

<i>In This Issue:</i>	Convention Photos . . .4
Interns1	More Photos5
Kirk & Equal Pay1	Pro-Israel Politics . . .6
Kirk Push Polls2	Kirk & Issa6
Issues Favor Seals . . .3	Big Oil7
25 Reasons/Seals . . .3	RRepublican #s7

For information or to volunteer call:
847.266.VOTE (8683)

Or write to:
Hon. Lauren Beth Gash, Chair, Tenth Dems
P.O. Box 523, Deerfield, IL 60015

Visit the website: www.tenthdems.org

Newsletter: newsletter@tenthdems.org

Editor: Barbara Altman

Editorial Staff: Joan Attenberg, Lou Barnett, Colleen Berk, Hon. Lauren Beth Gash, Ellen Beth Gill, Daniel Goldberg, Carol Hillsberg, John Hmurovic, Adrienne Kirshbaum, Leslie Lipschultz, Ross Nickow, Nancy Pred, George Rosenblit, Sharon Sanders, Steve Sheffey, Laurie Kaplan Singh

Design: Terry Jones

Distribution: Glenn Stier, Dave Du Bordieu, Cosette Winter

The opinions expressed are those of the writers, and not necessarily endorsed by Tenth Dems

Tenth Dems Interns Enjoy a Busy Summer

by Daniel Goldberg

2008 really has been an election year for young voters. Perhaps this can be attributed to a certain charismatic and progressive presidential candidate, or maybe it is the result of a myriad of concerns — from global warming to a spiraling national debt — that are sure to impact the future of young voters. Whatever the reason, we have seen the effect here at Tenth Dems.

The eleven interns who worked for the Tenth Dems this summer were selected from more than 60 applicants — an enormous and unprecedented number for our organization. We range in age from graduate students to high schoolers. We have been working in the office, with local candidates, at fundraising events, and anywhere else that offers free food.



Mohammed Mortoja, Gregg Garmisa, Jennifer Bishop-Jenkins, Emily Garmisa, David Bonner, Sen. Dick Durbin, Steve Ondra, and Marcia Fields pose with Tenth Dems interns Barrett Monie, Lexi Zarecky, Jordan Silver, Vlad Voskoboynikov, and Skippy Mesirov at the Illinois State Democratic Convention on August 13, 2008, in Springfield.

continued on page 8



Tenth News

www.tenthdems.org

SEPTEMBER 2008 Illinois Tenth Congressional District Democrats Newsletter Volume 5, Edition 9

Kirk Unmasked: Mark Kirk Votes Against Equal Pay for Women

This is the sixteenth in an ongoing series.

On July 31, the House of Representatives voted on the Paycheck Fairness Act (PCFA), a bill designed to ensure equal pay for women. The bill passed the House in a nearly straight party-line vote. All House Democrats and 14 Republicans voted for it.

“Most of the Republicans who supported the bill are cowards running from their voting records,” journalist Howie Klein said in the *Huffington Post*. “Petrified Bush rubber stamp reactionaries...crossed the aisle today...to lie to women and tell them they support [pay] equality. [But] most Republicans up for re-election in November didn’t have the sense to dodge this one.”

Mark Kirk was among this latter group. Exposing his true priorities — i.e., the corporate interests represented by the Bush White House — Kirk voted in lockstep with the vast majority of House Republicans against this important bill.

“Over the course of her lifetime, a female high school graduate will make \$700,000 less than the young man she graduates with,” Connecticut Congresswoman Rose DeLauro, the bill’s sponsor, said before the House of Representatives. “A female college student stands to lose up to \$2 million in the course of her career.”

The PCFA toughens the remedy provisions of the 1963 Equal Pay Act by allowing aggrieved women who sue to recover compensatory and

punitive damages. It also prohibits employer retaliation against employees who investigate wage practices, strengthens penalties for Equal Pay Act violations, and creates a grant program to help women strengthen their negotiation skills.



In a recent letter defending his NO vote that he emailed to constituents, Kirk criticized the PCFA, saying it undermines a woman’s control of legal actions against her employer by automatically making her part of a class action law suit and requiring her to proactively opt-out to maintain the right to sue independently.

