

111th Congress Unofficial Key Manufacturing Votes		
Description	Preferred Position	This official's vote compared with the preferred position
<p>Vote on H.R. 12, the Paycheck Fairness Act, which would: expose employers to unlimited damage awards and encourage more class action litigation against employers. Approved 256-163 on Jan. 9, 2009 (Roll No. 8). The NAM opposed the bill, noting that factors such as work experience and job location play a key role in compensation and its passage would likely prompt many employers to purchase additional legal liability insurance, thus increasing their costs and decreasing their ability to raise wages, increase benefits or hire new workers. NAM POSITION: No.</p>	N	Y
<p>Vote on H.R. 11, legislation that included language from two bills: the Ledbetter Fair Pay Act and the Paycheck Fairness Act. Approved 247-171 on Jan. 9, 2009 (Roll No. 9). The NAM opposed the legislation, which would significantly expand employers' exposure to pay discrimination claims under civil rights laws, class action litigation and unlimited damage awards. NAM POSITION: No.</p>	N	Y

<p>Vote on H.R. 11, legislation that included language from two bills: the Ledbetter Fair Pay Act and the Paycheck Fairness Act. Approved 247-171 on Jan. 9, 2009 (Roll No. 9). The NAM opposed the legislation, which would significantly expand employers' exposure to pay discrimination claims under civil rights laws, class action litigation and unlimited damage awards. NAM POSITION: No.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Y</p>
<p>Vote on Senate-passed S. 181, Ledbetter Fair Pay Act. Approved 250-177 on Jan. 27, 2009 (Roll No. 37). The NAM opposed the bill, which will significantly expand employers' exposure to pay discrimination claims under civil rights laws. Signed into law (P.L. 111-2) on Jan. 29, 2009. NAM POSITION: No.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Y</p>

110th Congress Unofficial Key Manufacturing Votes

<p>Eliminating Caps on Punitive Damages/Paycheck Fairness. Vote on H.R. 1338, the so-called "Paycheck Fairness Act," which would: expose employers to unlimited damage awards and encourage more class action litigation against employers. Approved 247-178 on July 31, 2008 (Roll No. 556). The NAM opposed the bill, noting that factors such as work location and experience play a key role in compensation, and the government's intervention would result in a confused set of constantly changing standards and prolonged litigation over employer compensation practices. NAM POSITION: No.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Y</p>
--	----------	----------

109th Congress Unofficial Key Manufacturing Votes

<p>Class Action Reform (S. 5) Vote on S. 5, the Class Action Fairness Act. Approved 279-149 on Feb. 17, 2005 (Roll No. 38). The NAM supported the bill, which would curb trial lawyer "forum shopping" by shifting most class actions to federal courts, without altering plaintiffs' right to sue. Signed into law (P.L. 109-2) on Feb. 18, 2005. NAM POSITION: Yes.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>N</p>
---	----------	----------

<p>Medical Liability Reform (H.R. 5) Vote on H.R. 5, legislation to help make health coverage more affordable for millions of Americans by reducing the additional cost that all forms of medical liability litigation adds to health coverage costs. Approved 230-194 on July 28, 2005 (Roll No. 449). The NAM has long championed medical liability reform because of the downstream consequences for higher health care costs from unlimited damage awards, liability insurance, and defensive medicine. NAM POSITION: Yes.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>Preventing Frivolous Litigation Against the Food Industry (H.R. 554) Vote on H.R. 554, legislation that would bar lawsuits based on claims of obesity except in limited circumstances (such as violation of law or regulation, breach of warranty or if the food was adulterated). Approved 306-120 on October 19, 2005 (Roll No. 533). The NAM supported the bill, noting that the current "regulation through litigation" threatens all businesses because it is designed to circumvent the democratic process and to pursue social goals with respect to a specific industry through judicial fiat. NAM POSITION: Yes.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>N</p>

<p>Discouraging Regulation Through Litigation (S. 397) Vote on S. 397, the Protection of Lawful Commerce in Arms Act. Approved 283-144 on October 20, 2005 (Roll No. 534). The NAM supported the bill, which would forestall lawsuits brought with the intent of shutting down a legitimate and legal industry, while allowing those with merit to proceed. Signed into law (P.L. 109-92) on Oct. 26, 2005. NAM POSITION: Yes.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>Discouraging Regulation Through Litigation (S. 397) Vote on S. 397, the Protection of Lawful Commerce in Arms Act. Approved 283-144 on October 20, 2005 (Roll No. 534). The NAM supported the bill, which would forestall lawsuits brought with the intent of shutting down a legitimate and legal industry, while allowing those with merit to proceed. Signed into law (P.L. 109-92) on Oct. 26, 2005. NAM POSITION: Yes.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act (Final Passage). Vote on H.R. 420, the Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act, which would restore disincentives for filing frivolous lawsuits under Rule 11 (the federal court rule governing frivolous lawsuits) by making sanctions mandatory, requiring prevailing parties to be awarded reasonable expenses and attorney's fees, etc. It would also expand Rule 11 to include discovery and take steps to limit forum shopping. Approved 228-184 on Oct. 27, 2005 (Roll No. 553). NAM POSITION: Yes.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>N</p>

