 94 to 1 (Roll Call Vote 280) to pass the same bill.

Chile FTA. The U.S.-Chile free-trade agreement eliminates barriers to trade between the two countries, covering 87 percent of trade upon its implementation in 2004 and remaining goods during phase-in periods ranging up to 12 years. The agreement breaks new ground in opening up opportunities for U.S. service exports such as telecommunications, engineering, express delivery, and retailing. The U.S.-Chile FTA recognizes Chile’s aggressive trade and economic reforms of recent decades, which have transformed it into Latin America’s most stable and prosperous economy while strengthening its democracy.⁸

On July 24, 2003, the House voted 270 to 156 (Roll Call Vote 436) in favor of the United States-Chile Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act.

On July 31, 2003, the Senate voted 65 to 32 (Roll Call Vote 319) in favor of the agreement.

Singapore FTA. The U.S.-Singapore free-trade agreement establishes free trade between our two countries by virtually eliminating remaining barriers to trade in goods and services upon implementation in 2004. Exceptions are imports to the United States of beef, dairy products, and sugar, and those barriers are phased out in 10 years. The agreement should please those who demand “a level playing field,” with Singapore agreeing to eliminate every one of its remaining barriers to U.S. goods “on the date this Agreement enters into force.” The agreement also contains strong protections for the \$30 billion of U.S. direct investment in the Southeast Asian city-state, which is already one of the world’s most open and prosperous nations.⁹

On July 24, 2003, the House voted 272 to 155 (Roll Call Vote 432) to approve the United States-Singapore Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act. On July 31, 2003, the Senate concurred by a vote of 66 to 32 (Roll Call Vote 318).

Cuba Travel and Remittances. The United States has maintained a comprehensive econom-

The U.S.-Chile FTA recognizes Chile’s aggressive trade and economic reforms of recent decades, which have transformed it into Latin America’s most stable and prosperous economy while strengthening its democracy.

Foreign Outsourcing and Jobs

Sen. Charles Grassley (R-IA): “It’s hard to listen to a politician or pundit these days without hearing that America is ‘losing jobs’ to poorer nations—manufacturing jobs to China, back-office work to India, just about every job to Latin America. This lament distracts our attention from the larger challenge of preparing more Americans for better jobs. . . . We should stop pining after the days when millions of Americans stood along assembly lines and continuously bolted, fit, soldered, or clamped whatever went by. Those days are over. And stop blaming poor nations whose workers get very low wages.” *Congressional Record*, March 4, 2004, p. S2194.

Sen. Chris Dodd (D-CT): “I think shipping jobs away, destroying the manufacturing base and human capital investment that makes it possible in the 21st century for us to be competitive in a global economy is the wrong way to proceed.” *Congressional Record*, March 4, 2004, p. S2190.

ic embargo against Cuba for more than four decades in an unsuccessful effort to oust the communist government of Fidel Castro. The 108th Congress considered legislation to loosen the embargo by granting Americans greater freedom to visit and to send remittances to Cuba. The almost total embargo has failed to achieve its policy objective of overthrowing the Cuban government or of even modifying its oppressive rule. American citizens have paid the price of that failure in lost economic freedom to trade, invest, and travel. The embargo has deprived Cuban citizens of economic opportunity while giving the Cuban government a handy excuse for the failures of its socialist economic system.¹⁰

On September 9, 2003, the House voted 227 to 188 (Roll Call Vote 483) in favor of an amendment by Rep. Jeff Flake (R-AZ) that would prohibit the use of funds by the U.S. Department of the Treasury to enforce the ban that prevents U.S. citizens from traveling freely to Cuba. That same day, the House voted 222 to 196 (Roll Call Vote 484) in favor of an amendment by William Delahunt (D-MA) that would prohibit Treasury from using funds to enforce restrictions on how much money Americans can send through remittances to nationals of Cuba or Cuban households. On October 23, 2003, the Senate voted 36 to 59 (Roll Call Vote 405) against a motion to table (i.e., kill) an amendment by Sen. Byron Dorgan (D-ND) that would have prohibited funds from being used to enforce the travel ban to Cuba.

Country-of-Origin Labeling. The 2002 farm bill required that a country-of-origin label (COOL) be stamped on meat, fish, peanuts, and produce imports starting in the fall of 2004. Implementation of the requirement was suspended by Congress because of concerns that it is really a disguised form of protectionism. Such labeling adds regulatory costs that do nothing to protect consumer health and safety and thus unnecessarily raise the cost of food for American families. This provision of the law will make it more difficult for the United States to resist demands by the European Union that all genetically modified organism products from the United States be labeled, even though such products have been proven safe in study after study. Mandating country-of-origin labeling unnecessarily interferes with trade, leading the world in a direction that will harm the American farmer.¹¹

On November 6, 2003, the Senate voted 36 to 58 (Roll Call 443) against a motion to table an amendment by Sen. Tom Daschle (D-SD) that directed Senate conferees to reject any limits on the use of funds to implement COOL requirements for imported meat or meat products. A vote in favor of the motion to table the amendment was in effect a vote against country-of-origin labeling.

Foreign Outsourcing Restrictions. A new trade issue before the 108th Congress was “foreign outsourcing”—the importation of services

The almost total embargo has failed to achieve its policy objective of overthrowing the Cuban government or of even modifying its oppressive rule.

to the United States or the relocation of production facilities from the United States to other countries. Two attempts were made in the U.S. Senate to curb outsourcing. One was an amendment by Sen. Christopher Dodd (D-CT) to forbid certain agencies of the federal government from contracting for services with companies that would provide the work from overseas. Another was an amendment by Sen. Byron Dorgan (D-ND) to raise taxes on U.S. companies that produce goods abroad for sale in the United States and would require companies to notify employees and the Department of Labor when jobs will be moved offshore, including the number of jobs affected, the destination of the relocated production, and reasons for the relocation.¹²

On March 4, 2004, the Senate voted 70 to 26 (Roll Call Vote 32) to approve the Dodd amendment to restrict certain federal agencies from outsourcing certain kinds of work. On May 5, 2004, the Senate voted 60 to 39 (Roll Call Vote 83) to table the Dorgan amendment that would have discouraged private-sector outsourcing.

Australia FTA. The U.S.-Australia free-trade agreement will eventually eliminate barriers to almost all trade between the two developed countries. The agreement eliminates barriers to trade in industrial products and commercial services. It immediately eliminates or phases out protection of politically sensitive agricultural products, with the glaring exception of Australian sugar imports to the United States, which will continue to be restricted by quota. The agreement also cements U.S. ties to an important ally in the war against international terrorism.¹³

On July 14, 2004, the House voted 314 to 109 (Roll Call Vote 375) to approve the United States-Australia Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act. On July 15, 2004, the Senate voted 80 to 16 (Roll Call Vote 156) to approve the bill.

Morocco FTA. The U.S.-Morocco free-trade agreement reduces tariffs and other trade barriers between the two countries beginning on January 1, 2005. More than 95 percent of bilateral trade will become duty-free upon imple-

mentation, and protection of other, more politically sensitive items will be phased out during the next nine years. Although the FTA will have minimal impact on the U.S. economy, it serves an important foreign policy interest by encourage more economic openness and reform in a moderate Muslim-majority country.¹⁴

On July 21, 2004, the Senate voted 85 to 13 (Roll Call Vote 159) to approve the United States-Morocco Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act. On July 22, 2004, the House voted 323 to 99 (Roll Call Vote 413) to approve the same act.

Foreign-Born Doctors. Many rural areas in the United States lack an adequate number of physicians to serve the health care needs of residents. Through various visa programs, including programs that encourage those doctors to practice in “underserved” rural areas, Congress has allowed qualified foreign-born doctors to practice in the United States. By allowing Americans to import the medical services of qualified foreign doctors, the program helps to provide more affordable and readily available health care in the United States.

On November 17, 2004, the House voted 407 to 4 (Roll Call Vote 533) in favor of a motion by Rep. James Sensenbrenner (R-WI) to provide a two-year extension of a program that allows foreign nationals who graduate from medical school in the United States to stay in the country if they agree to practice medicine for three years in specified, mostly rural areas.

Votes on Trade Subsidies

Byrd Amendment on Antidumping Duties. In 2000 Congress enacted the Continued Dumping and Subsidy Offset Act, which distributes antidumping duties collected by the U.S. government to the companies that filed the original antidumping petitions against their foreign competition. The so-called Byrd amendment, named after its sponsor, Sen. Robert Byrd (D-WV), encourages continued abuse of America’s flawed antidumping laws. It has also been found in violation of U.S. obligations in the World Trade Organization to curb subsidies for domestic industry.¹⁵

The so-called Byrd amendment encourages continued abuse of America’s flawed antidumping laws. It has also been found in violation of U.S. obligations in the World Trade Organization to curb subsidies for domestic industry.

As in previous Congresses, only a small minority of House members voted as free traders.

On February 3, 2003, 70 members of the U.S. Senate signed a letter declaring that they would oppose any efforts to repeal the Byrd amendment. Although the letter does not represent a formal vote in favor of the Byrd amendment, signing it does represent support for a law that promotes unfair barriers to trade and subsidies U.S. companies that compete in global markets.

Market Access Program Limits. Market Access Program funds are distributed by the U.S. Department of Agriculture to promote the sale abroad of goods containing U.S. agricultural products. Like other export subsidies, the MAP program does not promote trade in general but favors some exporters—in this case those using U.S. farm produce in their final products—over others. By doing so, the program helps to underwrite the foreign advertising and marketing costs of some of the largest U.S. multinational corporations.

On July 13, 2004, the House rejected, by a vote of 72 to 347 (Roll Call Vote 368), an amendment by Rep. Steve Chabot (R-OH) that would have amended the Agriculture Department and Rural Development Appropriations bill for fiscal year 2005 to prohibit federal funds from being used to carry out activities in the Market Access Program.

Who Supports Free International Markets?

The 108th Congress provided ample opportunities for members of the House and Senate to either oppose or support trade barriers. Unfortunately, there was only one clear opportunity in each chamber to oppose or support trade subsidies. Although more votes are preferable to fewer when categorizing members, the one vote does provide at least an imperfect indicator of who is more favorable toward the broader definition of free trade articulated in this study.

Members were deemed to exhibit a consistent pattern of voting if they voted two-thirds or more of the time either for or against trade

barriers and trade subsidies. Those who voted two-thirds of the time or more against both trade barriers and subsidies were classified as free traders. Those who voted two-thirds of the time against trade barriers and for subsidies were classified as internationalists. Those who voted two-thirds of the time for trade barriers and against subsidies were classified as isolationists. And those who voted two-thirds of the time for trade barriers and for subsidies were classified as interventionists.

A House Still Divided on Trade Barriers

As in previous Congresses, only a small minority of House members voted as free traders. Of the 432 House members of the 108th Congress who voted on at least half of the bills or amendments rated in this study, 25 voted consistently to reduce trade barriers and trade subsidies. Another 157, by far the largest category, voted as internationalists, consistently opposing trade barriers but supporting trade subsidies. Only 2 voted consistently as isolationists, favoring trade barriers and opposing subsidies. Another 16 voted as interventionists, consistently supporting trade barriers and subsidies.¹⁶

Of the 25 free traders, 22 were Republicans and 3 were Democrats. The only House member to vote against subsidies and barriers at every opportunity was Rep. Jeff Flake, a second-term Republican from Arizona. Voting for free trade on every vote but one were Reps. Michael Castle (R-DE), Susan Davis (D-CA), Vernon Ehlers (R-MI), Jim Ramstad (R-MN), Christopher Shays (R-CT), Chris Van Hollen (D-MD), Donald Manzullo (R-IL), Vito Fossella (R-NY), and Mark Udall (D-CO). Among the other free traders was House Majority Leader Tom DeLay (R-TX).

Of the 157 internationalists in the House, 84 were Republicans and 73 were Democrats. Rep. Nancy Johnson (R-CT) voted against trade barriers and for subsidies in every vote she cast. Another 53 members voted as internationalists on every vote they cast but one. Among the higher-profile internationalists in the 108th Congress were Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi (D-CA), Minority Whip Steny Hoyer (D-MD), ranking Ways and Means Committee member Charles Rangel (D-NY), Reps. Cal Dooley (D-CA), William Jefferson (D-

Table 1
Major House Votes on Trade Barriers and Subsidies, 108th Congress

Short Description	Date	Roll Call #	Free-Trade Position	Final Vote	% Voting Free Trade	
					GOP	Dems
Trade barrier votes						
Tariff reductions and Laos NTR	3/23/2003	45	Yes	415-11	98	97
Relax computer export controls	5/22/2003	219	Yes	207-217	39	60
Oppose EU ban on GMOs	7/10/2003	256	Yes	339-80	100	61
Burma trade embargo	7/15/2003	361	No	418-2	1	0
Chile FTA	7/24/2003	436	Yes	270-156	87	37
Singapore FTA	7/24/2003	432	Yes	272-155	88	37
End travel ban to Cuba	9/9/2003	483	Yes	227-188	25	89
Lift cap on remittances to Cuba	9/9/2003	484	Yes	222-196	21	90
Australia FTA	7/14/2004	317	Yes	314-109	89	59
Morocco FTA	7/22/2004	413	Yes	323-99	91	61
Increase foreign-born doctors	11/17/2004	533	Yes	407-4	98	100
Trade subsidy vote						
End Market Access Program	7/13/2004	368	Yes	72-347	28	6

Source: *Congressional Quarterly*, various issues.

LA), the late Robert Matsui (D-CA), Jim Kolbe (R-AZ), Ray LaHood (R-IL), Phil Crane (R-IL), David Dreier (R-CA), Katherine Harris (R-FL), and Michael Oxley (R-OH).

The two House isolationists in the 108th Congress were both Democrats from New Jersey, Reps. Robert Andrews and Bill Pascrell.

Of the 16 interventionists, 10 were Democrats, 5 were Republicans, and 1, Bernard Sanders of Vermont, was an Independent. The two most consistent interventionists were Wilson Goode (R-VA) and Walter Jones (R-NC), who voted to support trade barriers and subsidies with every vote they cast but one. The other interventionists were Robert Aderholt (R-AL), Corrine Brown (D-FL), Gene Green (D-TX), Alcee Hastings (D-FL), Robin Hayes (R-NC), Gerald Kleczka (D-WI), William Lipinski (D-IL), Frank Pallone (D-NJ), Steven Rothman (D-NJ), Pete Stark (D-CA), Charles Taylor (R-NC), Nydia Velazquez (D-NY), and Lynn Woolsey (D-CA). (See Appendix A for a full list of members in each of the four categories.)

The partisan divide in the House on trade was noticeably smaller in the 108th Congress than in the previous Congress. On the 11 votes affecting trade barriers, House Republicans voted for lower

barriers 67 percent of the time and Democrats 62 percent of the time (Table 1). That compares with a 60 to 43 percent divide in the 107th Congress. On the one vote on a trade subsidy, the Market Access Program, small minorities in both parties—28 percent of Republicans and 6 percent of Democrats—voted against the subsidy.

The closeness of the overall averages hides sharp divisions on particular trade votes. On both the Chile and Singapore free-trade agreements, about 88 percent of House Republicans voted for lower trade barriers compared with 37 percent of Democrats. The division on the Australia and Morocco FTAs was less stark but still significant, with about 90 percent of Republicans supporting those agreements and 60 percent of Democrats. The difference was equally wide, but in the opposite direction, on commercial ties with Cuba. About 90 percent of Democrats in the House voted to effectively lift restrictions on traveling and sending remittances to Cuba, while three-quarters or more of Republicans voted to keep the restrictions in place. (See Appendix B for a complete list of House members and their individual votes.)

A Senate Even More Divided

Of the 99 senators who voted on more than

half of the measures rated in this study, 24 voted as free traders in the 108th Congress. They consistently opposed trade barriers while withholding their endorsement of trade subsidies by not signing the Byrd amendment letter. Another quarter voted as internationalists, opposing trade barriers but supporting the trade subsidy. And 15 voted as interventionists, supporting both trade barriers and subsidies. None voted as an isolationist.¹⁷

Of the quarter of the Senate that voted as free traders, 22 were Republicans and 2 were Democrats. The most consistent was Sen. John Sununu (R-NH), who voted against trade barriers and subsidies on every vote he cast. Opposing barriers and subsidies on every vote but one were Sens. Wayne Allard (R-CO), Sam Brownback (R-KS), and Pat Roberts (R-KS). Among the other free traders were Senate Majority Leader Bill Frist (R-TN), Sens. John McCain (R-AZ), Chuck Hagel (R-NE), Lincoln Chafee (R-RI), and Maria Cantwell and Patty Murray, both Democrats from Washington State.

Of the 24 internationalists, 15 were Republicans and 9 were Democrats. The purest of the subspecies were Sens. Robert Bennett (R-UT), Ben Nighthorse Campbell (R-CO), and Michael Enzi (R-WY), who voted against trade barriers and for subsidies on every vote they cast but one. Voting as internationalists on every vote but two were Thad Cochran (R-MS), John Warner (R-VA), Mark Pryor (D-AR), Conrad Burns (R-MT), John Breaux (D-LA), and Zell Miller (D-GA). Also among the internationalists were Sens. Max Baucus (D-MT), the ranking minority member on the trade-law-writing Finance Committee, and former presidential candidate Joe Lieberman (D-CT).