But Kirk’s letter failed to disclose the significance of the PCFA: The Act makes possible for the first time class action lawsuits for gender pay differences. It puts gender-based wage discrimination on an equal footing with wage discrimination based on race or ethnicity — for which full compensatory and punitive damages currently are available. It also makes it illegal for employers to retaliate against women who share salary information with co-workers, thus ending pay secrecy — “an enabler of wage discrimination,” as 10th District blogger Ellen Beth Gill noted on August 14 (<http://ellenofthetenth.blogspot.com/2008/08/important-debunk-of-mark-kirk-lies.html>). (Excerpts from this blog are published as a companion to this article.)

His vote against the PCFA is the second time in a year that Mark Kirk opposed women’s right to equal pay. Exactly one year ago, he voted against the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act of 2007, a bill that clarifies the

continued on page 2

Mark Kirk Uses Misinformation and a Push Poll to Defend His Vote Against Equal Pay for Women

—Excerpted and adapted from Ellen's Illinois Tenth Congressional District Blog dated August 14, 2008, "Baby May Have Back, but Mark Kirk's Sorry Email Push Poll is Thin on Facts," by Ellen Beth Gill

Background: Mark Kirk sent out an email to 10th District voters misrepresenting the Paycheck Fairness Act in order to defend his vote against it. He made it sound like the bill prevents women from making a case against a discriminating employer when it actually opens up their ability to file and maintain a lawsuit and increases the potential for an award. In that email, he asked a single question that entirely misrepresents the effect of the bill. He is likely to use the results of that push poll in a future campaign advertisement to show the district's agreement with his vote.

This is what Kirk said in the email:

While Americans already have the right to bring an equal pay discrimination lawsuit, Congress considered making radical changes (H.R. 1338) that would transfer control of your case to others. In short, the proposed bill would:

- § Automatically make you a member of a class-action lawsuit whether you were discriminated against or not and even if you were unaware of the lawsuit. The new law would force a woman to proactively opt-out of the class action lawsuit or forfeit her right to sue independently. If you did not opt-out in time, you could lose your right to bring your own lawsuit in the future.
- § Remove the current \$300,000 cap on punitive damages for intentional discrimination suits, opening up a new round of unlimited non-economic damage lawsuits; and allow huge punitive damages to be charged against an employer even if the court found only unintentional discrimination. Employers will be forced to increase the prices of their goods by reducing wages or eliminating jobs.
- § Allow Congress to take away your right to govern your own lawsuit - class-action lawsuits would be controlled by trial lawyers that routinely take over 30% of all court awards for themselves. We have seen other class action suits yield questionable results, including an infamous case that awarded

poor plaintiffs 33 cents but required them to file for their award using a stamp costing 34 cents. Of course, trial lawyers made millions just the same.

Here's the push poll question:


Should Congress force a woman to proactively opt-out of class action lawsuits or lose her right to sue for wage discrimination?

Kirk's question oversimplifies and generally misleads constituents about the Paycheck Fairness Act (PCFA) and class action lawsuits.

Here are the facts: Corporate wage secrecy is one of the prime enablers of wage discrimination. Not so long ago, the Supreme Court concluded that a woman named Lilly Ledbetter lost her ability to sue for wage discrimination because she was unable to discover that she was paid significantly less than her male co-workers until the 180-day statutory time limit for filing a lawsuit had expired (see *Ledbetter v. Goodyear Tire & Rubber*

Company, Docket No. 05-1074). The PCFA is designed to avoid that unjust outcome by making it illegal for employers to retaliate against workers inquiring about their employers' wage practices or disclosing their own wages to co-workers. An employer defending a lawsuit must show that wage gaps truly are attributable to factors other than sex discrimination. In addition, the U.S. Department of Labor is required to resume its prior practice of collecting and publishing wage-related data.

Kirk would have constituents believe that the PCFA is a wage discrimination rather than wage equity bill, claiming that it requires women to give up control of their legal actions against employers. This is nonsense. The class opt-out provisions of the PCFA that Kirk decries actually help women. Federal court rules were changed more than 40 years ago to adopt the opt-out method for all federal class actions, and most states have adopted the federal rule. The idea of a class action suit is to remove the requirement of joining every single possible plaintiff individually. A New York court recently noted that opt-out was especially appropriate in an employee class action because "workers might be reluctant to affirmatively opt-in to the case for fear of reprisal and retaliation." (see *Guzman v. VLM, Inc. d/b/a Reliable Bakery*, Case No. 07-CV-1126).



Kirk Unmasked *continued from page 1*

Civil Rights Act of 1964 to declare that a new unlawful employment practice occurs each time discriminatory compensation is paid.