108th Congress Unofficial Key Manufacturing Votes

<p>1) Medical Liability Reform. Vote on H.R. 5, legislation to help make health coverage more affordable for millions of Americans by addressing all forms of medical liability (malpractice, plan coverage decisions, medical devices, pharmaceuticals, etc.). Approved 229-196 on March 13, 2003 (Roll No. 64). The NAM has long championed medical liability reform because of the downstream consequences for higher health care costs from unlimited damage awards, liability insurance, and defensive medicine. NAM POSITION: Yes.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>6) Class Action Reform. Vote on H.R. 1115, legislation aimed at curbing the explosion of frivolous class-action lawsuits. Approved 253-170 on June 12, 2003 (Roll No. 272). The NAM supported the bill, which would curb trial lawyer "forum shopping" by shifting most major class actions to federal courts, without altering plaintiffs' right to sue. NAM POSITION: Yes.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>N</p>

<p>Curbing Lawsuit Abuse (H.R. 4571) Vote on H.R. 4571, the Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act of 2004, which would restore disincentives for filing frivolous lawsuits under Rule 11 (the federal court rule governing frivolous lawsuits) by making sanctions mandatory, requiring prevailing parties to be awarded reasonable expenses and attorney's fees, etc. It would also expand Rule 11 to include discovery and has a provision to limit forum shopping. Approved 229-174 on Sept. 14, 2004 (Roll No. 450). NAM POSITION: Yes.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>N</p>
--	-----------------	-----------------

NAM's Official 107th Congress Voting Record (House of Representatives)

<p>Medical Liability Reform (H.R. 4600). Vote on H.R. 4600, legislation advocating reforms (caps on damage awards and attorneys' fees, proportional liability, uniform statute of limitations, etc.) to stabilize the out-of-control medical liability system while ensuring that injured patients are fairly compensated. Approved 217-203 on Sept. 26, 2002 (Roll No. 421). NAM Position: Yes.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>N</p>
---	-----------------	-----------------

NAM's Official 106th Congress Voting Record (House of Representatives)

<p>Vote on H.R. 775, Davis (R-VA)/Moran (D-VA) legislation establishing reasonable federal liability standards for Y2K litigation. Approved 236-190 on May 12, 1999 (Roll No. 128). Signed into law (P.L. 106-37) on July 20, 1999. NAM Position: Yes.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>N</p>
--	-----------------	-----------------

<p>Vote on H.R. 1875, a Goodlatte (R-VA) bill to limit "forum shopping" and shift most major class actions to federal court if they involve foreign or interstate commerce; \$1 million or more; and 100 or more plaintiffs. Approved 222-207 on September 29, 1999 (Roll No. 443). NAM Position: Yes.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>Vote on H.R. 2723, the Dingell (D-MI)/Norwood (R-GA) health care liability/medical necessity bill, which would have left employers open to medical malpractice/personal-injury lawsuits, increased the government's role in the health care delivery system, increased health care costs and forced down coverage. Approved 275-151 on October 7, 1999 (Roll No. 490). NAM Position: No.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>Vote on H.R. 2005, a Chabot (R-OH) bill to set a national, uniform 18-year statute of repose for workplace durable goods covered under worker compensation law. Approved 222-194 on February 2, 2000 (Roll No. 7). NAM Position: Yes.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>Vote on H.R. 2366, a Rogan (R-CA) bill to establish national standards for punitive damages in product liability suits affecting small businesses by: capping punitive damages for small firms (fewer than 25 workers); raising the standard of proof for awarding punitive damages to "clear and convincing" evidence; discouraging trial lawyer "forum shopping"; and more. Approved 221-193 on February 16, 2000 (Roll No. 25). NAM Position: Yes.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>N</p>

NAM's Official 105th Congress Voting Record

<p>Uniform Securities Litigation Standard (H.R. 1689). Vote on a White (R-WA)/ Eshoo (D-CA) proposal to create a uniform national standard for securities class action suits. Closes a loophole in a 1995 federal law that allows trial lawyers to file frivolous securities suits against public companies in state courts. Approved 340–83 on July 22, 1998. The NAM supported the bill, which allows company resources to flow to growth-oriented endeavors (research, job creation, higher wages and shareholder returns), rather than litigation. NAM POSITION: Yes.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>Employer Health Liability (Dingell Amendment to H.R. 4250). Vote on a Dingell (D-MI) amendment to GOP health bill H.R. 4250. Rejected 217–212 on July 24, 1998. The NAM opposed the amendment, dubiously named the “patients’ bill of rights,” which would have exposed employer health plans — and employers — to medical malpractice liability, thereby increasing health care costs, decreasing insurance coverage and shifting much-needed resources from health care to the trial bar. NAM POSITION: No.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Y</p>