Of the 15 interventionists, 13 were Democrats and 2 were Republicans. The most consistent were Harry Reid (D-NV), the new Senate minority leader; Robert Byrd (D-WV); Russ Feingold (D-WI); and John Edwards (D-NC), last year's Democratic vice presidential nominee. Each of them supported trade barriers and subsidies on every vote they cast but one. Among the other interventionists were Byron Dorgan (D-ND),

Table 2
Major Senate Votes on Trade Barriers and Subsidies, 108th Congress

Short Description	Date	Roll Call #	Free-Trade Position	Final Vote	% Voting Free Trade	
					GOP	Dems
Trade barrier votes						
Burma trade embargo	7/16/2003	280	No	94-1	2	0
Chile FTA	7/31/2003	319	Yes	65-32	86	47
Singapore FTA	7/31/2003	318	Yes	66-32	86	47
End travel ban to Cuba (table)	10/23/2003	405	No	36-59	39	87
Enforce country-of-origin labeling (table)	11/6/2003	443	Yes	36-58	59	16
Restrict federal outsourcing	3/4/2004	32	No	70-26	51	0
Discourage private outsourcing (table)	5/5/2004	83	Yes	60-39	100	19
Australia FTA	7/15/2004	156	Yes	80-16	96	70
Morocco FTA	7/21/2004	159	Yes	85-13	90	83
Tariff reductions and Laos NTR	11/19/2004	214	Yes	88-5	98	91
Trade subsidy vote						
Signed letter supporting Byrd amendment	2/3/2003	N/A	No	70-30	53	6

Source: *Congressional Quarterly*, various issues.

Note: A vote to table is a vote to kill the amendment on the floor. Thus a vote in favor of tabling an amendment is in effect a vote against the amendment.

Tom Harkin (D-IA), Richard Shelby (R-AL), Lindsey Graham (R-SC), and now-retired Ernest “Fritz” Hollings (D-SC). (See Appendix C for a complete list of Senate members.)

Voting on trade was even more partisan in the Senate than in the House. On average, Republican senators voted against trade barriers 71 percent of the time compared with 46 percent for Democrats, while 53 percent of Republicans opposed the subsidies contained in the Byrd amendment compared with only 6 percent of Democrats (Table 2). The differences were especially wide on the Singapore and Chile free-trade agreements, the Byrd amendment letter, country-of-origin labeling, and foreign outsourcing, where Republicans were far more likely to oppose trade barriers or subsidies, and travel to Cuba, where it was the Democrats who were far more likely to oppose barriers. (See Appendix D for a complete list of senators and their individual votes.)

A Look Back across Four Congresses

This is the fourth Congress that has been examined according to the Cato Institute’s free-trade matrix.¹⁸ Combining the votes from all four studies plus three other major trade votes allows us to discern which members of Congress have displayed a consistent voting pattern over a period spanning more than a decade. This and the previous three studies have analyzed the 105th through the 108th Congresses, covering the years 1997 through 2004. In addition, the combined analysis also includes House and Senate votes in 1993 on the North American Free Trade Agreement; in 1994 on the Uruguay Round Agreements Act that established the World Trade Organization; and in 1996 on the so-called Freedom to Farm Act, which, temporarily at least, reduced U.S. agricultural subsidies. In all, we can identify 38 trade barrier votes in the House during that period and 18 trade subsidy votes. In the Senate during that same period, we can identify 38 trade barrier votes and 9 trade subsidy votes.

The combined ratings include all members of the 108th Congress who also cast votes in the same chamber in a previous Congress. This survey of a decade of votes includes 380 House members and 90 senators.

In the House, 11 members, all Republicans, voted consistently as free traders in all the votes included in this analysis since 1993. The most consistent free trader was Jeff Flake (AZ), who opposed trade barriers in 95 percent of votes he cast and subsidies in 100 percent of his votes. The other free traders during that time were John Shadegg (AZ), Philip Crane (IL), Charles Bass (NH), James Ramstad (MN), Jim DeMint (SC), Thomas Petri (WI), Patrick Toomey (PA), John Linder (GA), and Nick Smith (MI). (See Appendix E for a complete list of House member ratings since 1993.)

In the Senate, as in the House, 11 Republican members voted consistently as free traders during that time span. The most consistent free trader was Don Nickles (OK), who opposed trade barriers in 89 percent of votes he cast and subsidies in 100 percent of his votes. The other free traders in the Senate during that time were Lincoln Chafee (RI), Sam Brownback (KS), John Ensign (NV), Richard Lugar (IN), Jon Kyl (AZ), Wayne Allard (CO), George Voinovich (OH), John McCain (AZ), Judd Gregg (NH), and Mike DeWine (OH). (See Appendix F for a complete listing of Senate member ratings since 1993.)

Another 107 House members voted consistently as internationalists during the past decade, 66 Republicans and 41 Democrats. The most consistent internationalists were John Boozman (R-AR), Thomas Osborne (R-NE), Samuel Graves (R-MO), Timothy Johnson (R-IL), Charles Gonzales (D-TX), Baron Hill (D-IN), Heather Wilson (R-NM), Ruben Hinojosa (D-TX), and Cal Dooley (D-CA). In the Senate, 15 members voted consistently as internationalists in the past decade, 10 Democrats and 5 Republicans. The truest to form were Zell Miller (D-GA), Mary Landrieu (D-LA), John Breaux (D-LA), and Max Baucus (D-MT), who almost always voted against trade barriers and in favor of trade subsidies. Other notable career internationalists were former presidential candidates John Kerry (D-MA) and Joseph Lieberman (D-CT).

A small band of 5 House members, 4 Republicans and 1 Democrat, voted consistently as isolationists during the past decade. They were John Duncan Jr. (R-TN), Dana Rohrabacher

**In the House,
11 members,
all Republicans,
voted consistently
as free traders in all
the votes included
in this analysis
since 1993.**

Judging from the findings of this study, changes in Congress brought about by the November 2, 2004, elections do not signal a sharp change in the direction of U.S. trade policy.

(R-CA), Frank LoBiondo (R-NJ), Clifford Stearns (R-FL), and Robert Andrews (D-NJ). Only 2 senators, Jon Corzine (D-NJ) and Russ Feingold (D-WI), consistently favored trade barriers and opposed subsidies.

Gathered in the opposite corner from the free traders were 24 career interventionists in the House, 16 Democrats and 8 Republicans. The most consistent interventionist in the past decade was now-retired House Minority Leader Richard Gephardt (D-MO), who voted against trade barriers on 20 percent of the votes he cast and against trade subsidies on 12 percent. Joining Gephardt among the more hard-core career interventionists were Charles Taylor (R-NC), Gene Green (D-TX), Don Young (R-AK), Eliot Engel (D-NY), Dale Kildee (D-MI), Alcee Hastings (D-FL), and Corrine Brown (D-FL). Other career interventionists in the House were Jesse Jackson Jr. (D-IL), David Obey (D-WI), Ileana Ros-Lehtinen (R-FL), Patrick Kennedy (D-RI), and John Spratt (D-SC).

In the Senate, all 7 career interventionists were Democrats. The most unwavering among them was now-retired Ernest “Fritz” Hollings (SC), who opposed trade barriers 16 percent and trade subsidies 22 percent of the time. The others were the new Senate Minority Leader Harry Reid (NV), former vice presidential nominee John Edwards (NC), Byron Dorgan (ND), Patrick Leahy (VT), Robert Byrd (WV), and Mark Dayton (MN).

Clues to the 109th Congress

Judging from the findings of this study, changes in Congress brought about by the November 2, 2004, elections do not signal a sharp change in the direction of U.S. trade policy. Because Republican members are more likely to vote for lower trade barriers and subsidies, the strengthened GOP majorities in the House and the Senate likely portend a Congress that will be slightly more friendly to free trade.

In the House, 41 members of the 108th Congress will not be returning for the 109th. Deciphering what impact the new members will have on trade policy is a challenge in part

because newly elected House members typically have no previous record of voting on trade issues. As a group, the 41 departed House members were somewhat more likely to have voted against trade barriers than returning members and slightly less likely to have opposed trade subsidies. But any net effect on Congress as a whole will depend, of course, on how their replacements vote on trade issues.

Among the more notable departures regarding trade policy were those of Reps. Cal Dooley (D-CA), a leading internationalist among the Democrats; former minority leader Richard Gephardt (D-MO), a leading interventionist; and Reps. Phil Crane (R-IL) and Patrick Toomey (R-PA), who were among the most consistent free traders.

The only significant leadership change in the House affecting trade will be the chairmanship of the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Trade, where Rep. Clay Shaw (R-FL) has replaced Rep. Phil Crane, who was defeated for reelection. During his 35 years in the House, Crane compiled one of the most consistent records for opposing both trade barriers and subsidies. In the major trade votes of the past decade, Crane opposed trade barriers 79 percent of the time compared with Shaw’s 68 percent, and he opposed trade subsidies 82 percent of the time compared with Shaw’s 39 percent. (See Appendix E for the combined ratings.)

The tea leaves are somewhat easier to read in the Senate, where 6 of the 9 new senators compiled voting records on trade in the House. The sharpest difference between an outgoing and incoming senator is in South Carolina. There, Jim DeMint (R), who compiled one of the most consistent free-trade records during his six years in the House (1999–2005), has replaced Ernest “Fritz” Hollings (D), who in his years in the Senate compiled one of the most consistent interventionist records. In North Carolina, Richard Burr (R), who had an inconsistent record as a House member, has replaced John Edwards, a consistent interventionist. In Oklahoma, Tom Coburn (R), who compiled a consistent record as an isolationist in the House, has replaced Don Nickles, a leading free trader.

Another significant change occurred in South Dakota. There, John Thune (R), a consistent internationalist during his time in the House, replaced Minority Leader Tom Daschle (D), who was somewhat more inclined to support trade barriers and subsidies during his time in Congress. As a consequence of that switch, the Democratic Party now has a new minority leader in the Senate, Harry Reid of Nevada, who has compiled a consistently interventionist record. In the past decade, Reid has voted for lower trade barriers 24 percent of the time compared with Daschle's 63 percent. That could signal that Reid will be less inclined philosophically to cooperate on trade liberalization with Republicans than was Daschle during his time in leadership.

In Georgia, retiring internationalist Zell Miller (D) has been replaced by Johnny Isakson (R), who also compiled an internationalist record during his time in the House. The same was true in Louisiana, where the retiring John Breaux (D) has been replaced by former House member David Vitter (R).

None of the other three new senators—Ken Salazar (D-CO), Mel Martinez (R-FL), and Barack Obama (D-IL)—has served in Congress previously, and thus those three have no voting record on trade issues. Statements on trade during the 2004 campaign are inconclusive. For example, Salazar told the United Stock Growers of America: "I am a strong proponent of free trade, but we must implement appropriate safeguards for agriculture, labor, and conservation interests. I would carefully consider all agreements before casting my vote." He also declared his support for the World Trade Organization as "essential to the current system of international trade."¹⁹ The senator Salazar has replaced, Ben Nighthorse Campbell (R), compiled an inconsistent record, opposing trade barriers on 46 percent of votes in the past decade and opposing trade subsidies on 44 percent of votes.

Mel Martinez also sounded the "I favor free trade, but . . ." theme in his campaign. On his official website he declared: "I support free trade measures that will create more jobs and provide new economic opportunities for Florida's workers. Trade must also be fair so that Florida's busi-

nesses and workers can compete on a level playing field in the global market." In pursuing free trade, he said Congress must "stand up" for such Florida farm sectors as sugar, citrus, and vegetables.²⁰ The senator he has replaced, Bob Graham (D), was a borderline internationalist, opposing barriers on 64 percent of his votes and subsidies on 33 percent.

Barack Obama sounded less friendly toward free trade during his campaign than either Martinez or Salazar. While declaring that "free trade—when also fair—can benefit workers in rich and poor countries alike," Obama criticized the North American Free Trade Agreement with Mexico for lacking necessary "worker and environmental protections." He favors a "significant renegotiation" of both NAFTA and presidential trade promotion authority.²¹ Regarding trade with China, Obama believes the United States "should insist on labor standards and human rights" when negotiating on bilateral trade issues but that we should also avoid "triggering a trade war" that could cause instability in the Chinese economy with global economic consequences.²² Of the campaign positions of the three new senators who had not previously served in Congress, those of Obama stand in the sharpest contrast to the senator he replaced. During his one term in the Senate (1999–2005), Peter Fitzgerald (R) was a borderline free trader, opposing trade barriers 88 percent of the time and trade subsidies 60 percent of the time.

When examined individually and as a whole, changes in the 109th Congress point toward a continuation of the status quo in congressional attitudes toward free trade.

A Final Assessment

Creating a free and vibrant market for international trade requires more than eliminating tariff and nontariff barriers. It requires the elimination of export and production subsidies that distort trade, draw resources away from their best use, and leave the United States and its trading partners worse off.

Measured by this more comprehensive definition of free trade, the 108th Congress was a

The Democratic Party now has a new minority leader in the Senate, Harry Reid of Nevada, who has compiled a consistently interventionist record.

While a majority in Congress hesitates to impose sweeping new trade barriers, it does not hesitate to distort U.S. trade with a plethora of subsidies.

mixed success. On the positive side of the ledger, the House and the Senate enacted several modest but significant trade bills, including free-trade agreements with Chile, Singapore, Australia, and Morocco. Congress also passed a bill that unilaterally reduced tariffs on a grab bag of miscellaneous products. And in the category of the dog that didn't bark, Congress refrained from passing any bills that raised trade barriers or subsidies in a significant way.

On the negative side, the 108th Congress made no progress in reducing trade subsidies. Spending on the Export-Import Bank, OPIC, the IMF, and agricultural subsidies all escaped congressional scrutiny. Billions in trade subsidies continued to flow undisturbed. The House resoundingly defeated a motion to cut the Market Access Program, and 70 senators pledged to oppose any cuts in the direct producer subsidies doled out through the WTO-illegal Byrd amendment. While a majority in Congress hesitates to impose sweeping new trade barriers, it does not hesitate to distort U.S. trade with a plethora of subsidies.

Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle should consider the cost of pursuing such an incoherent policy on trade. One cost is a tarnished U.S. image abroad. The lack of commitment in practice to free trade stands in contrast to the pronouncements members frequently make that they support the goal of free trade. America's political leaders complain incessantly that U.S. producers must compete in a world of "unfair" trade barriers and subsidies, while the U.S. market is open. But this study shows that very few members of Congress vote consistently for policies that would create an international

market free of both distorting barriers and subsidies. Judging by the voting behavior analyzed in this study, most members of the U.S. Congress have no standing to criticize other governments for deviating from free trade.

Another cost is to U.S. taxpayers. Trade barriers rob Americans of income through higher prices. Trade subsidies rob Americans by driving up the cost of government, necessitating higher taxes or more government borrowing, or both. As Congress searches for ways to restrain spending and bring down a fiscal deficit that exceeded \$400 billion last year, trade subsidies should provide an inviting target. Congress can save billions of dollars each year, remove distortions from the international economy, and improve America's image abroad.

Members of Congress who want to advance the cause of limited government, economic liberty, and prosperity at home and abroad should favor a consistent agenda of eliminating trade barriers and trade-related subsidies. Both protectionism and subsidies undermine the workings of the free market, substituting the judgment of politicians for that of millions of informed citizens cooperating in the international marketplace for mutual advantage.

When weighing policy toward the international economy, members of Congress do not need to choose between anti-trade, anti-subsidy isolationism and pro-trade, pro-subsidy internationalism. They can choose to vote for a coherent program to liberalize trade and eliminate subsidies—in sum, to let Americans enjoy the freedom and prosperity of a seamless free market undistorted by government intervention.