Kirk's votes against women's legal rights to fight against unfair pay practices come as little surprise to constituents familiar with his long history of supporting so-called tort reform — a 16-year-old, Orwellian-named effort to shield corporations from liability by restricting individuals' Constitutional access to the courts. Kirk's real motive for voting against the FCPA is his commitment to shielding large corporations from lawsuits.

Kirk's failure to support the passage of the FCPA and the Lilly Ledbetter Act also shed light on his long pattern of undermining women's rights — except on high-profile issues with the potential to jeopardize his approval rating from major women's advocacy groups.

A 2004 analysis of Kirk's voting record on women's issues found that he votes pro-choice only on high profile pieces of legislation, and only just enough to maintain his Planned Parenthood approval rating. But behind the scenes, Kirk has undermined a woman's right to quality reproductive healthcare and her right to a safe, and legal, abortion. (See pamphlet, "I thought Mark Kirk was Pro-Choice," Tenth Congressional District Democrats)

With his votes against the FCPA and the Lilly Ledbetter Act, Mark Kirk has once again allowed his constituents a glimpse of his true top priority — and that of his Party — to enrich corporate America at the expense of justice. This is precisely why 10th District residents must elect Dan Seals to Congress in November. Unlike Kirk, Seals can be trusted to vote to support the rights of all Americans, women and other minorities among them.

Issues Favor Seals

by Nancy Pred

Why is it that so many Mark Kirk supporters ignore the big issues our country is facing and choose to focus their energy on maligning Dan Seals with insignificant and often misleading taunts? I can only assume that they do it because they have nothing substantive to say.

Recently we have seen Kirk supporters' letters to the editor whining about a successful event Seals held highlighting the increase in gas prices since Messrs. Bush and Kirk took office in 2001. While the Kirk staffers and supporters complained, the voters who lined up for discounted gas told reporters they were impressed with Seals and his attention to issues that matter to 10th District residents. More recently, we saw a letter from a Kirk supporter agonizing over Seals living two blocks beyond the 10th District borders. The Kirk folks never mention that their guy had lived in Washington for years when he first ran for office here, and he used his father's Kenilworth address when he registered. Since then he has bought a house in Highland Park, but he is rarely seen in the neighborhood, or even the 10th District, and his wife publicly stated a few years ago that she was moving back to D.C. Kirk has not actually lived in the 10th District on a regular basis in decades, so it's strange for his supporters to make this an issue.

I encourage voters who are open-minded to look into the real issues of this campaign and to compare Mr. Kirk's voting record with his

rhetoric. He says he supports the troops, yet he has voted against benefits and even armor for them. He claims to be pro-choice, and he votes pro-choice, but he makes significant contributions to extreme anti-choice congressional representatives in Texas and other states. He pretends to care about those suffering in this

economy, yet on June 12 he voted against the Emergency Extended Unemployment Compensation Act, which would extend unemployment insurance for needy families whose unemployment insurance has run out. Likewise, in May Kirk voted to block a refundable tax credit that was to help first-time home buyers with an interest-free loan of \$7,500 to be paid back over 15 years. The same bill would help returning soldiers avoid foreclosure by providing extra time before a lender can bring foreclosure proceedings after a soldier returns from service.

Ours is an educated, involved, and caring district. Voters concerned about issues need to look beyond the noise, and when they do they will vote for Seals.



Dan Seals discusses the issues with local seniors.

Twenty-Five Reasons to Vote for Dan Seals

by Sharon Sanders

I, personally, am tired of our congressman who votes for and protects corporate interests over the individual, private industry over worker rights, and the executive branch over Congress; who favors a war without end, underfunding No Child Left Behind, minimal restrictions on the mortgage and financial industries, and privatizing social security; and who is protective of the interests of the oil industry and unwilling to negotiate with the pharmaceutical industry for lower drug costs. It seems to me that we have only one choice, and that's to get Dan Seals elected in November.

To me, Dan stands for so many things –

1. You and me, not just private corporations.
2. A phased withdrawal of American troops from Iraq with a reasonable timeline.
3. Providing our soldiers with state-of-the art, safe equipment, and fully funding all services for returning veterans.
4. Requiring federal agencies to work for and protect the consumer, not corporate interests, so that our mortgages are fair and easily understood, our food, air, and water are safe and clean, our airwaves are open, and our civil rights are protected under the Constitution.
5. Adherence to the rule of law, the Constitution, the Geneva Conventions, and the rights of the individual in a democratic society.
6. Access to affordable housing and transparent mortgages and credit lines so that individuals are not saddled with unreasonable and unforeseen debt.
7. A level playing field for Internet access and global trade policies.
8. Reversing the trend toward ownership and control of the airwaves by only a few corporations.
9. Fully funding No Child Left Behind and improving public education for all our children from Head Start through college.
10. Fair and equitable tax credits, and reasonable loans, for students

entering college.

11. Fair and flexible standards for measuring student progress nationwide.
12. The separation of church and state, while respecting the rights of individuals to practice any religion, or no religion.
13. A critical safety net through programs such as Social Security and Medicare, ones that are not subject to the whims of Wall Street.
14. An affordable healthcare alternative for those who are uninsured or underinsured.
15. A viable universal healthcare system.
16. Developing alternative and renewable technology and fuels that are funded with tax dollars now used to subsidize big oil.
17. Significantly reducing our dependence on foreign oil.
18. Continuing and increasing foreign aid to Israel.
19. Protecting a woman's right to choose while keeping abortions safe, legal, and rare.
20. Changing the tax system to make it simpler, flatter, and fairer.
21. Requiring warrants and greater judicial oversight for surveillance conducted by the president and national security agencies.
22. Protecting the interests of business, while insuring our citizens' right to join unions without employer harassment.
23. Fair pay and protection of workers' pensions.
24. An immigration policy that is tough but fair and not rooted in xenophobia.
25. Understanding the diversity of the 10th District and the need to work for the greater good of all its constituents.

Not every goal can be achieved; nevertheless, these are what I believe Dan Seals and most of us in the 10th Congressional District want for our society. We dream of a return to the days when our country stood for the rules of law, our Constitution, and respect for diversity, equality, and a time when other nations looked to us in awe and with respect for all we stood for as a great democracy.

Join Us to Watch
History Being Made!

**10th District Democratic
National Convention Watch Party**

Please join the Tenth Congressional District Democrats and special guest Dan Seals, our Democratic Nominee for Congress as history is made on Thursday, August 28th, when Barack Obama accepts the Democratic nomination for President of the United States of America.

Watch Barack Obama speak from Invesco Field at Mile High in Denver in the comfort of your own home. We guarantee a lively evening of celebration and what is certain to be a speech for the ages.

SOLD OUT!



Watch Obama's historic speech

Thursday, August 28, 2008

Time: 7:00 pm-???

**Location:
Renaissance Chicago
North Shore Hotel
933 Skokie Boulevard
Northbrook, IL 60062**



Meet special guest Dan Seals

Admission: FREE (food and drink available for purchase.)

Space is limited. To ensure your spot, register at <http://my.barackobama.com/page/event/detail/gpg9s5>, email events@tenthdems.org or call 847-266-VOTE (8683)

Let us know if you can help organize or staff this event.



Tenth Dems activists and interns share a moment with State Treasurer Alexi Gianoulis at the Illinois State Democratic Convention.




Tenth Dems conventioneers heard from Illinois Senator Dick Durbin, New Mexico Governor Bill Richardson, Illinois Attorney General Lisa Madigan, and other luminaries.

Pro-Israel Politics and the 10th District

by Lou Barnett

Tenth Dems University's Thursday, July 31 session at the Alcott Center in Buffalo Grove featured Steve Sheffey, pro-Israel and Democratic activist, who shared with the audience his perspective on the role a candidate's pro-Israel stance plays in the 10th Congressional District. With his extensive background in both politics and the Jewish community, including two years as president of CityPAC, Sheffey possesses a deep understanding of not only the issue but also how it relates to local politics within the 10th District.

After covering 3,000 years of Middle East history in seven minutes, during which he reminded the audience that Israel has offered, on several occasions, to give back land for peace, only to be rebuffed by the Arab states, he explained his views on how important support for Israel is in any 10th District election. It is, he believes, a very emotional issue, with 20 percent of the district being Jewish and



Steve Sheffey holds forth on Israel at a recent Tenth Dems University class.

many residents having family and friends who live in Israel. Israel is also considered a loyal and valuable ally of the United States and the only democracy in the Middle East. He then reviewed what he considers to be a pro-Israel stance for a political candidate. Essentially, it means: supporting foreign aid to Israel; opposing arms sales to Israel's enemies; being concerned enough about the Iranian threat to demand sanctions against Iran; supporting Israel's efforts towards peace rather than pressuring Israeli leaders to compromise; understanding Israel and letting Israelis decide on how to proceed; comprehending Israel's legitimate right to self-defense; and rejecting even-handedness and moral equivalence and instead supporting Israel in its quest for peace.