Appendix A: House Members by Category

Party	State	First Elected	Barrier Votes	Subsidy Votes		Party	State	First Elected	Barrier Votes	Subsidy Votes	
<i>Free Traders</i>											
Flake, Jeff	R	AZ	2000	100%	100%	Toomey, Patrick	R	PA	1998	78%	100%
Castle, Michael	R	DE	1992	91%	100%	Bass, Charles	R	NH	1994	73%	100%
Davis, Susan	D	CA	2000	91%	100%	Cox, Christopher	R	CA	1988	73%	100%
Ehlers, Vernon	R	MI	1993	91%	100%	DeLay, Tom	R	TX	1984	73%	100%
Ramstad, Jim	R	MN	1990	91%	100%	DeMint, Jim	R	SC	1998	73%	100%
Shays, Christopher	R	CT	1987	91%	100%	Hensarling, Jeb	R	TX	2002	73%	100%
Van Hollen, Chris	D	MD	2002	91%	100%	Linder, John	R	GA	1992	73%	100%
Manzullo, Donald	R	IL	1992	90%	100%	Petri, Thomas	R	WI	1979	73%	100%
Fossella, Vito	R	NY	1997	89%	100%	Smith, Nick	R	MI	1992	73%	100%
Udall, Mark	D	CO	1998	89%	100%	Hayworth, J. D.	R	AZ	1994	70%	100%
Portman, Rob	R	OH	1993	82%	100%	Kirk, Mark Steven	R	IL	2000	67%	100%
Tiberi, Patrick	R	OH	2001	82%	100%	Myrick, Sue	R	NC	1994	67%	100%
Pitts, Joseph	R	PA	1996	80%	100%						
<i>Internationalists</i>											
Johnson, Nancy	R	CT	1982	100%	0%	Pelosi, Nancy	D	CA	1987	91%	0%
Becerra, Xavier	D	CA	1992	91%	0%	Price, David	D	NC	1996	91%	0%
Biggert, Judy	R	IL	1998	91%	0%	Schiff, Adam	D	CA	2000	91%	0%
Blumenauer, Earl	D	OR	1996	91%	0%	Shimkus, John	R	IL	1996	91%	0%
Boehler, Sherwood	R	NY	1982	91%	0%	Tauscher, Ellen	D	CA	1996	91%	0%
Bono, Mary	R	CA	1994	91%	0%	Thompson, Mike	D	CA	1998	91%	0%
Boswell, Leonard	D	IA	1996	91%	0%	Upton, Fred	R	MI	1986	91%	0%
Brady, Kevin	R	TX	1996	91%	0%	Weiner, Anthony David	D	NY	1998	91%	0%
Camp, Dave	R	MI	1990	91%	0%	Dooley, Calvin	D	CA	1990	90%	0%
Cardin, Benjamin	D	MD	1986	91%	0%	Eshoo, Anna	D	CA	1992	90%	0%
Cooper, Jim	D	TN	1982	91%	0%	Greenwood, James	R	PA	1992	90%	0%
Crowley, Joseph	D	NY	1998	91%	0%	Harman, Jane	D	CA	2000	90%	0%
Davis, Artur	D	AL	2002	91%	0%	Jefferson, William	D	LA	1990	90%	0%
Etheridge, Bob	D	NC	1996	91%	0%	John, Christopher	D	LA	1996	90%	0%
Gonzalez, Charles	D	TX	1998	91%	0%	Kind, Ron	D	WI	1996	90%	0%
Hill, Baron	D	IN	1998	91%	0%	Leach, James	R	IA	1976	90%	0%
Hinojosa, Ruben	D	TX	1996	91%	0%	Lowey, Nita	D	NY	1998	90%	0%
Hoyer, Steny	D	MD	1981	91%	0%	Smith, Adam	D	WA	1996	90%	0%
Inslee, Jay	D	WA	1998	91%	0%	Snyder, Vic	D	AR	1996	90%	0%
Israel, Steven	D	NY	2000	91%	0%	Whitfield, Edward	R	KY	1994	90%	0%
Kolbe, Jim	R	AZ	1984	91%	0%	Knollenberg, Joseph	R	MI	1992	89%	0%
LaHood, Ray	R	IL	1994	91%	0%	Oxley, Michael	R	OH	1981	89%	0%
Latham, Tom	R	IA	1994	91%	0%	Rangel, Charles	D	NY	1970	88%	0%
Lofgren, Zoe	D	CA	1994	91%	0%	Doolittle, John	R	CA	1990	86%	0%
Matheson, James	D	UT	2000	91%	0%	Berman, Howard	D	CA	1982	82%	0%
Matsui, Robert	D	CA	1978	91%	0%	Boozman, John	R	AR	2001	82%	0%
Meeks, Gregory	D	NY	1998	91%	0%	Boyd, F. Allen, Jr.	D	FL	1996	82%	0%
Moore, Dennis	D	KS	1998	91%	0%	Capps, Lois	D	CA	1996	82%	0%
Moran, James	D	VA	1990	91%	0%	Cramer, Robert, Jr.	D	AL	1990	82%	0%
Neal, Richard	D	MA	1988	91%	0%	Davis, Jim	D	FL	1996	82%	0%

continued

Appendix A—continued

Party	State	First Elected	Barrier Votes	Subsidy Votes	Party	State	First Elected	Barrier Votes	Subsidy Votes		
Davis, Lincoln	D	TN	2002	82%	0%	Hastings, Doc	R	WA	1994	73%	0%
DeGette, Diana	D	CO	1996	82%	0%	Hulshof, Kenny	R	MO	1996	73%	0%
Dicks, Norman	D	WA	1976	82%	0%	Johnson, Eddie Bernice	D	TX	1992	73%	0%
Emanuel, Rahm	D	IL	2002	82%	0%	Kelly, Sue	R	NY	1994	73%	0%
Ford, Harold, Jr.	D	TN	1996	82%	0%	Kennedy, Mark	R	MN	2000	73%	0%
Gallegly, Elton	R	CA	1986	82%	0%	Lampson, Nicholas	D	TX	1996	73%	0%
Hall, Ralph	D	TX	1980	82%	0%	LaTourette, Steven	R	OH	1994	73%	0%
Hooley, Darlene	D	OR	1996	82%	0%	McCreary, Jim	R	LA	1988	73%	0%
Issa, Darrell	R	CA	2000	82%	0%	Mica, John	R	FL	1992	73%	0%
Johnson, Timothy	R	IL	2000	82%	0%	Moran, Jerry	R	KS	1996	73%	0%
Levin, Sander	D	MI	1982	82%	0%	Ney, Robert	R	OH	1994	73%	0%
Lucas, Kenneth	D	KY	1998	82%	0%	Northup, Anne	R	KY	1996	73%	0%
Maloney, Carolyn	D	NY	1992	82%	0%	Ose, Doug	R	CA	1998	73%	0%
Nethercutt, George, Jr.	R	WA	1994	82%	0%	Pickering, Charles, Jr.	R	MS	1996	73%	0%
Nussle, Jim	R	IA	1990	82%	0%	Pomeroy, Earl	D	ND	1992	73%	0%
Osborne, Thomas	R	NE	2000	82%	0%	Pryce, Deborah	R	OH	1992	73%	0%
Otter, C. L.	R	ID	2000	82%	0%	Putnam, Adam	R	FL	2000	73%	0%
Peterson, John	R	PA	1996	82%	0%	Radanovich, George	R	CA	1994	73%	0%
Ryan, Paul	R	WI	1998	82%	0%	Rehberg, Dennis	R	MT	2000	73%	0%
Randlin, Max, Jr.	D	TX	1996	82%	0%	Reyes, Silvestre	D	TX	1996	73%	0%
Stenholm, Charles	D	TX	1978	82%	0%	Reynolds, Thomas	R	NY	1998	73%	0%
Tamner, John	D	TN	1988	82%	0%	Rogers, Harold	R	KY	1980	73%	0%
Thornberry, William	R	TX	1994	82%	0%	Roybal-Allard, Lucille	D	CA	1992	73%	0%
Turner, Jim	D	TX	1996	82%	0%	Sanchez, Loretta	D	CA	1996	73%	0%
Watson, Diane	D	CA	2001	82%	0%	Smith, Lamar	R	TX	1986	73%	0%
Wilson, Heather	R	NM	1998	82%	0%	Thomas, William	R	CA	1978	73%	0%
Herger, Wally	R	CA	1986	80%	0%	Walden, Greg	R	OR	1998	73%	0%
Meehan, Martin	D	MA	1992	80%	0%	Walsh, James	R	NY	1988	73%	0%
Terry, Lee	R	NE	1998	80%	0%	Watt, Melvin	D	NC	1992	73%	0%
Cubin, Barbara	R	WY	1994	78%	0%	Weldon, Curt	R	PA	1986	73%	0%
Dunn, Jennifer	R	WA	1982	78%	0%	Weller, Gerald	R	IL	1994	73%	0%
Graves, Samuel	R	MO	2000	78%	0%	Blunt, Roy	R	MO	1996	70%	0%
Keller, Richard	R	FL	2000	78%	0%	Bonilla, Henry	R	TX	1992	70%	0%
Baird, Brian	D	WA	1998	73%	0%	Brown-Waite, Ginny	R	FL	2002	70%	0%
Boehner, John	R	OH	1990	73%	0%	Clay, William, Jr.	D	MO	1968	70%	0%
Brown, Henry, Jr.	R	SC	2000	73%	0%	Diaz-Balart, Lincoln	R	FL	1992	70%	0%
Cantor, Eric	R	VA	2000	73%	0%	Gordon, Bart	D	TN	1984	70%	0%
Chocola, Chris	R	IN	2002	73%	0%	McCarthy, Carolyn	D	NY	1996	70%	0%
Crane, Philip	R	IL	1969	73%	0%	Nunes, Devin	R	CA	2002	70%	0%
Cunningham, Randy	R	CA	1990	73%	0%	Ortiz, Solomon	D	TX	1982	70%	0%
Dingell, John	D	MI	1955	73%	0%	Sessions, Pete	R	TX	1996	70%	0%
Dreier, David	R	CA	1980	73%	0%	Cannon, Chris	R	UT	1996	67%	0%
Edwards, Chet	D	TX	1990	73%	0%	Davis, Thomas, III	R	VA	1994	67%	0%
Foley, Mark	R	FL	1994	73%	0%	Goss, Porter	R	FL	1988	67%	0%
Gilchrest, Wayne	R	MD	1990	73%	0%	Millender-McDonald, Juanita	D	CA	1996	67%	0%
Goodlatte, Bob	R	VA	1992	73%	0%	Neugebauer, Randy	R	TX	2003	67%	0%
Granger, Kay	R	TX	1996	73%	0%	Sullivan, John	R	OK	2002	67%	0%
Harris, Katherine	R	FL	2002	73%	0%	Towns, Edolphus	D	NY	1982	67%	0%
Hart, Melissa	R	PA	2000	73%	0%						

	Party	State	First Elected	Barrier Votes	Subsidy Votes		Party	State	First Elected	Barrier Votes	Subsidy Votes
						<i>Isolationists</i>					
Andrews, Robert	D	NJ	1990	18%	100%	Pascrell, William, Jr.	D	NJ	1996	18%	100%
						<i>Interventionists</i>					
Klecza, Gerald	D	WI	1984	33%	0%	Hayes, Robin	R	NC	1998	27%	0%
Velazquez, Nydia	D	NY	1992	33%	0%	Lipinski, William	D	IL	1982	27%	0%
Stark, Fortney	D	CA	1972	30%	0%	Pallone, Frank, Jr.	D	NJ	1988	27%	0%
Woolsey, Lynn	D	CA	1992	30%	0%	Sanders, Bernard	I	VT	1990	27%	0%
Aderholt, Robert	R	AL	1996	27%	0%	Rothman, Steven	D	NJ	1996	20%	0%
Brown, Corrine	D	FL	1992	27%	0%	Taylor, Charles	R	NC	1990	18%	0%
Green, Gene	D	TX	1992	27%	0%	Goode, Virgil, Jr.	R	VA	1996	9%	0%
Hastings, Alcee	D	FL	1992	27%	0%	Jones, Walter, Jr.	R	NC	1994	9%	0%

Appendix B: Individual House Voting Records

	Party	State	First Elected	Barrier Votes	Subsidy Votes	Miscellaneous Tariff Reduction	Relax Computer Export Controls	Oppose EU GMO Ban	Burma Import Sanctions	Singapore FTA	Chile FTA	Allow Cuba Travel	Allow Remittances to Cuba	Australia FTA	Morocco FTA	Increase Foreign Doctors	Cut Market Access Program
Roll call number						45	219	256	361	432	436	483	484	375	413	533	368
Year of vote						2003	2003	2003	2003	2003	2003	2003	2003	2004	2004	2004	2004
“Free-Trade” position						Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Abercrombie, Neil	D	HI	1990	45%	0%	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	-
Ackerman, Gary	D	NY	1983	55%	0%	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	-
Aderholt, Robert	R	AL	1996	27%	0%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	-
Akin, W. Todd	R	MO	2000	45%	0%	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	-
Alexander, Rodney	R	LA	2002	45%	0%	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	-
Allen, Thomas	D	ME	1996	64%	0%	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	-
Andrews, Robert	D	NJ	1990	18%	100%	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+
Baca, Joe	D	CA	1999	45%	0%	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	-
Bachus, Spencer	R	AL	1992	64%	100%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+
Baird, Brian	D	WA	1998	73%	0%	+	+	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	-
Baker, Richard	R	LA	1986	64%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
Balance, Frank	D	NC	2002	88%		+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+				
Baldwin, Tammy	D	WI	1998	45%	0%	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	-
Ballenger, Cass	R	NC	1986	64%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
Barrett, J. Gresham	R	SC	2002	36%	100%	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	+
Bartlett, Roscoe	R	MD	1992	64%	100%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+
Barton, Joe	R	TX	1984	64%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
Bass, Charles	R	NH	1994	73%	100%	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+
Beauprez, Bob	R	CO	2002	64%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
Becerra, Xavier	D	CA	1992	91%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
Bell, Chris	D	TX	2002	64%	0%	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	-
Bereuter, Douglas	R	NE	1978	90%		+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+		
Berkley, Shelly	D	NV	1998	63%	100%	+	+	-				-	-	+	+	+	+
Berman, Howard	D	CA	1982	82%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
Berry, Marion	D	AR	1996	45%	0%	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	-
Biggert, Judy	R	IL	1998	91%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
Bilirakis, Michael	R	FL	1982	64%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
Bishop, Robert	R	UT	2002	44%	0%	+	-	+	-			-	-	-	+	+	-
Bishop, Sanford, Jr.	D	GA	1992	64%	0%	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	-
Bishop, Tim	D	NY	2002	64%	0%	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	-
Blackburn, Marsha	R	TN	2002	64%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-

	Party	State	First Elected	Barrier Votes	Subsidy Votes	Miscellaneous Tariff Reduction	Relax Computer Export Controls	Oppose EU GMO Ban	Burma Import Sanctions	Singapore FTA	Chile FTA	Allow Cuba Travel	Allow Remittances to Cuba	Australia FTA	Morocco FTA	Increase Foreign Doctors	Cut Market Access Program
Roll call number						45	219	256	361	432	436	483	484	375	413	533	368
Year of vote						2003	2003	2003	2003	2003	2003	2003	2003	2004	2004	2004	2004
“Free-Trade” position						Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Blumenauer, Earl	D	OR	1996	91%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
Blunt, Roy	R	MO	1996	70%	0%		+	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
Boehlert, Sherwood	R	NY	1982	91%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
Boehner, John	R	OH	1990	73%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
Bonilla, Henry	R	TX	1992	70%	0%	+		+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
Bonner, Jo	R	AL	2002	64%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
Bono, Mary	R	CA	1994	91%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
Boozman, John	R	AR	2001	82%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
Boswell, Leonard	D	IA	1996	91%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
Boucher, Rick	D	VA	1982	55%	0%	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	-
Boyd, F. Allen, Jr.	D	FL	1996	82%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
Bradley, Jeb	R	NH	2002	64%	100%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+
Brady, Kevin	R	TX	1996	91%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
Brady, Robert	D	PA	1998	45%	0%	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	-
Brown, Corrine	D	FL	1992	27%	0%	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-
Brown, Henry, Jr.	R	SC	2000	73%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
Brown, Sherrod	D	OH	1992	36%	100%	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	+
Brown-Waite, Ginny	R	FL	2002	70%	0%	+		+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
Burgess, Michael	R	TX	2002	60%	100%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+		+
Burns, Max	R	GA	2002	55%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	-	+	-
Burr, Richard	R	NC	1982	60%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	-		-
Burton, Dan	R	IN	1982	45%	100%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	+
Butterfield, G. K.	D	NC	2004	50%											-	+	
Buyer, Steve	R	IN	1992	64%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
Calvert, Ken	R	CA	1992	64%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
Camp, Dave	R	MI	1990	91%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
Cannon, Chris	R	UT	1996	67%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	+			-
Cantor, Eric	R	VA	2000	73%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
Capito, Shelly Moore	R	WV	2000	64%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
Capps, Lois	D	CA	1996	82%	0%	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
Capuano, Michael	D	MA	1998	55%	0%	-	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	+	-

continued

Appendix B—continued

	Party	State	First Elected	Barrier Votes	Subsidy Votes	Miscellaneous Tariff Reduction	Relax Computer Export Controls	Oppose EU GMO Ban	Burma Import Sanctions	Singapore FTA	Chile FTA	Allow Cuba Travel	Allow Remittances to Cuba	Australia FTA	Morocco FTA	Increase Foreign Doctors	Cut Market Access Program
Roll call number						45	219	256	361	432	436	483	484	375	413	533	368
Year of vote						2003	2003	2003	2003	2003	2003	2003	2003	2004	2004	2004	2004
“Free-Trade” position						Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Cardin, Benjamin	D	MD	1986	91%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
Cardoza, Dennis	D	CA	2002	55%	0%	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	-
Carson, Brad	D	OK	2000	73%		+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-
Carson, Julia	D	IN	1996	44%	0%	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+			+	-
Carter, John	R	TX	2002	64%	100%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+
Case, Ed	D	HI	2002	64%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	-
Castle, Michael	R	DE	1992	91%	100%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Chabot, Steve	R	OH	1994	64%	100%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+
Chandler, Ben	D	KY	2004	100%	0%									+	+	+	-
Chocola, Chris	R	IN	2002	73%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
Clay, William, Jr.	D	MO	1968	70%	0%	+	+	+	-	-	-		+	+	+	+	-
Clyburn, James	D	SC	1992	36%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	-
Coble, Howard	R	NC	1984	36%	0%	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	-
Cole, Tom	R	OK	2002	64%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
Collins, Michael	R	GA	1992	56%		+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-			+	
Combest, Larry	R	TX	1984	100%		+											
Conyers, John, Jr.	D	MI	1964	50%	0%	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	-
Cooper, Jim	D	TN	1982	91%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
Costello, Jerry	D	IL	1988	45%	0%	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	-
Cox, Christopher	R	CA	1988	73%	100%	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+
Cramer, Robert, Jr.	D	AL	1990	82%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
Crane, Philip	R	IL	1969	73%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
Crenshaw, Ander	R	FL	2000	64%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
Crowley, Joseph	D	NY	1998	91%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
Cubin, Barbara	R	WY	1994	78%	0%	+	+		-	+	+	-	+	+	+		-
Culberson, John Abney	R	TX	2000	64%	100%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+
Cummings, Elijah	D	MD	1996	56%	0%	+	+	+	-	-	-			-	+	+	-
Cunningham, Randy	R	CA	1990	73%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
Davis, Artur	D	AL	2002	91%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
Davis, Danny	D	IL	1996	45%	0%	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	-
Davis, Jim	D	FL	1996	82%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	-