How does this impact the 10th District's election this coming fall? Sheffey believes that both Dan Seals and Mark Kirk are pro-Israel and understand the issues involved. Kirk has been articulate on the subject, and is good at manipulating the legitimate emotions of pro-Israel voters. But, as Sheffey pointed out, nearly everyone in Congress is for Israel.

What about Dan Seals? Seals has issued a position statement on Israel that is "outstanding," according to Sheffey, and as a Democrat he represents a party equally committed to Israel's survival and success. In short, Seals replacing Kirk in Congress would have no impact on congressional support for Israel.

Given that both candidates are the same on the emotional issue of Israel, Sheffey feels it is imperative that voters in the 10th District focus on the issues Seals and Kirk differ on, like the war in Iraq,

continued on page 8

Mark Kirk and Darrell Issa, Republican Compatriots

by Steve Sheffey

The week after Mark Kirk was re-elected in 2006, Kirk voted for Rep. Darrell Issa (R-CA) for Republican Policy Committee Chairman. Issa had previously referred to Israel as an "apartheid state" and called for the U.N. to redraw Israel's borders. But Kirk voted for him anyway. Fortunately, Kirk's fellow Republicans rejected Issa by a margin of two to one.

In my opinion, someone who accuses Israel of apartheid should not be serving in Congress, let alone in Republican leadership. This is yet another example of Kirk supporting leaders whose agenda is not that of the vast majority of voters in the 10th District. To help us understand Kirk's vote, I've answered some commonly asked questions below.

Was this a party-line vote?

No, this was not a party-line vote. This was a vote within the Republican Party for a Republican leadership position. It was one Republican against another Republican, and only Republicans voted. Rep. Thaddeus McCotter (R-MI) defeated Issa.

What is the Republican Policy Committee Chairman?

The Republican Policy Committee Chairman is a Republican leadership position. It's important both in its own right and as a stepping-stone to greater power and influence. Dick Cheney once held this position. The Policy Committee conducts a regular liaison with think-tanks, scholars, and private-sector experts on the issues before the Congress. Meetings of the Policy Advisory Boards and the House leadership provide an important forum for the development of Republican policy and legislative initiatives. Past Policy Committee Chairmen include a future House Republican leader, a future World Bank President, the current Vice President of the United States, and a future International Relations Committee Chairman.

Did Kirk know about Issa's views on Israel?

Issa's views are widely known among pro-Israel activists. A better question is how Kirk or his staff could not have known about Issa. I would expect my congressman to look into someone's views on an issue as important as Israel before supporting him for his party's Policy Committee Chairman. If he didn't know already, all it would have taken was ten seconds on Google. If you go to Google and enter the search term "Jihad Darrell," you'll find many articles about the man Kirk supported for Republican Policy Committee Chairman. (Note: I do not endorse the use of this nickname, but this search term brings up the most relevant articles.)

Why did Kirk vote for Issa?

I can't explain Kirk's vote.

But Mark Kirk has a penchant for supporting leaders with extreme agendas. The most important vote a member of Congress casts is for Speaker of the House. The Speaker sets the agenda for the House of Representatives. Unlike the Issa vote, the vote for Speaker is a party-line vote, which is why party labels are important.

Barring a major shake-up, if Kirk wins reelection, he'll vote for the current House Minority Leader, John Boehner, to become Speaker. Boehner received a zero rating from NARAL Pro-Choice America. Boehner received a zero rating from Planned Parenthood. Boehner received a zero rating from the American Civil Liberties Union. Boehner received a zero rating from the League of Conservation Voters. The National Education Association gave Boehner an F. The National Right to Life Committee gave Boehner a rating of 100. The Gun Owners of America gave Boehner a rating of 100. The National

continued on page 8

Why We Should Not Trust Big Oil

by George Rosenblit

Why are we at war in Iraq when the enemy, al Qaeda, is in Afghanistan? This question had been a puzzlement until it dawned on me that there is a relationship among the history of Iraq, the actions of major oil companies to suppress Iraqi oil production since World War I, and the high price of oil today.