	Party	State	First Elected	Barrier Votes	Subsidy Votes	Miscellaneous Tariff Reduction	Relax Computer Export Controls	Oppose EU GMO Ban	Burma Import Sanctions	Singapore FTA	Chile FTA	Allow Cuba Travel	Allow Remittances to Cuba	Australia FTA	Morocco FTA	Increase Foreign Doctors	Cut Market Access Program	
Roll call number						45	219	256	361	432	436	483	484	375	413	533	368	
Year of vote						2003	2003	2003	2003	2003	2003	2003	2003	2004	2004	2004	2004	
“Free-Trade” position						Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Davis, Jo Ann	R	VA	2000	45%	100%	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+		
Davis, Lincoln	D	TN	2002	82%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-		
Davis, Susan	D	CA	2000	91%	100%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		
Davis, Thomas, III	R	VA	1994	67%	0%	+	+		-	+	-	-	+	+	+	-		
Deal, Nathan	R	GA	1992	45%	0%	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	-		
DeFazio, Peter	D	OR	1986	36%	0%	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+		
DeGette, Diana	D	CO	1996	82%	0%	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-		
Delahunt, William	D	MA	1996	45%	0%	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+		
DeLauro, Rosa	D	CT	1990	55%	0%	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	+		
DeLay, Tom	R	TX	1984	73%	100%	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+		
DeMint, Jim	R	SC	1998	73%	100%	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		
Deutsch, Peter	D	FL	1992	36%		+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+			
Diaz-Balart, Lincoln	R	FL	1992	70%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	-		
Diaz-Balart, Mario	R	FL	2002	60%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	-		
Dicks, Norman	D	WA	1976	82%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-		
Dingell, John	D	MI	1955	73%	0%	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	-		
Doggett, Lloyd	D	TX	1994	64%	100%	+	+	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+		
Dooley, Calvin	D	CA	1990	90%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-		
Doolittle, John	R	CA	1990	86%	0%	+			-	+	+		+	+	+	-		
Doyle, Michael	D	PA	1994	55%	0%	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	+		
Dreier, David	R	CA	1980	73%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+		
Duncan, John, Jr.	R	TN	1988	36%	100%	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-		
Dunn, Jennifer	R	WA	1982	78%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+		-	+	+	-		
Edwards, Chet	D	TX	1990	73%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+		
Ehlers, Vernon	R	MI	1993	91%	100%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		
Emanuel, Rahm	D	IL	2002	82%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	-		
Emerson, Jo Ann	R	MO	1996	63%	0%	+		+	-	+	+		-	-	+	-		
Engel, Eliot	D	NY	1988	45%	0%	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+		
English, Philip	R	PA	1994	64%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+		
Eshoo, Anna	D	CA	1992	90%	0%	+	+		-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-		
Etheridge, Bob	D	NC	1996	91%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-		

continued

Appendix B—continued

	Party	State	First Elected	Barrier Votes	Subsidy Votes	Miscellaneous Tariff Reduction	Relax Computer Export Controls	Oppose EU GMO Ban	Burma Import Sanctions	Singapore FTA	Chile FTA	Allow Cuba Travel	Allow Remittances to Cuba	Australia FTA	Morocco FTA	Increase Foreign Doctors	Cut Market Access Program
Roll call number						45	219	256	361	432	436	483	484	375	413	533	368
Year of vote						2003	2003	2003	2003	2003	2003	2003	2003	2004	2004	2004	2004
“Free-Trade” position						Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Evans, Lane	D	IL	1982	45%	0%	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	-
Everett, Terry	R	AL	1992	64%	0%	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	-
Farr, Sam	D	CA	1993	55%	0%	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	+	-
Fattah, Chaka	D	PA	1994	45%	0%	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	-
Feeney, Tom	R	FL	2002	64%	100%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+
Ferguson, Michael	R	NJ	2000	64%	100%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+
Filner, Bob	D	CA	1992	36%	0%	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	-
Flake, Jeff	R	AZ	2000	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Fletcher, Ernest	R	KY	1988	86%		+	+		-	+	+	+	+				
Foley, Mark	R	FL	1994	73%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
Forbes, J. Randy	R	VA	2001	64%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
Ford, Harold, Jr.	D	TN	1996	82%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
Fossella, Vito	R	NY	1997	89%	100%	+	+	+	-	+	+			+	+	+	+
Frank, Barney	D	MA	1980	50%	0%	+	+	-		-	-	+	+	-	-	+	-
Franks, Trent	R	AZ	2002	60%	100%		-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+
Frelinghuysen, Rodney	R	NJ	1994	64%	100%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+
Frost, Martin	D	TX	1978	64%	0%	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-
Gallegly, Elton	R	CA	1986	82%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	-
Garrett, Scott	R	NJ	2002	64%	100%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+
Gephardt, Richard	D	MO	1976	33%	0%					-	-			+			-
Gerlach, Jim	R	PA	2002	64%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
Gibbons, James	R	NV	1996	64%	100%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+
Gilchrest, Wayne	R	MD	1990	73%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	-
Gillmor, Paul	R	OH	1988	55%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	-
Gingrey, Phil	R	GA	2002	64%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
Gonzalez, Charles	D	TX	1998	91%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
Goode, Virgil, Jr.	R	VA	1996	9%	0%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Goodlatte, Bob	R	VA	1992	73%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
Gordon, Bart	D	TN	1984	70%	0%	+		+	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	-
Goss, Porter	R	FL	1988	67%	0%	+	+	+	-		+	-	-	+	+		-
Granger, Kay	R	TX	1996	73%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-

	Party	State	First Elected	Barrier Votes	Subsidy Votes	Miscellaneous Tariff Reduction	Relax Computer Export Controls	Oppose EU GMO Ban	Burma Import Sanctions	Singapore FTA	Chile FTA	Allow Cuba Travel	Allow Remittances to Cuba	Australia FTA	Morocco FTA	Increase Foreign Doctors	Cut Market Access Program	
Roll call number						45	219	256	361	432	436	483	484	375	413	533	368	
Year of vote						2003	2003	2003	2003	2003	2003	2003	2003	2004	2004	2004	2004	
“Free-Trade” position						Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Graves, Samuel	R	MO	2000	78%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	
Green, Gene	D	TX	1992	27%	0%	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	
Green, Mark	R	WI	1998	45%	0%	+	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	-	
Greenwood, James	R	PA	1992	90%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	
Grijalva, Raul	D	AZ	2002	45%	0%	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	-	
Gutierrez, Luis	D	IL	1992	45%	0%	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	-	
Gutknecht, Gil	R	MN	1994	60%		+	+	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	-	
Hall, Ralph	D	TX	1980	82%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	
Harman, Jane	D	CA	2000	90%	0%	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	
Harris, Katherine	R	FL	2002	73%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-	
Hart, Melissa	R	PA	2000	73%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-	
Hastert, J. Dennis	R	IL	1986	100%				+										
Hastings, Alcee	D	FL	1992	27%	0%	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	
Hastings, Doc	R	WA	1994	73%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-	
Hayes, Robin	R	NC	1998	27%	0%	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	
Hayworth, J. D.	R	AZ	1994	70%	100%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	
Hefley, Joel	R	CO	1986	55%	100%	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	
Hensarling, Jeb	R	TX	2002	73%	100%	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	
Herger, Wally	R	CA	1986	80%	0%	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	
Herseth, Stephanie	D	SD	2004	67%	0%									-	+	+	-	
Hill, Baron	D	IN	1998	91%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	
Hinchey, Maurice	D	NY	1992	36%	0%	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	-	
Hinojosa, Ruben	D	TX	1996	91%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	
Hobson, David	R	OH	1990	64%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-	
Hoeffel, Joseph, III	D	PA	1998	60%	0%	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	+		+	+	-	
Hoekstra, Peter	R	MI	1992	56%	100%	+	+	+	-	-	-			-	+	+	+	
Holden, Tim	D	PA	1992	55%	0%	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	
Holt, Rush	D	NJ	1998	64%	0%	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	
Honda, Michael	D	CA	2000	64%	0%	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	
Hooley, Darlene	D	OR	1996	82%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	
Hostettler, John	R	IN	1994	45%	100%	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	

continued

Appendix B—continued

	Party	State	First Elected	Barrier Votes	Subsidy Votes	Miscellaneous Tariff Reduction	Relax Computer Export Controls	Oppose EU GMO Ban	Burma Import Sanctions	Singapore FTA	Chile FTA	Allow Cuba Travel	Allow Remittances to Cuba	Australia FTA	Morocco FTA	Increase Foreign Doctors	Cut Market Access Program
Roll call number						45	219	256	361	432	436	483	484	375	413	533	368
Year of vote						2003	2003	2003	2003	2003	2003	2003	2003	2004	2004	2004	2004
“Free-Trade” position						Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Houghton, Amory, Jr.	R	NY	1986	90%		+	+		-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Hoyer, Steny	D	MD	1981	91%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
Hulshof, Kenny	R	MO	1996	73%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
Hunter, Duncan	R	CA	1980	36%	0%	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	-
Hyde, Henry	R	IL	1974	64%	100%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+
Inslee, Jay	D	WA	1998	91%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
Isakson, John	R	GA	1998	60%		+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-		+	+	
Israel, Steven	D	NY	2000	91%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
Issa, Darrell	R	CA	2000	82%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	-
Istook, Ernest, Jr.	R	OK	1992	60%		+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-		+	+	
Jackson, Jesse, Jr.	D	IL	1995	45%	0%	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	-
Jackson-Lee, Sheila	D	TX	1994	55%		+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	
Janklow, William	R	SD	2002	80%		+	-	+		+	+						
Jefferson, William	D	LA	1990	90%	0%	+	+	-		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
Jenkins, William	R	TN	1996	64%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
John, Christopher	D	LA	1996	90%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+		-
Johnson, Eddie Bernice	D	TX	1992	73%	0%	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	-
Johnson, Nancy	R	CT	1982	100%	0%	+	+	+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
Johnson, Sam	R	TX	1991	64%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
Johnson, Timothy	R	IL	2000	82%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
Jones, Stephanie Tubbs	D	OH	1998	64%	0%	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	-
Jones, Walter, Jr.	R	NC	1994	9%	0%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kanjorski, Paul	D	PA	1984	45%	0%	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	-
Kaptur, Marcy	D	OH	1982	36%	0%	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	-
Keller, Richard	R	FL	2000	78%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+			+	+	+	-
Kelly, Sue	R	NY	1994	73%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
Kennedy, Mark	R	MN	2000	73%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
Kennedy, Patrick	D	RI	1994	45%	0%	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	-
Kildee, Dale	D	MI	1976	36%	0%	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	-
Kilpatrick, Carolyn	D	MI	1996	60%	0%	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+		-
Kind, Ron	D	WI	1996	90%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+		+	+	-

	Party	State	First Elected	Barrier Votes	Subsidy Votes	Miscellaneous Tariff Reduction	Relax Computer Export Controls	Oppose EU GMO Ban	Burma Import Sanctions	Singapore FTA	Chile FTA	Allow Cuba Travel	Allow Remittances to Cuba	Australia FTA	Morocco FTA	Increase Foreign Doctors	Cut Market Access Program
Roll call number						45	219	256	361	432	436	483	484	375	413	533	368
Year of vote						2003	2003	2003	2003	2003	2003	2003	2003	2004	2004	2004	2004
“Free-Trade” position						Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
King, Peter	R	NY	1992	64%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
King, Steve	R	IA	2002	64%	100%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+
Kingston, Jack	R	GA	1992	64%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
Kirk, Mark Steven	R	IL	2000	67%	100%	+	+	+	-	+		-	-	+		+	+
Klecza, Gerald	D	WI	1984	33%	0%	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-			-
Kline, John	R	MN	2002	64%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
Knollenberg, Joseph	R	MI	1992	89%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+			+	+	+	-
Kolbe, Jim	R	AZ	1984	91%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
Kucinich, Dennis	D	OH	1996	38%	0%	+	+	-	-	-	-			-		+	-
LaHood, Ray	R	IL	1994	91%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
Lampson, Nicholas	D	TX	1996	73%	0%	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	-
Langevin, James	D	RI	2000	60%	0%	+		-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	-
Lantos, Tom	D	CA	1980	40%	0%	+	-		-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	-
Larsen, Richard	D	WA	2000	91%		+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
Larson, John	D	CT	1998	40%	0%	+	-		-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	-
Latham, Tom	R	IA	1994	91%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
LaTourette, Steven	R	OH	1994	73%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-
Leach, James	R	IA	1976	90%	0%	+	+		-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
Lee, Barbara	D	CA	1998	45%		+	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	-
Levin, Sander	D	MI	1982	82%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
Lewis, Jerry	R	CA	1978	64%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
Lewis, John	D	GA	1986	64%	0%	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	-
Lewis, Ron	R	KY	1994	64%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
Linder, John	R	GA	1992	73%	100%	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+
Lipinski, William	D	IL	1982	27%	0%	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-
LoBiondo, Frank	R	NJ	1994	45%	100%	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+
Lofgren, Zoe	D	CA	1994	91%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
Lowey, Nita	D	NY	1988	90%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+		+	-
Lucas, Frank	R	OK	1994	55%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	-
Lucas, Kenneth	D	KY	1998	82%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	-
Lynch, Stephen	D	MA	2001	60%	0%		-	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	-

continued

Appendix B—continued

	Party	State	First Elected	Barrier Votes	Subsidy Votes	Miscellaneous Tariff Reduction	Relax Computer Export Controls	Oppose EU GMO Ban	Burma Import Sanctions	Singapore FTA	Chile FTA	Allow Cuba Travel	Allow Remittances to Cuba	Australia FTA	Morocco FTA	Increase Foreign Doctors	Cut Market Access Program
Roll call number						45	219	256	361	432	436	483	484	375	413	533	368
Year of vote						2003	2003	2003	2003	2003	2003	2003	2003	2004	2004	2004	2004
“Free-Trade” position						Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Majette, Denise	D	GA	2002	80%		+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+		+	+	
Maloney, Carolyn	D	NY	1992	82%	0%	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
Manzullo, Donald	R	IL	1992	90%	100%	+	+		-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Markey, Edward	D	MA	1976	45%	0%	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	-
Marshall, Jim	D	GA	2002	45%	0%	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	-
Matheson, James	D	UT	2000	91%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
Matsui, Robert	D	CA	1978	91%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
McCarthy, Carolyn	D	NY	1996	70%	0%	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	+		-
McCarthy, Karen	D	MO	1994	64%	0%	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	-
McCollum, Betty	D	MN	2000	55%	100%	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	+
McCotter, Thaddeus	R	MI	2002	64%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
McCrery, Jim	R	LA	1988	73%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
McDermott, Jim	D	WA	1988	60%	0%	-	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	+		-
McGovern, James	D	MA	1996	64%	0%	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	+	-
McHugh, John	R	NY	1992	45%	0%	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	-
McInnis, Scott	R	CO	1992	64%	100%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+
McIntyre, Mike	D	NC	1996	45%	0%	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	-
McKeon, Howard	R	CA	1992	64%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
McNulty, Michael	D	NY	1988	45%	0%	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	-
Meehan, Martin	D	MA	1992	80%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+		+	-
Meek, Carrie	D	FL	1992	64%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
Meeks, Gregory	D	NY	1998	91%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
Menendez, Robert	D	NJ	1992	64%	0%	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
Mica, John	R	FL	1992	73%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
Michaud, Michael	D	ME	2002	55%	0%	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	-
Millender-McDonald, Juanita	D	CA	1996	67%	0%	+	+	+		-	-	+	+	-	+		-
Miller, Brad	D	NC	2002	64%	0%	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	+	-
Miller, Candice	R	MI	2002	64%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
Miller, Gary	R	CA	1998	64%	100%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+
Miller, George	D	CA	1974	40%	0%	+	-	-	-		-	+	+	-	-	+	-
Miller, Jeff	R	FL	2001	64%	100%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+

	Party	State	First Elected	Barrier Votes	Subsidy Votes	Miscellaneous Tariff Reduction	Relax Computer Export Controls	Oppose EU GMO Ban	Burma Import Sanctions	Singapore FTA	Chile FTA	Allow Cuba Travel	Allow Remittances to Cuba	Australia FTA	Morocco FTA	Increase Foreign Doctors	Cut Market Access Program
Roll call number						45	219	256	361	432	436	483	484	375	413	533	368
Year of vote						2003	2003	2003	2003	2003	2003	2003	2003	2004	2004	2004	2004
“Free-Trade” position						Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mollohan, Alan	D	WV	1982	45%	0%	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	-
Moore, Dennis	D	KS	1998	91%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
Moran, James	D	VA	1990	91%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
Moran, Jerry	R	KS	1996	73%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-
Murphy, Timothy	R	PA	2002	64%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
Murtha, John	D	PA	1974	40%	0%	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	-
Musgrave, Marilyn	R	CO	2002	60%	100%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+		+
Myrick, Sue	R	NC	1994	67%	100%	+	+	+		+		-	-	+	-	+	+
Nadler, Jerrold	D	NY	1992	45%	0%	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	-
Napolitano, Grace	D	CA	1998	64%	100%	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	+	+
Neal, Richard	D	MA	1988	91%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
Nethercutt, George, Jr.	R	WA	1994	82%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
Neugebauer, Randy	R	TX	2003	67%	0%			+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
Ney, Robert	R	OH	1994	73%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	-
Northup, Anne	R	KY	1996	73%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
Norwood, Charles	R	GA	1994	40%	0%	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+		-
Nunes, Devin	R	CA	2002	70%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-		+	+	-
Nussle, Jim	R	IA	1990	82%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
Oberstar, James	D	MN	1974	36%	0%	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	-
Obey, David	D	WI	1969	36%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	-
Olver, John	D	MA	1991	55%	0%	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	+	-
Ortiz, Solomon	D	TX	1982	70%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	+		-
Osborne, Thomas	R	NE	2000	82%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-
Ose, Doug	R	CA	1998	73%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
Otter, C. L.	R	ID	2000	82%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-
Owens, Major R.	D	NY	1982	40%	0%	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	-
Oxley, Michael	R	OH	1981	89%	0%	+		+		+	+	+	-	+	+	+	-
Pallone, Frank, Jr.	D	NJ	1988	27%	0%	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-
Pascrell, William, Jr.	D	NJ	1996	18%	100%	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+
Pastor, Ed	D	AZ	1991	56%	0%	+	+	-	-			+	+	-	-	+	-
Paul, Ron	R	TX	1996	60%	100%	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	-		+	+

continued

Appendix B—continued

	Party	State	First Elected	Barrier Votes	Subsidy Votes	Miscellaneous Tariff Reduction	Relax Computer Export Controls	Oppose EU GMO Ban	Burma Import Sanctions	Singapore FTA	Chile FTA	Allow Cuba Travel	Allow Remittances to Cuba	Australia FTA	Morocco FTA	Increase Foreign Doctors	Cut Market Access Program
Roll call number						45	219	256	361	432	436	483	484	375	413	533	368
Year of vote						2003	2003	2003	2003	2003	2003	2003	2003	2004	2004	2004	2004
“Free-Trade” position						Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Payne, Donald	D	NJ	1988	36%	0%	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	-
Pearce, Steve	R	NM	2002	55%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	-
Pelosi, Nancy	D	CA	1987	91%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
Pence, Mike	R	IN	2000	64%	100%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+
Peterson, Collin	D	MN	1990	55%	0%	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	-
Peterson, John	R	PA	1996	82%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
Petri, Thomas	R	WI	1979	73%	100%	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+
Pickering, Charles, Jr.	R	MS	1996	73%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	-
Pitts, Joseph	R	PA	1996	80%	100%	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+
Platts, Todd	R	PA	2000	64%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
Pombo, Richard	R	CA	1992	45%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	-
Pomeroy, Earl	D	ND	1992	73%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-
Porter, Jon	R	NV	2002	64%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
Portman, Rob	R	OH	1993	82%	100%	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+
Price, David	D	NC	1996	91%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
Pryce, Deborah	R	OH	1992	73%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
Putnam, Adam	R	FL	2000	73%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
Quinn, Jack	R	NY	1992	40%	0%	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-
Radanovich, George	R	CA	1994	73%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
Rahall, Nick, III	D	WV	1976	64%	0%	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	-
Ramstad, Jim	R	MN	1990	91%	100%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Rangel, Charles	D	NY	1970	88%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+				+	+	-
Regula, Ralph	R	OH	1972	64%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
Rehberg, Dennis	R	MT	2000	73%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-
Renzi, Rick	R	AZ	2002	64%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
Reyes, Silvestre	D	TX	1996	73%	0%	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
Reynolds, Thomas	R	NY	1998	73%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
Rodriguez, Ciro	D	TX	1997	64%	0%	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	-
Rogers, Harold	R	KY	1980	73%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	-
Rogers, Michael D.	R	AL	2002	55%	100%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	-	+	+
Rogers, Michael J.	R	MI	2000	64%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-

	Party	State	First Elected	Barrier Votes	Subsidy Votes	Miscellaneous Tariff Reduction	Relax Computer Export Controls	Oppose EU GMO Ban	Burma Import Sanctions	Singapore FTA	Chile FTA	Allow Cuba Travel	Allow Remittances to Cuba	Australia FTA	Morocco FTA	Increase Foreign Doctors	Cut Market Access Program	
Roll call number						45	219	256	361	432	436	483	484	375	413	533	368	
Year of vote						2003	2003	2003	2003	2003	2003	2003	2003	2004	2004	2004	2004	
"Free-Trade" position						Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Rohrabacher, Dana	R	CA	1988	36%	100%	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	+	
Ros-Lehtinen, Ileana	R	FL	1989	60%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-		+	+	-	
Ross, Michael	D	AR	2000	64%	0%	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	
Rothman, Steven	D	NJ	1996	20%	0%	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+		-	
Roybal-Allard, Lucille	D	CA	1992	73%	0%	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	
Royce, Edward	R	CA	1992	64%	100%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	
Ruppersberger, C. A.	D	MD	2002	64%	0%	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	
Rush, Bobby	D	IL	1992	55%	0%	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	-	
Ryan, Paul	R	WI	1998	82%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	
Ryan, Tim	D	OH	2002	36%	0%	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	-	
Ryun, Jim	R	KS	1996	64%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-	
Sabo, Martin Olav	D	MN	2002	36%	0%	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	-	
Sanchez, Linda	D	CA	2002	45%	0%	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	-	
Sanchez, Loretta	D	CA	1996	73%	0%	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	
Sanders, Bernard	I	VT	1990	27%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	-	
Sandlin, Max, Jr.	D	TX	1996	82%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	
Saxton, Jim	R	NJ	1984	64%		+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+		
Schakowsky, Janice	D	IL	1998	45%	100%	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	
Schiff, Adam	D	CA	2000	91%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	
Schrock, Edward	R	VA	2000	64%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-	
Scott, David	D	GA	2002	64%	0%	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	
Scott, Robert	D	VA	1992	64%	0%	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	-	
Sensenbrenner, F. James, Jr.	R	WI	1978	55%	100%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	
Serrano, Jose	D	NY	1990	44%	0%	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	
Sessions, Pete	R	TX	1996	70%	0%	+	+		-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-	
Shadegg, John	R	AZ	1994	64%	100%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	
Shaw, E. Clay, Jr.	R	FL	1980	64%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-	
Shays, Christopher	R	CT	1987	91%	100%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
Sherman, Bradley	D	CA	1996	55%	0%	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	
Sherwood, Don	R	PA	1998	64%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-	
Shimkus, John	R	IL	1996	91%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	

continued

Appendix B—continued

	Party	State	First Elected	Barrier Votes	Subsidy Votes	Miscellaneous Tariff Reduction	Relax Computer Export Controls	Oppose EU GMO Ban	Burma Import Sanctions	Singapore FTA	Chile FTA	Allow Cuba Travel	Allow Remittances to Cuba	Australia FTA	Morocco FTA	Increase Foreign Doctors	Cut Market Access Program
Roll call number						45	219	256	361	432	436	483	484	375	413	533	368
Year of vote						2003	2003	2003	2003	2003	2003	2003	2003	2004	2004	2004	2004
“Free-Trade” position						Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Shuster, Bill	R	PA	1972	64%	100%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+
Simmons, Robert	R	CT	2000	64%	0%	+	-	+	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	-
Simpson, Michael	R	ID	1998	55%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	-
Skelton, Ike	D	MO	1976	64%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
Slaughter, Louise McIntosh	D	NY	1986	36%	0%	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	-
Smith, Adam	D	WA	1996	90%	0%	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
Smith, Christopher	R	NJ	1980	64%	100%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+
Smith, Lamar	R	TX	1986	73%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
Smith, Nick	R	MI	1992	73%	100%	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+
Snyder, Vic	D	AR	1996	90%	0%		+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
Solis, Hilda	D	CA	2000	45%	0%	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	-
Souder, Mark	R	IN	1994	64%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
Spratt, John, Jr.	D	SC	1982	45%	0%	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	-
Stark, Fortney	D	CA	1972	30%	0%	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-		-
Stearns, Clifford	R	FL	1988	60%	0%	+	-	+	-	+		-	-	+	+	+	-
Stenholm, Charles	D	TX	1978	82%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
Strickland, Ted	D	OH	1996	36%	0%	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	-
Stupak, Bart	D	MI	1992	50%	0%		-	+	-	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	-
Sullivan, John	R	OK	2002	67%	0%	+	+	+	-			-	-	+	+	+	-
Sweeney, John	R	NY	1998	50%	0%		-	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	-
Tancredo, Thomas	R	CO	1998	45%	100%	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+
Tanner, John	D	TN	1988	82%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
Tauscher, Ellen	D	CA	1996	91%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
Tauzin, W. J.	R	LA	1980	64%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
Taylor, Charles	R	NC	1990	18%	0%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-
Taylor, Gene	D	MS	1989	36%	0%	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	-
Terry, Lee	R	NE	1998	80%	0%		-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
Thomas, William	R	CA	1978	73%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
Thompson, Bennie	D	MS	1993	45%	0%	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	-
Thompson, Mike	D	CA	1998	91%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
Thornberry, William	R	TX	1994	82%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	-

	Party	State	First Elected	Barrier Votes	Subsidy Votes	Miscellaneous Tariff Reduction	Relax Computer Export Controls	Oppose EU GMO Ban	Burma Import Sanctions	Singapore FTA	Chile FTA	Allow Cuba Travel	Allow Remittances to Cuba	Australia FTA	Morocco FTA	Increase Foreign Doctors	Cut Market Access Program
Roll call number						45	219	256	361	432	436	483	484	375	413	533	368
Year of vote						2003	2003	2003	2003	2003	2003	2003	2003	2004	2004	2004	2004
"Free-Trade" position						Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Tiaht, Todd	R	KS	1994	64%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
Tiberi, Patrick	R	OH	2001	82%	100%	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Tierney, John	D	MA	1996	45%	0%	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	-
Toomey, Patrick	R	PA	1998	78%	100%	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-	+	+		+
Towns, Edolphus	D	NY	1982	67%	0%	+	+	+	-	-	-			+	+	+	-
Turner, Jim	D	TX	1996	82%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
Turner, Michael	R	OH	2002	64%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
Udall, Mark	D	CO	1998	89%	100%	+	+	+	-	+	+			+	+	+	+
Udall, Tom	D	NM	1998	55%	0%	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	-
Upton, Fred	R	MI	1986	91%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
Van Hollen, Chris	D	MD	2002	91%	100%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Velazquez, Nydia	D	NY	1992	33%	0%	+	+	-	-	-	-			-	-	+	-
Visclosky, Peter	D	IN	1984	55%	0%	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	+	-
Vitter, David	R	LA	1998	64%		+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	
Walden, Greg	R	OR	1998	73%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
Walsh, James	R	NY	1988	73%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
Wamp, Zach	R	TN	1994	55%	100%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	-	+	+
Waters, Maxine	D	CA	1990	45%	0%	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	-
Watson, Diane	D	CA	2001	82%	0%	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
Watt, Melvin	D	NC	1992	73%	0%	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	-
Waxman, Henry	D	CA	1974	60%	100%	+	-	-		+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+
Weiner, Anthony David	D	NY	1998	91%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
Weldon, Curt	R	PA	1986	73%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	-
Weldon, Dave	R	FL	1994	64%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
Weller, Gerald	R	IL	1994	73%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
Wexler, Robert	D	FL	1996	45%	0%	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	-
Whitfield, Edward	R	KY	1994	90%	0%	+		+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
Wicker, Roger	R	MS	1994	64%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
Wilson, Heather	R	NM	1998	82%	0%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	-
Wilson, Joe	R	SC	2001	36%	100%	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	+
Wolf, Frank	R	VA	1980	64%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-

continued

Appendix B—continued

	Party	State	First Elected	Barrier Votes	Subsidy Votes	Miscellaneous Tariff Reduction	Relax Computer Export Controls	Oppose EU GMO Ban	Burma Import Sanctions	Singapore FTA	Chile FTA	Allow Cuba Travel	Allow Remittances to Cuba	Australia FTA	Morocco FTA	Increase Foreign Doctors	Cut Market Access Program
Roll call number						45	219	256	361	432	436	483	484	375	413	533	368
Year of vote						2003	2003	2003	2003	2003	2003	2003	2003	2004	2004	2004	2004
“Free-Trade” position						Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Woolsey, Lynn	D	CA	1992	30%	0%	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-
Wu, David	D	OR	1998	45%	0%	+	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	+	-
Wynn, Albert	D	MD	1992	64%	0%	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	-
Young, C. W.	R	FL	1970	64%	0%	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
Young, Don	R	AK	1973	45%	0%	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	-

Appendix C: Senate Members by Category

Party	State	First Elected	Barrier Votes	Subsidy Votes		Party	State	First Elected	Barrier Votes	Subsidy Votes	
<i>Free Traders</i>											
Sununu, John	R	NH	2002	100%	100%	Nickles, Don	R	OK	1980	80%	100%
Allard, Wayne	R	CO	1996	90%	100%	Talent, Jim	R	MO	2002	80%	100%
Brownback, Sam	R	KS	1996	90%	100%	Bond, Christopher	R	MO	1986	78%	100%
Roberts, Pat	R	KS	1996	90%	100%	Hutchison, Kay Bailey	R	TX	1993	78%	100%
Chafee, Lincoln	R	RI	1999	80%	100%	Lugar, Richard	R	IN	1976	78%	100%
Cornyn, John	R	TX	2002	80%	100%	Alexander, Lamar	R	TN	2002	70%	100%
Fitzgerald, Peter	R	IL	1998	80%	100%	Allen, George	R	VA	2000	70%	100%
Hagel, Chuck	R	NE	1996	80%	100%	Frist, William	R	TN	1994	70%	100%
Hatch, Orrin	R	UT	1976	80%	100%	McConnell, Mitch, Jr.	R	KY	1984	70%	100%
Inhofe, James	R	OK	1994	80%	100%	Stevens, Ted	R	AK	1968	70%	100%
Kyl, Jon	R	AZ	1994	80%	100%	Cantwell, Maria	D	WA	2000	70%	100%
McCain, John	R	AZ	1986	80%	100%	Murray, Patty	D	WA	1992	70%	100%
<i>Internationalists</i>											
Bennett, Robert	R	UT	1992	90%	0%	Crapo, Michael	R	ID	1998	70%	0%
Campbell, Ben Nighthorse	R	CO	1992	89%	0%	DeWine, Mike	R	OH	1994	70%	0%
Enzi, Michael	R	WY	1996	89%	0%	Gregg, Judd	R	NH	1992	70%	0%
Cochran, Thad	R	MS	1978	80%	0%	Lott, Trent	R	MS	1988	70%	0%
Warner, John	R	VA	1978	80%	0%	Santorum, Rick	R	PA	1994	70%	0%
Pryor, Mark	D	AR	2002	80%	0%	Thomas, Craig	R	WY	1994	70%	0%
Burns, Conrad	R	MT	1989	78%	0%	Bayh, Evan	D	IN	1998	70%	0%
Breaux, John	D	LA	1972	78%	0%	Durbin, Richard	D	IL	1996	70%	0%
Miller, Zell	D	GA	2000	75%	0%	Lincoln, Blanche	D	AR	1998	70%	0%
Bunning, Jim	R	KY	1998	70%	0%	Nelson, Bill	D	FL	2000	70%	0%
Collins, Susan	R	ME	1996	70%	0%	Baucus, Max	D	MT	1978	67%	0%
Craig, Larry	R	ID	1990	70%	0%	Lieberman, Joseph	D	CT	1988	67%	0%
<i>Interventionists</i>											
Johnson, Tim	D	SD	1996	33%	0%	Dayton, Mark	D	MN	2000	20%	0%
Leahy, Patrick	D	VT	1974	33%	0%	Dorgan, Byron	D	ND	1992	20%	0%
Graham, Lindsey	R	SC	2002	30%	0%	Edwards, John	D	NC	1998	20%	0%
Shelby, Richard	R	AL	1986	30%	0%	Kohl, Herbert	D	WI	1988	20%	0%
Harkin, Tom	D	IA	1984	30%	0%	Byrd, Robert	D	WV	1958	10%	0%
Hollings, Ernest "Fritz"	D	SC	1966	30%	0%	Feingold, Russell	D	WI	1992	10%	0%
Inouye, Daniel	D	HI	1962	30%	0%	Reid, Harry	D	NV	1986	10%	0%
Akaka, Daniel	D	HI	1990	20%	0%						

Appendix D: Individual Senate Voting Records

	Party	State	First Elected	Barrier Votes	Subsidy Votes	Burma Import Sanctions	Singapore FTA	Chile FTA	Cuba Travel Ban	Country-of-Origin Labeling (table)	Restrict Federal Outsourcing	Restrict Outsourcing (table)	Australia FTA	Morocco FTA	Miscellaneous Tariff Cuts	Byrd Amendment
Roll call number						280	318	319	405	443	32	83	156	159	214	N/A
Year of vote						2003	2003	2003	2003	2003	2004	2004	2004	2004	2004	2003
“Free-Trade” position						N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Akaka, Daniel	D	HI	1990	20%	0%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-
Alexander, Lamar	R	TN	2002	70%	100%	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+
Allard, Wayne	R	CO	1996	90%	100%	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Allen, George	R	VA	2000	70%	100%	-	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+
Baucus, Max	D	MT	1978	67%	0%	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	-
Bayh, Evan	D	IN	1998	70%	0%	-	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
Bennett, Robert	R	UT	1992	90%	0%	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
Biden, Joseph, Jr.	D	DE	1972	40%	0%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	-
Bingaman, Jeff	D	NM	1982	60%	0%	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	-
Bond, Christopher	R	MO	1986	78%	100%	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+
Boxer, Barbara	D	CA	1992	40%	0%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	-
Breaux, John	D	LA	1972	78%	0%	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	-
Brownback, Sam	R	KS	1996	90%	100%	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Bunning, Jim	R	KY	1998	70%	0%	-	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	-
Burns, Conrad	R	MT	1989	78%	0%	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	-
Byrd, Robert	D	WV	1958	10%	0%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Campbell, Ben Nighthorse	R	CO	1992	89%	0%	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
Cantwell, Maria	D	WA	2000	70%	100%	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+
Carper, Thomas	D	DE	2000	60%	0%	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	-
Chafee, Lincoln	R	RI	1999	80%	100%	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+
Chambliss, Saxby	R	GA	2002	60%	0%	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
Clinton, Hillary Rodham	D	NY	2000	56%	0%	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	-
Cochran, Thad	R	MS	1978	80%	0%	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
Coleman, Norm	R	MN	2002	60%	0%	-	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	-
Collins, Susan	R	ME	1996	70%	0%	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	-
Conrad, Kent	D	ND	1986	50%	0%	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	-
Cornyn, John	R	TX	2002	80%	100%	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Corzine, Jon	D	NJ	2000	40%	0%	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
Craig, Larry	R	ID	1990	70%	0%	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
Crapo, Michael	R	ID	1998	70%	0%	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
Daschle, Thomas	D	SD	1986	50%	0%	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	-
Dayton, Mark	D	MN	2000	20%	0%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	-
DeWine, Mike	R	OH	1994	70%	0%	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	-
Dodd, Christopher	D	CT	1980	40%	0%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	-
Dole, Elizabeth	R	NC	2002	50%	100%	-	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	+	+
Domenici, Pete	R	NM	1972	50%	0%	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	-
Dorgan, Byron	D	ND	1992	20%	0%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-

	Party	State	First Elected	Barrier Votes	Subsidy Votes	Burma Import Sanctions	Singapore FTA	Chile FTA	Cuba Travel Ban	Country-of-Origin Labeling (table)	Restrict Federal Outsourcing	Restrict Outsourcing (table)	Australia FTA	Morocco FTA	Miscellaneous Tariff Cuts	Byrd Amendment
Roll call number						280	318	319	405	443	32	83	156	159	214	N/A
Year of vote						2003	2003	2003	2003	2003	2004	2004	2004	2004	2004	2003
“Free-Trade” position						N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Durbin, Richard	D	IL	1996	70%	0%	-	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
Edwards, John	D	NC	1998	20%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-
Ensign, John Eric	R	NV	2000	60%	100%	-	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+
Enzi, Michael	R	WY	1996	89%	0%	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	-
Feingold, Russell	D	WI	1992	10%	0%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Feinstein, Dianne	D	CA	1992	40%	0%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	-
Fitzgerald, Peter	R	IL	1998	80%	100%	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Frist, William	R	TN	1994	70%	100%	-	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+
Graham, Bob	D	FL	1986	50%	100%	-	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	+
Graham, Lindsey	R	SC	2002	30%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	+	-
Grassley, Charles	R	IA	1980	60%	100%	-	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+
Gregg, Judd	R	NH	1992	70%	0%	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	-
Hagel, Chuck	R	NE	1996	80%	100%	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+
Harkin, Tom	D	IA	1984	30%	0%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	+	-
Hatch, Orrin	R	UT	1976	80%	100%	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Hollings, Ernest “Fritz”	D	SC	1966	30%	0%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	+	-
Hutchison, Kay Bailey	R	TX	1993	78%	100%	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+
Inhofe, James	R	OK	1994	80%	100%	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+
Inouye, Daniel	D	HI	1962	30%	0%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	-
Jeffords, James	I	VT	1988	44%	0%	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	-	-
Johnson, Tim	D	SD	1996	33%	0%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	-
Kennedy, Edward	D	MA	1962	40%	0%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	-
Kerry, John	D	MA	1984	100%	0%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	-
Kohl, Herbert	D	WI	1988	20%	0%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	-
Kyl, Jon	R	AZ	1994	80%	100%	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Landrieu, Mary	D	LA	1996	60%	0%	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	-
Lautenberg, Frank	D	NJ	2002	40%	0%	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
Leahy, Patrick	D	VT	1974	33%	0%	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Levin, Carl	D	MI	1978	60%	0%	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	-
Lieberman, Joseph	D	CT	1988	67%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	-
Lincoln, Blanche	D	AR	1998	70%	0%	-	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
Lott, Trent	R	MS	1988	70%	0%	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	-
Lugar, Richard	R	IN	1976	78%	100%	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
McCain, John	R	AZ	1986	80%	100%	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
McConnell, Mitch, Jr.	R	KY	1984	70%	100%	-	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+
Mikulski, Barbara	D	MD	1986	40%	0%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	-
Miller, Zell	D	GA	2000	75%	0%	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	-
Murkowski, Lisa	R	AK	2002	50%	100%	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+

continued

Appendix D—continued

	Party	State	First Elected	Barrier Votes	Subsidy Votes	Burma Import Sanctions	Singapore FTA	Chile FTA	Cuba Travel Ban	Country-of-Origin Labeling (table)	Restrict Federal Outsourcing	Restrict Outsourcing (table)	Australia FTA	Morocco FTA	Miscellaneous Tariff Cuts	Byrd Amendment
Roll call number						280	318	319	405	443	32	83	156	159	214	N/A
Year of vote						2003	2003	2003	2003	2003	2004	2004	2004	2004	2004	2003
“Free-Trade” position						N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Murray, Patty	D	WA	1992	70%	100%	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+
Nelson, Bill	D	FL	2000	70%	0%	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	-
Nelson, E. Benjamin	D	NE	2000	60%	0%	-	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
Nickles, Don	R	OK	1980	80%	100%	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Pryor, Mark	D	AR	2002	80%	0%	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	-
Reed, Jack	D	RI	1996	40%	0%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	-
Reid, Harry	D	NV	1986	10%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-
Roberts, Pat	R	KS	1996	90%	100%	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Rockefeller, John, IV	D	WV	1984	40%	0%	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	-
Santorum, Rick	R	PA	1994	70%	0%	-	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	-
Sarbanes, Paul	D	MD	1976	40%	0%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	-
Schumer, Charles	D	NY	1998	50%	0%	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	-
Sessions, Jeff	R	AL	1996	50%	0%	-	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	-	+	-
Shelby, Richard	R	AL	1986	30%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	+	-
Smith, Gordon	R	OR	1996	60%	100%	-	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+
Snowe, Olympia	R	ME	1994	50%	0%	-	+	+	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	-
Specter, Arlen	R	PA	1980	60%	0%	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	-
Stabenow, Debbie	D	MI	2000	60%	0%	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	-
Stevens, Ted	R	AK	1968	70%	100%	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Sununu, John	R	NH	2002	100%	100%		+	+	+		+	+	+	+	+	+
Talent, Jim	R	MO	2002	80%	100%	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+
Thomas, Craig	R	WY	1994	70%	0%	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	-
Voinovich, George	R	OH	1998	60%	0%	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	-
Warner, John	R	VA	1978	80%	0%	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	-
Wyden, Ron	D	OR	1996	40%	0%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	-

Appendix E: Individual House Voting Records Since 1993

Member	State	Trade Barriers	Barrier Votes Cast	Trade Subsidies	Subsidy Votes Cast	Member	State	Trade Barriers	Barrier Votes Cast	Trade Subsidies	Subsidy Votes Cast
Abercrombie, Neil	HI	34%	38	18%	17	Capuano, Michael	MA	45%	31	25%	12
Ackerman, Gary	NY	50%	36	22%	18	Cardin, Benjamin	MD	58%	38	28%	18
Aderholt, Robert	AL	31%	36	12%	17	Carson, Brad	OK	73%	22	0%	7
Akin, W. Todd	MO	55%	22	50%	8	Carson, Julia	IN	42%	33	12%	17
Allen, Thomas	ME	63%	35	18%	17	Castle, Michael	DE	79%	38	39%	18
Andrews, Robert	NJ	24%	38	67%	18	Chabot, Steve	OH	61%	36	94%	18
Baca, Joe	CA	41%	22	13%	8	Clay, William, Jr.	MO	46%	35	22%	18
Bachus, Spencer	AL	63%	38	63%	16	Clyburn, James	SC	39%	38	6%	18
Baird, Brian	WA	68%	31	15%	13	Coble, Howard	NC	32%	38	65%	17
Baker, Richard	LA	71%	38	12%	17	Collins, Michael	GA	43%	35	59%	17
Baldwin, Tammy	WI	39%	31	58%	12	Conyers, John, Jr.	MI	46%	35	71%	17
Ballenger, Cass	NC	66%	38	6%	18	Costello, Jerry	IL	34%	38	28%	18
Bartlett, Roscoe	MD	34%	38	72%	18	Cox, Christopher	CA	61%	38	94%	17
Barton, Joe	TX	60%	35	6%	17	Cramer, Robert, Jr.	AL	63%	38	11%	18
Bass, Charles	NH	78%	36	83%	18	Crane, Philip	IL	79%	38	82%	17
Becerra, Xavier	CA	68%	38	11%	18	Crenshaw, Ander	FL	59%	22	0%	8
Bereuter, Douglas	NE	84%	37	12%	17	Crowley, Joseph	NY	65%	31	23%	13
Berkley, Shelly	NV	46%	28	38%	13	Cubin, Barbara	WY	65%	31	28%	18
Berman, Howard	CA	71%	35	33%	18	Culberson, John Abney	TX	64%	22	88%	8
Berry, Marion	AR	56%	36	0%	17	Cummings, Elijah	MD	47%	34	18%	17
Biggert, Judy	IL	94%	31	38%	13	Cunningham, Randy	CA	66%	38	33%	18
Bilirakis, Michael	FL	39%	38	39%	18	Davis, Danny	IL	42%	36	29%	17
Bishop, Sanford, Jr.	GA	53%	38	11%	18	Davis, Jim	FL	69%	36	12%	17
Blumenauer, Earl	OR	76%	34	29%	17	Davis, Jo Ann	VA	32%	22	50%	8
Blunt, Roy	MO	70%	33	12%	17	Davis, Susan	CA	82%	22	63%	8
Boehler, Sherwood	NY	74%	38	17%	18	Davis, Thomas, III	VA	71%	34	39%	18
Boehner, John	OH	71%	38	12%	17	Deal, Nathan	GA	32%	37	33%	18
Bonilla, Henry	TX	73%	37	11%	18	DeFazio, Peter	OR	25%	36	56%	18
Bono, Mary	CA	80%	35	28%	18	DeGette, Diana	CO	67%	36	31%	16
Boozman, John	AR	88%	17	0%	3	Delahunt, William	MA	35%	34	31%	16
Boswell, Leonard	IA	71%	35	18%	17	DeLauro, Rosa	CT	42%	38	22%	18
Boucher, Rick	VA	50%	38	11%	18	DeLay, Tom	TX	74%	35	61%	18
Boyd, F. Allen, Jr.	FL	61%	36	0%	17	DeMint, Jim	SC	74%	31	85%	13
Brady, Kevin	TX	83%	36	6%	17	Deutsch, Peter	FL	39%	38	29%	17
Brady, Robert	PA	39%	31	15%	13	Diaz-Balart, Lincoln	FL	41%	37	22%	18
Brown, Corrine	FL	31%	36	6%	18	Dicks, Norman	WA	84%	38	6%	17
Brown, Henry, Jr.	SC	68%	22	25%	8	Dingell, John	MI	50%	38	6%	18
Brown, Sherrod	OH	26%	38	65%	17	Doggett, Lloyd	TX	61%	36	44%	18
Burr, Richard	NC	51%	35	24%	17	Dooley, Calvin	CA	92%	37	11%	18
Burton, Dan	IN	34%	32	79%	14	Doolittle, John	CA	50%	34	61%	18
Buyer, Steve	IN	54%	37	24%	17	Doyle, Michael	PA	44%	36	39%	18
Calvert, Ken	CA	66%	38	11%	18	Dreier, David	CA	79%	38	28%	18
Camp, Dave	MI	79%	38	17%	18	Duncan, John, Jr.	TN	18%	38	100%	17
Cannon, Chris	UT	70%	33	31%	16	Dunn, Jennifer	WA	78%	36	22%	18
Cantor, Eric	VA	73%	22	25%	8	Edwards, Chet	TX	73%	37	17%	18
Capito, Shelly Moore	WV	45%	22	13%	8	Ehlers, Vernon	MI	83%	36	39%	18
Capps, Lois	CA	64%	36	18%	17	Emerson, Jo Ann	MO	70%	33	17%	18

continued

Appendix E—continued

Member	State	Trade Barriers	Barrier Votes Cast	Trade Subsidies	Subsidy Votes Cast	Member	State	Trade Barriers	Barrier Votes Cast	Trade Subsidies	Subsidy Votes Cast
Engel, Eliot	NY	27%	37	12%	17	Hinchev, Maurice	NY	35%	37	35%	17
English, Philip	PA	70%	37	28%	18	Hinojosa, Ruben	TX	80%	35	0%	17
Eshoo, Anna	CA	78%	37	29%	17	Hobson, David	OH	58%	38	39%	18
Etheridge, Bob	NC	69%	36	0%	17	Hoeffel, Joseph, III	PA	60%	30	31%	13
Evans, Lane	IL	34%	38	28%	18	Hoekstra, Peter	MI	56%	36	94%	18
Everett, Terry	AL	39%	36	22%	18	Holden, Tim	PA	39%	38	28%	18
Farr, Sam	CA	58%	38	28%	18	Holt, Rush	NJ	58%	31	38%	13
Fattah, Chaka	PA	50%	36	18%	17	Honda, Michael	CA	55%	22	38%	8
Ferguson, Michael	NJ	59%	22	75%	8	Hooley, Darlene	OR	67%	36	6%	17
Filner, Bob	CA	45%	38	12%	17	Hostettler, John	IN	37%	35	89%	18
Flake, Jeff	AZ	95%	21	100%	8	Houghton, Amory, Jr.	NY	83%	36	7%	14
Fletcher, Ernest	KY	74%	27	17%	12	Hoyer, Steny	MD	59%	37	6%	18
Foley, Mark	FL	65%	37	22%	18	Hulshof, Kenny	MO	75%	36	18%	17
Forbes, J. Randy	VA	64%	22	38%	8	Hunter, Duncan	CA	16%	37	50%	18
Ford, Harold, Jr.	TN	69%	35	0%	16	Hyde, Henry	IL	59%	37	28%	18
Fossella, Vito	NY	70%	33	53%	17	Inslee, Jay	WA	81%	31	15%	13
Frank, Barney	MA	36%	36	38%	16	Isakson, John	GA	70%	30	8%	12
Frelinghuysen, Rodney	NJ	67%	36	44%	18	Israel, Steven	NY	73%	22	38%	8
Frost, Martin	TX	57%	37	6%	17	Issa, Darrell	CA	81%	21	25%	8
Gallegly, Elton	CA	58%	38	18%	17	Istook, Ernest, Jr.	OK	59%	37	80%	15
Gephardt, Richard	MO	20%	30	12%	17	Jackson, Jesse, Jr.	IL	33%	36	33%	18
Gibbons, James	NV	46%	35	47%	15	Jackson-Lee, Sheila	TX	55%	31	8%	13
Gilchrest, Wayne	MD	78%	37	13%	16	Jefferson, William	LA	83%	35	6%	16
Gillmor, Paul	OH	63%	38	28%	18	Jenkins, William	TN	46%	35	6%	17
Gonzalez, Charles	TX	81%	31	0%	13	John, Christopher	LA	76%	34	0%	16
Goode, Virgil, Jr.	VA	6%	36	47%	17	Johnson, Eddie Bernice	TX	72%	36	6%	18
Goodlatte, Bob	VA	71%	38	33%	18	Johnson, Nancy	CT	92%	37	35%	17
Gordon, Bart	TN	57%	37	11%	18	Johnson, Sam	TX	66%	38	22%	18
Goss, Porter	FL	69%	35	39%	18	Johnson, Timothy	IL	82%	22	0%	8
Granger, Kay	TX	72%	36	6%	17	Jones, Stephanie Tubbs	OH	52%	29	25%	12
Graves, Samuel	MO	85%	20	0%	8	Jones, Walter, Jr.	NC	11%	36	50%	18
Green, Gene	TX	27%	37	6%	18	Kanjorski, Paul	PA	45%	38	39%	18
Green, Mark	WI	55%	31	31%	13	Kaptur, Marcy	OH	25%	36	44%	18
Greenwood, James	PA	83%	36	28%	18	Keller, Richard	FL	75%	20	38%	8
Gutierrez, Luis	IL	27%	37	28%	18	Kelly, Sue	NY	58%	36	33%	18
Gutknecht, Gil	MN	59%	34	29%	17	Kennedy, Mark	MN	73%	22	0%	8
Hall, Ralph	TX	66%	38	17%	18	Kennedy, Patrick	RI	17%	35	28%	18
Harman, Jane	CA	68%	25	25%	12	Kildee, Dale	MI	29%	38	11%	18
Hart, Melissa	PA	59%	22	25%	8	Kilpatrick, Carolyn	MI	44%	34	0%	15
Hastert, J. Dennis	IL	82%	11	80%	5	Kind, Ron	WI	74%	35	41%	17
Hastings, Alcee	FL	31%	36	6%	18	King, Peter	NY	50%	38	22%	18
Hastings, Doc	WA	71%	35	18%	17	Kingston, Jack	GA	45%	38	44%	18
Hayes, Robin	NC	29%	31	31%	13	Kirk, Mark Steven	IL	60%	20	50%	8
Hayworth, J. D.	AZ	56%	32	89%	18	Kleczka, Gerald	WI	44%	36	28%	18
Hefley, Joel	CO	37%	38	78%	18	Knollenberg, Joseph	MI	81%	36	11%	18
Herger, Wally	CA	86%	37	24%	17	Kolbe, Jim	AZ	89%	38	28%	18
Hill, Baron	IN	81%	31	0%	13	Kucinich, Dennis	OH	27%	33	59%	17

Member	State	Trade Barriers	Barrier Votes Cast	Trade Subsidies	Subsidy Votes Cast	Member	State	Trade Barriers	Barrier Votes Cast	Trade Subsidies	Subsidy Votes Cast
LaHood, Ray	IL	83%	36	11%	18	Moore, Dennis	KS	84%	31	23%	13
Lampson, Nicholas	TX	61%	36	0%	17	Moran, James	VA	87%	38	39%	18
Langevin, James	RI	48%	21	50%	8	Moran, Jerry	KS	78%	36	18%	17
Lantos, Tom	CA	34%	35	33%	15	Murtha, John	PA	39%	36	19%	16
Larsen, Richard	WA	77%	22	0%	7	Myrick, Sue	NC	61%	33	72%	18
Larson, John	CT	52%	29	23%	13	Nadler, Jerrold	NY	34%	38	44%	18
Latham, Tom	IA	89%	36	12%	17	Napolitano, Grace	CA	61%	31	15%	13
LaTourette, Steven	OH	63%	35	22%	18	Neal, Richard	MA	66%	38	24%	17
Leach, James	IA	86%	36	17%	18	Nethercutt, George, Jr.	WA	81%	36	17%	18
Lee, Barbara	CA	42%	36	25%	16	Ney, Robert	OH	50%	36	47%	17
Levin, Sander	MI	66%	38	0%	18	Northup, Anne	KY	75%	36	18%	17
Lewis, Jerry	CA	67%	36	12%	17	Norwood, Charles	GA	17%	35	33%	18
Lewis, John	GA	41%	37	29%	17	Nussle, Jim	IA	82%	38	6%	18
Lewis, Ron	KY	62%	37	17%	18	Oberstar, James	MN	41%	37	11%	18
Linder, John	GA	76%	38	72%	18	Obey, David	WI	28%	36	28%	18
Lipinski, William	IL	17%	36	56%	16	Olver, John	MA	43%	37	18%	17
LoBiondo, Frank	NJ	22%	36	72%	18	Ortiz, Solomon	TX	68%	37	6%	17
Lofgren, Zoe	CA	74%	35	22%	18	Osborne, Thomas	NE	86%	22	0%	8
Lowey, Nita	NY	70%	37	22%	18	Ose, Doug	CA	74%	31	0%	13
Lucas, Frank	OK	58%	36	17%	18	Otter, C. L.	ID	86%	22	25%	8
Lucas, Kenneth	KY	71%	31	8%	13	Owens, Major R.	NY	35%	37	53%	17
Lynch, Stephen	MA	56%	18	0%	3	Oxley, Michael	OH	81%	36	11%	18
Maloney, Carolyn	NY	61%	38	33%	18	Pallone, Frank, Jr.	NJ	18%	38	33%	18
Manzullo, Donald	IL	86%	37	44%	18	Pascrell, William, Jr.	NJ	17%	36	59%	17
Markey, Edward	MA	42%	38	44%	18	Pastor, Ed	AZ	61%	36	6%	18
Matheson, James	UT	82%	22	25%	8	Paul, Ron	TX	63%	35	100%	16
Matsui, Robert	CA	76%	38	11%	18	Payne, Donald	NJ	32%	37	22%	18
McCarthy, Carolyn	NY	54%	35	24%	17	Pelosi, Nancy	CA	58%	36	11%	18
McCarthy, Karen	MO	61%	36	12%	17	Pence, Mike	IN	68%	22	50%	8
McCollum, Betty	MN	45%	22	13%	8	Peterson, Collin	MN	47%	36	28%	18
McDermott, Jim	WA	72%	36	27%	15	Peterson, John	PA	79%	34	23%	13
McGovern, James	MA	57%	35	18%	17	Petri, Thomas	WI	71%	38	83%	18
McHugh, John	NY	38%	37	28%	18	Pickering, Charles, Jr.	MS	58%	36	13%	16
McInnis, Scott	CO	64%	36	72%	18	Pitts, Joseph	PA	71%	34	53%	17
McIntyre, Mike	NC	29%	35	35%	17	Platts, Todd	PA	67%	21	50%	8
McKeon, Howard	CA	71%	38	22%	18	Pombo, Richard	CA	34%	38	44%	18
McNulty, Michael	NY	47%	36	27%	15	Pomeroy, Earl	ND	63%	38	6%	18
Meehan, Martin	MA	74%	34	44%	16	Portman, Rob	OH	74%	38	50%	18
Meek, Carrie	FL	47%	36	6%	18	Price, David	NC	72%	36	0%	17
Meeks, Gregory	NY	75%	28	15%	13	Pryce, Deborah	OH	71%	35	50%	16
Menendez, Robert	NJ	35%	37	17%	18	Putnam, Adam	FL	62%	21	0%	8
Mica, John	FL	53%	38	44%	18	Quinn, Jack	NY	33%	33	28%	18
Millender-McDonald, Juanita	CA	53%	34	7%	15	Radanovich, George	CA	67%	36	22%	18
Miller, Gary	CA	68%	31	38%	13	Rahall, Nick, III	WV	37%	38	17%	18
Miller, George	CA	32%	37	44%	18	Ramstad, Jim	MN	92%	38	67%	18
Miller, Jeff	FL	58%	19	100%	3	Rangel, Charles	NY	68%	34	22%	18
Mollohan, Alan	WV	31%	35	23%	13	Regula, Ralph	OH	53%	38	22%	18

continued

Appendix E—continued

Member	State	Trade Barriers	Barrier Votes Cast	Trade Subsidies	Subsidy Votes Cast	Member	State	Trade Barriers	Barrier Votes Cast	Trade Subsidies	Subsidy Votes Cast
Rehberg, Dennis	MT	77%	22	0%	8	Stearns, Clifford	FL	32%	34	72%	18
Reyes, Silvestre	TX	56%	36	0%	14	Stenholm, Charles	TX	82%	38	6%	17
Reynolds, Thomas	NY	74%	31	15%	13	Strickland, Ted	OH	28%	36	41%	17
Rodriguez, Ciro	TX	58%	36	0%	17	Stupak, Bart	MI	31%	36	50%	18
Rogers, Harold	KY	39%	38	17%	18	Sullivan, John	OK	64%	14	50%	2
Rogers, Michael	MI	59%	22	13%	8	Sweeney, John	NY	57%	28	8%	13
Rohrabacher, Dana	CA	29%	38	100%	18	Tancredo, Thomas	CO	39%	31	92%	13
Ros-Lehtinen, Ileana	FL	33%	36	20%	15	Tanner, John	TN	82%	38	6%	18
Ross, Michael	AR	45%	22	0%	8	Tauscher, Ellen	CA	78%	36	24%	17
Rothman, Steven	NJ	14%	35	29%	17	Tauzin, W. J.	LA	61%	38	11%	18
Roybal-Allard, Lucille	CA	54%	37	6%	17	Taylor, Charles	NC	19%	37	19%	16
Royce, Edward	CA	47%	38	100%	18	Taylor, Gene	MS	24%	38	39%	18
Rush, Bobby	IL	45%	38	22%	18	Terry, Lee	NE	83%	30	31%	13
Ryan, Paul	WI	84%	31	31%	13	Thomas, William	CA	74%	38	11%	18
Ryun, Jim	KS	69%	36	47%	17	Thompson, Bennie	MS	37%	35	6%	16
Sabo, Martin Olav	MN	39%	38	0%	18	Thompson, Mike	CA	74%	31	0%	13
Sanchez, Loretta	CA	42%	33	18%	17	Thornberry, William	TX	78%	36	17%	18
Sanders, Bernard	VT	24%	37	61%	18	Tiahrt, Todd	KS	67%	36	33%	18
Sandlin, Max, Jr.	TX	61%	36	0%	17	Tiberi, Patrick	OH	82%	22	50%	8
Saxton, Jim	NJ	50%	36	29%	17	Tierney, John	MA	36%	36	59%	17
Schakowsky, Janice	IL	43%	30	31%	13	Toomey, Patrick	PA	76%	29	77%	13
Schiff, Adam	CA	64%	22	25%	8	Towns, Edolphus	NY	50%	36	17%	18
Schrock, Edward	VA	68%	22	50%	8	Turner, Jim	TX	64%	36	12%	17
Scott, Robert	VA	50%	38	11%	18	Udall, Mark	CO	55%	29	31%	13
Sensenbrenner, F. James, Jr.	WI	45%	38	89%	18	Udall, Tom	NM	43%	30	15%	13
Serrano, Jose	NY	55%	33	13%	16	Upton, Fred	MI	84%	38	28%	18
Sessions, Pete	TX	74%	35	24%	17	Velazquez, Nydia	NY	34%	35	39%	18
Shadegg, John	AZ	69%	36	100%	18	Visclosky, Peter	IN	38%	37	38%	16
Shaw, E. Clay, Jr.	FL	68%	38	39%	18	Vitter, David	LA	70%	30	8%	12
Shays, Christopher	CT	84%	38	56%	18	Walden, Greg	OR	71%	31	8%	13
Sherman, Bradley	CA	42%	36	24%	17	Walsh, James	NY	58%	38	6%	18
Sherwood, Don	PA	68%	31	33%	12	Wamp, Zach	TN	36%	36	94%	18
Shimkus, John	IL	81%	36	18%	17	Waters, Maxine	CA	43%	37	19%	16
Shuster, Bill	PA	57%	37	41%	17	Watson, Diane	CA	55%	22	13%	8
Simmons, Robert	CT	59%	22	38%	8	Watt, Melvin	NC	53%	38	11%	18
Simpson, Michael	ID	71%	31	8%	13	Waxman, Henry	CA	50%	36	40%	15
Skelton, Ike	MO	61%	38	6%	18	Weiner, Anthony David	NY	74%	31	46%	13
Slaughter, Louise McIntosh	NY	44%	36	35%	17	Weldon, Curt	PA	59%	37	31%	16
Smith, Adam	WA	78%	32	25%	16	Weldon, Dave	FL	43%	35	22%	18
Smith, Christopher	NJ	26%	38	44%	18	Weller, Gerald	IL	68%	34	17%	18
Smith, Lamar	TX	68%	38	18%	17	Wexler, Robert	FL	34%	35	0%	15
Smith, Nick	MI	74%	38	67%	18	Whitfield, Edward	KY	71%	35	22%	18
Snyder, Vic	AR	80%	35	6%	17	Wicker, Roger	MS	64%	36	11%	18
Solis, Hilda	CA	41%	22	25%	8	Wilson, Heather	NM	81%	31	0%	13
Souder, Mark	IN	39%	36	44%	18	Wilson, Joe	SC	38%	16	33%	3
Spratt, John, Jr.	SC	32%	38	6%	18	Wolf, Frank	VA	42%	38	33%	18
Stark, Fortney	CA	30%	37	60%	15	Woolsey, Lynn	CA	30%	37	33%	18

Member	State	Trade Barriers	Barrier Votes Cast	Trade Subsidies	Subsidy Votes Cast	Member	State	Trade Barriers	Barrier Votes Cast	Trade Subsidies	Subsidy Votes Cast
Wu, David	OR	39%	31	15%	13	Young, C. W.	FL	58%	36	33%	18
Wynn, Albert	MD	49%	37	6%	18	Young, Don	AK	24%	34	15%	13

Appendix F: Individual Senate Voting Records Since 1993

Member	State	Trade Barriers	Barrier Votes Cast	Trade Subsidies	Subsidy Votes Cast	Member	State	Trade Barriers	Barrier Votes Cast	Trade Subsidies	Subsidy Votes Cast
Akaka, Daniel	HI	37%	35	0%	9	Hatch, Orrin	UT	76%	38	56%	9
Allard, Wayne	CO	89%	36	75%	8	Hollings, Ernest "Fritz"	SC	16%	38	22%	9
Allen, George	VA	78%	18	40%	5	Hutchison, Kay Bailey	TX	81%	37	44%	9
Baucus, Max	MT	78%	37	11%	9	Inhofe, James	OK	61%	36	56%	9
Bayh, Evan	IN	58%	33	20%	5	Inouye, Daniel	HI	52%	33	22%	9
Bennett, Robert	UT	84%	38	38%	8	Jeffords, James	VT	56%	36	11%	9
Biden, Joseph, Jr.	DE	61%	38	38%	8	Johnson, Tim	SD	43%	35	25%	8
Bingaman, Jeff	NM	68%	37	33%	9	Kennedy, Edward	MA	42%	33	33%	9
Bond, Christopher	MO	89%	36	33%	9	Kerry, John	MA	72%	29	22%	9
Boxer, Barbara	CA	37%	38	22%	9	Kohl, Herbert	WI	49%	37	44%	9
Breaux, John	LA	81%	37	11%	9	Kyl, Jon	AZ	78%	36	89%	9
Brownback, Sam	KS	94%	34	88%	8	Landrieu, Mary	LA	75%	36	0%	8
Bunning, Jim	KY	53%	32	60%	5	Leahy, Patrick	VT	32%	37	11%	9
Burns, Conrad	MT	63%	35	25%	8	Levin, Carl	MI	42%	38	11%	9
Byrd, Robert	WV	21%	38	22%	9	Lieberman, Joseph	CT	67%	30	22%	9
Campbell, Ben Nighthorse	CO	46%	37	44%	9	Lincoln, Blanche	AR	76%	33	20%	5
Cantwell, Maria	WA	61%	18	40%	5	Lott, Trent	MS	74%	38	33%	9
Carper, Thomas	DE	56%	18	40%	5	Lugar, Richard	IN	95%	37	78%	9
Chafee, Lincoln	RI	88%	26	100%	6	McCain, John	AZ	85%	33	75%	8
Clinton, Hillary Rodham	NY	35%	17	20%	5	McConnell, Mitch, Jr.	KY	79%	38	56%	9
Cochran, Thad	MS	84%	38	22%	9	Mikulski, Barbara	MD	39%	38	22%	9
Collins, Susan	ME	53%	36	50%	8	Miller, Zell	GA	87%	15	0%	5
Conrad, Kent	ND	47%	38	11%	9	Murkowski, Frank	AK	76%	38	44%	9
Corzine, Jon	NJ	28%	18	80%	5	Murray, Patty	WA	68%	38	33%	9
Craig, Larry	ID	71%	38	44%	9	Nelson, Ben	NE	72%	18	20%	5
Crapo, Michael	ID	76%	33	40%	5	Nelson, Bill	FL	50%	18	20%	5
Daschle, Thomas	SD	63%	38	11%	9	Nickles, Don	OK	89%	38	100%	9
Dayton, Mark	MN	22%	18	20%	5	Reed, Jack	RI	39%	36	38%	8
DeWine, Mike	OH	69%	36	78%	9	Reid, Harry	NV	24%	38	33%	9
Dodd, Christopher	CT	54%	37	22%	9	Roberts, Pat	KS	92%	36	63%	8
Domenici, Pete	NM	79%	34	29%	7	Rockefeller, John, IV	WV	49%	37	22%	9
Dorgan, Byron	ND	32%	37	22%	9	Santorum, Rick	PA	81%	36	56%	9
Durbin, Richard	IL	50%	36	13%	8	Sarbanes, Paul	MD	37%	38	22%	9
Edwards, John	NC	32%	28	0%	5	Schumer, Charles	NY	55%	33	40%	5
Ensign, John Eric	NV	72%	18	100%	5	Sessions, Jeff	AL	46%	35	25%	8
Enzi, Michael	WY	85%	34	38%	8	Shelby, Richard	AL	44%	36	11%	9
Feingold, Russell	WI	18%	38	67%	9	Smith, Gordon	OR	72%	36	38%	8
Feinstein, Dianne	CA	64%	36	33%	9	Snowe, Olympia	ME	39%	36	33%	9
Fitzgerald, Peter	IL	88%	33	60%	5	Specter, Arlen	PA	63%	38	44%	9
Frist, William	TN	89%	35	44%	9	Stabenow, Debbie	MI	39%	18	20%	5
Graham, Bob	FL	64%	36	33%	9	Stevens, Ted	AK	70%	37	44%	9
Grassley, Charles	IA	79%	38	44%	9	Thomas, Craig	WY	83%	36	56%	9
Gregg, Judd	NH	80%	35	78%	9	Voinovich, George	OH	84%	32	80%	5
Hagel, Chuck	NE	89%	36	50%	8	Warner, John	VA	84%	37	33%	9
Harkin, Tom	IA	45%	38	11%	9	Wyden, Ron	OR	58%	36	33%	9

Notes

1. See, for example, a 2001 study by economists at the University of Michigan and Tufts University that estimated that elimination of the remaining global barriers to trade in services and industrial and agricultural products would raise world welfare by \$1.9 trillion, including a boost to the U.S. economy of \$537 billion, or 5.9 percent of U.S. gross domestic product. Drusilla K. Brown, Alan V. Deardorff, and Robert M. Stern, "CGE Modeling and Analysis of Multilateral and Regional Negotiating Options," Discussion Paper Series 2001-08, Tufts University, January 23, 2001, p. 17, <http://ase.tufts.edu/econ/papers/200108.pdf>.
2. U.S. International Trade Commission, *The Economic Effects of Significant U.S. Import Restraints: Fourth Update 2004*, USITC Investigation no. 332-325, Publication 3701, June 2004, pp. xvi-xviii.
3. See Aaron Lukas and Ian Vásquez, "Rethinking the Export-Import Bank," Cato Institute Trade Briefing Paper no. 15, March 12, 2002.
4. James K. Jackson, "Export-Import Bank: Background and Legislative Issues," Congressional Research Service Report for Congress 98-568E, January 19, 2001, p. 5.
5. See Public Law 108-429. The Liberty Bell replica is addressed in Section 1502.
6. See Ronald Bailey, "The Looming Trade War over Plant Biotechnology," Cato Institute Trade Policy Analysis no. 18, August 1, 2002, especially the section on labeling, pp. 10-12.
7. See Daniel Griswold, "Going Alone on Sanctions Hurts U.S. More Than Foes," Cato Institute, November 27, 2000, www.freetrade.org/pubs/articles/dg-11-27-00.html.
8. See Daniel T. Griswold, "Free Trade Agreements: Steppingstones to a More Open World," Cato Trade Briefing Paper no. 18, July 10, 2003.
9. Ibid.
10. For various articles and studies on the U.S. embargo against Cuba, see the Cato Institute's Center for Trade Policy Studies, www.freetrade.org/issues/cuba.html.
11. See Daniel J. Ikenson, "Uncool Rules: Second Thoughts on Mandatory Country of Origin Labeling," Cato Free Trade Bulletin no. 7, January 16, 2004; and Bailey, especially the section on labeling, pp. 10-12.
12. See Brink Lindsey, "Job Losses and Trade: A Reality Check," Cato Institute Trade Briefing Paper no. 19, March 17, 2004; and Daniel Griswold, "Out-source, Outsource, and Outsource Some More," *National Review*, May 4, 2004, pp. 36-38.
13. See Griswold, "Free Trade Agreements: Steppingstones to a More Open World."
14. Ibid.
15. See Dan Ikenson, "Byrdening Relations: U.S. Trade Policies Continue to Flout the Rules," Cato Institute Free Trade Bulletin no. 5, January 13, 2004; and Brink Lindsey and Daniel J. Ikenson, *Antidumping Exposed: The Devilish Details of Unfair Trade Law* (Washington: Cato Institute, 2003).
16. Another 232 House members compiled records that were not consistent in opposing or supporting trade barriers or subsidies.
17. Another 36 senators compiled records that were not consistent in opposing or supporting trade barriers or subsidies.
18. The previous studies were Daniel T. Griswold, "Free Trade, Free Markets: Rating the 105th Congress," Cato Institute Trade Policy Analysis no. 6, February 3, 1999; Daniel T. Griswold, "Free Trade, Free Markets: Rating the 106th Congress," Cato Institute Trade Policy Analysis no. 13, March 26, 2001; and Daniel T. Griswold, "Free Trade, Free Markets: Rating the 107th Congress," Cato Institute Trade Policy Analysis no. 22, January 30, 2003.
19. United Stockgrowers of America, "Candidate Survey: Ken Salazar," October 29, 2004, www.r-calfusa.com/ken_salazar.htm.
20. Mel Martinez for Senate, "Promoting Free and Fair Trade," www.melforsenate.org.
21. Illinois Senate Race—2004, "Barack Obama: The Issues," www.ilsenate.com/issues.asp?ID=17.
22. On the Issues, "Barack Obama on Free Trade," ontheissues.org/International/Barack_Obama_Free_Trade.htm.

Trade Briefing Papers from the Cato Institute

- “Nonmarket Nonsense: U.S. Antidumping Policy toward China” by Daniel Ikenson (no. 22, March 7, 2005)
- “The Case for CAFTA: Consolidating Central America’s Freedom Revolution” by Daniel Griswold and Daniel Ikenson (no. 21, September 21, 2004)
- “Ready to Compete: Completing the Steel Industry’s Rehabilitation” by Dan Ikenson (no. 20, June 22, 2004)
- “Job Losses and Trade: A Reality Check” by Brink Lindsey (no. 19, March 17, 2004)
- “Free-Trade Agreements: Steppingstones to a More Open World” by Daniel T. Griswold (no. 18, July 10, 2003)
- “Ending the ‘Chicken War’: The Case for Abolishing the 25 Percent Truck Tariff” by Dan Ikenson (no. 17, June 18, 2003)
- “Grounds for Complaint? Understanding the ‘Coffee Crisis’” by Brink Lindsey (no. 16, May 6, 2003)
- “Rethinking the Export-Import Bank” by Aaron Lukas and Ian Vásquez (no. 15, March 12, 2002)
- “Steel Trap: How Subsidies and Protectionism Weaken the U.S. Steel Industry” by Dan Ikenson (no. 14, March 1, 2002)
- “America’s Bittersweet Sugar Policy” by Mark A. Groombridge (no. 13, December 4, 2001)
- “Missing the Target: The Failure of the Helms-Burton Act” by Mark A. Groombridge (no. 12, June 5, 2001)
- “The Case for Open Capital Markets” by Robert Krol (no. 11, March 15, 2001)
- “WTO Report Card III: Globalization and Developing Countries” by Aaron Lukas (no. 10, June 20, 2000)
- “WTO Report Card II: An Exercise or Surrender of U.S. Sovereignty?” by William H. Lash III and Daniel T. Griswold (no. 9, May 4, 2000)
- “WTO Report Card: America’s Economic Stake in Open Trade” by Daniel T. Griswold (no. 8, April 3, 2000)
- “The H-1B Straitjacket: Why Congress Should Repeal the Cap on Foreign-Born Highly Skilled Workers” by Suzette Brooks Masters and Ted Ruthizer (no. 7, March 3, 2000)
- “Trade, Jobs, and Manufacturing: Why (Almost All) U.S. Workers Should Welcome Imports” by Daniel T. Griswold (no. 6, September 30, 1999)
- “Trade and the Transformation of China: The Case for Normal Trade Relations” by Daniel T. Griswold, Ned Graham, Robert Kapp, and Nicholas Lardy (no. 5, July 19, 1999)
- “The Steel ‘Crisis’ and the Costs of Protectionism” by Brink Lindsey, Daniel T. Griswold, and Aaron Lukas (no. 4, April 16, 1999)
- “State and Local Sanctions Fail Constitutional Test” by David R. Schmahmann and James S. Finch (no. 3, August 6, 1998)
- “Free Trade and Human Rights: The Moral Case for Engagement” by Robert A. Sirico (no. 2, July 17, 1998)
- “The Blessings of Free Trade” by James K. Glassman (no. 1, May 1, 1998)

Trade Policy Analysis Papers from the Cato Institute

- “Protection without Protectionism: Reconciling Trade and Homeland Security” by Aaron Lukas (no. 27, April 8, 2004)
- “Trading Tyranny for Freedom: How Open Markets Till the Soil for Democracy” by Daniel T. Griswold (no. 26, January 6, 2004)
- “Threadbare Excuses: The Textile Industry’s Campaign to Preserve Import Restraints” by Dan Ikenson (no. 25, October 15, 2003)
- “The Trade Front: Combating Terrorism with Open Markets” by Brink Lindsey (no. 24, August 5, 2003)
- “Whither the WTO? A Progress Report on the Doha Round” by Razeen Sally (no. 23, March 3, 2003)
- “Free Trade, Free Markets: Rating the 107th Congress” by Daniel T. Griswold (no. 22, January 30, 2003)
- “Reforming the Antidumping Agreement: A Road Map for WTO Negotiations” by Brink Lindsey and Dan Ikenson (no. 21, December 11, 2002)
- “Antidumping 101: The Devilish Details of ‘Unfair Trade’ Law” by Brink Lindsey and Dan Ikenson (no. 20, November 21, 2002)
- “Willing Workers: Fixing the Problem of Illegal Mexican Migration to the United States” by Daniel T. Griswold (no. 19, October 15, 2002)
- “The Looming Trade War over Plant Biotechnology” by Ronald Bailey (no. 18, August 1, 2002)
- “Safety Valve or Flash Point? The Worsening Conflict between U.S. Trade Laws and WTO Rules” by Lewis E. Leibowitz (no. 17, November 6, 2001)
- “Safe Harbor or Stormy Waters? Living with the EU Data Protection Directive” by Aaron Lukas (no. 16, October 30, 2001)
- “Trade, Labor, and the Environment: How Blue and Green Sanctions Threaten Higher Standards” by Daniel T. Griswold (no. 15, August 2, 2001)
- “Coming Home to Roost: Proliferating Antidumping Laws and the Growing Threat to U.S. Exports” by Brink Lindsey and Dan Ikenson (no. 14, July 30, 2001)
- “Free Trade, Free Markets: Rating the 106th Congress” by Daniel T. Griswold (no. 13, March 26, 2001)
- “America’s Record Trade Deficit: A Symbol of Economic Strength” by Daniel T. Griswold (no. 12, February 9, 2001)
- “Nailing the Homeowner: The Economic Impact of Trade Protection of the Softwood Lumber Industry” by Brink Lindsey, Mark A. Groombridge, and Prakash Loungani (no. 11, July 6, 2000)
- “China’s Long March to a Market Economy: The Case for Permanent Normal Trade Relations with the People’s Republic of China” by Mark A. Groombridge (no. 10, April 24, 2000)
- “Tax Bytes: A Primer on the Taxation of Electronic Commerce” by Aaron Lukas (no. 9, December 17, 1999)
- “Seattle and Beyond: A WTO Agenda for the New Millennium” by Brink Lindsey, Daniel T. Griswold, Mark A. Groombridge, and Aaron Lukas (no. 8, November 4, 1999)
- “The U.S. Antidumping Law: Rhetoric versus Reality” by Brink Lindsey (no. 7, August 16, 1999)
- “Free Trade, Free Markets: Rating the 105th Congress” by Daniel T. Griswold (no. 6, February 3, 1999)

Board of Advisers

Jagdish Bhagwati
Columbia University

Donald J. Boudreaux
George Mason University

James K. Glassman
American Enterprise
Institute

Douglas A. Irwin
Dartmouth College

Lawrence Kudlow
Kudlow & Co.

José Piñera
International Center for
Pension Reform

Russell Roberts
George Mason University

Razeen Sally
London School of
Economics

George P. Shultz
Hoover Institution

Clayton Yeutter
Former U.S. Trade
Representative

CENTER FOR TRADE POLICY STUDIES

The mission of the Cato Institute's Center for Trade Policy Studies is to increase public understanding of the benefits of free trade and the costs of protectionism. The center publishes briefing papers, policy analyses, and books and hosts frequent policy forums and conferences on the full range of trade policy issues.

Scholars at the Cato trade policy center recognize that open markets mean wider choices and lower prices for businesses and consumers, as well as more vigorous competition that encourages greater productivity and innovation. Those benefits are available to any country that adopts free-trade policies; they are not contingent upon "fair trade" or a "level playing field" in other countries. Moreover, the case for free trade goes beyond economic efficiency. The freedom to trade is a basic human liberty, and its exercise across political borders unites people in peaceful cooperation and mutual prosperity.

The center is part of the Cato Institute, an independent policy research organization in Washington, D.C. The Cato Institute pursues a broad-based research program rooted in the traditional American principles of individual liberty and limited government.

For more information on the Center for Trade Policy Studies,
visit www.freetrade.org.

Other Trade Studies from the Cato Institute

"Nonmarket Nonsense: U.S. Antidumping Policy toward China" by Daniel Ikenson, Trade Briefing Paper no. 22 (March 7, 2005)

"The Case for CAFTA: Consolidating Central America's Freedom Revolution" by Daniel Griswold and Daniel Ikenson, Trade Briefing Paper no. 21 (September 21, 2004)

"Ready to Compete: Completing the Steel Industry's Rehabilitation" by Dan Ikenson, Trade Briefing Paper no. 20 (June 22, 2004)

"Protection without Protectionism: Reconciling Trade and Homeland Security" by Aaron Lukas, Trade Policy Analysis no. 27 (April 8, 2004)

"Job Losses and Trade: A Reality Check" by Brink Lindsey, Trade Briefing Paper no. 19 (March 17, 2004)

"Trading Tyranny for Freedom: How Open Markets Till the Soil for Democracy" by Daniel T. Griswold, Trade Policy Analysis no. 26 (January 6, 2004)

"Threadbare Excuses: The Textile Industry's Campaign to Preserve Import Restraints" by Dan Ikenson, Trade Policy Analysis no. 25 (October 15, 2003)

TRADE POLICY ANALYSIS TRADE POLICY ANALYSIS TRADE POLICY ANALYSIS

Nothing in Trade Policy Analysis should be construed as necessarily reflecting the views of the Center for Trade Policy Studies or the Cato Institute or as an attempt to aid or hinder the passage of any bill before Congress. Contact the Cato Institute for reprint permission. Additional copies of Trade Policy Analysis studies are \$6 each (\$3 for five or more). To order, contact the Cato Institute, 1000 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20001. (202) 842-0200, fax (202) 842-3490, www.cato.org.

CAIO
INSTITUTE