The price of crude oil recently peaked at over \$147 per barrel, and the price of gasoline peaked over \$4 per gallon. The explanation given was that dwindling reserves in the U.S., turmoil in Nigeria, reduced output in Mexico, and increasing demand in China are contributing to a world shortage. Are these excuses masking an effort by OPEC and the Big Oil refiners/marketers to keep the price of petroleum products as high as possible to sustain their very high profits at the expense of consumers?

Let's turn back a few pages in history to examine the role of Iraq then and now to try to explain this scenario.

World War I resulted in the collapse of the Ottoman Empire and its partitioning by the League of Nations. The United Kingdom was given a mandate over Iraq. Winston Churchill, in his role as Colonial Secretary, installed Feisal of the Hashemite Arab tribe of Mecca as King of Iraq. Then, along came a wealthy Armenian oil expert named Calouste Gulbenkian, who in 1925 made a deal with King Feisal to obtain exclusive rights to all oil production in Iraq for his newly formed oil company, Iraq Petroleum Company. Gulbenkian contacted four major oil companies, Anglo-Persian (now British Petroleum), Royal Dutch Shell, CFP of France, and Standard Oil (now Exxon Mobil), to make a shrewd deal to let them keep 95 percent of all proceeds from oil they could find. He expected that he would keep the other 5 percent and make a fortune just sitting on his hands.

But the oil companies had no interest in finding oil that would increase the world supply and reduce oil prices, so they sat on their hands, too. They engaged in modest drilling operations that were not too deep, mainly in areas where they knew they would not find much oil. Gulbenkian did not gain much on this deal, and the market price of oil continued to be whatever the market would bear. See "Keeping Iraq's Oil in the Ground," Greg Palast, Alnet, June 14, 2008, www.truthout.org/article/greg-palast-keeping-iraqs-oil-ground.

Fast forward to the present. Iraq has proven oil reserves of 112 to 115 billion barrels, which rank second behind Saudi Arabia's 260 billion barrels. Unexplored regions in Iraq are estimated to yield another 100 billion barrels, bringing the total to 212 billion barrels. See "Iraq: Oil and the Economy," www.usgovinfo.about.com/library/weekly/aaIraqioil.htm and "Iraq Oil: Reserves, Production, and Potential Revenues", *CRS Report for Congress*, April 13, 2005.

Is this why Bush wanted to invade Iraq and remain as an occupying power? As I reported in the Tenth Dems newsletter of August 2007, "the truth appears to be in an obscure clause in the current Iraq War Supplemental Spending Bill which demands that the Iraqi Parliament pass the 'Iraq Oil Law.' ... Although the primary purpose of this proposed law is to divide oil revenues among Sunni, Shia, and Kurds, it also stipulates that 70 percent of Iraq's known oil reserves and all future oil discoveries would be privatized primarily for the benefit of U.S. oil companies!"

Maliki and the Iraqi parliament still oppose this law, as they should. They do not want to give away their natural resources to outsiders.

In view of the history of these same Big Oil companies outlined above, their role in Iraq as proposed by the Bush administration could result in drastically reduced Iraqi oil output designed to keep



the world price as high as possible. An incentive for this strategy may be discerned from a report that the supply of oil is predicted to peak, level off, and then decline in the foreseeable future. See "Tapped Out." (*National Geographic*, August 2008).

That thought should set off an alarm: Big Oil may very well become involved in the development of alternative sources of energy in order to control that market and protect lucrative oil revenues as long as possible. We should be alert and speak out to be sure that the government does not give taxpayer money for alternative energy research and development to Big Oil. There are many other companies, and university laboratories, with innovative ideas for alternative energy sources that desperately need funding. To help this happen, we must work harder to ensure the election of Barack Obama as president, Dick Durbin as our senator, and Dan Seals as our congressman.

Republicans by the Numbers

by Steve Sheffey

- 8** Years Kirk has been in Congress.
- 88** Bills Kirk has sponsored since January 3, 2001.¹
- 0** Bills Kirk has sponsored that became law.²
- 257** Kirk's power ranking in Congress.³
- 164** Republicans who voted against aid to Israel in 2007.⁴
- 10** Democrats who voted against aid to Israel in 2007.
- 0** Black caucus members who voted against aid to Israel in 2007.
- 15** Years Terry Schiavo was in a vegetative state when Kirk voted for federal intervention.
- 29** Height in feet of cross Kirk voted to maintain on federal land.
- 23** Kirk's rank among the 29 Republicans on the Appropriations Committee.
- 95** Democrats who signed Rep. Weiner's letter opposing Saudi arms sale.
- 17** Republicans who signed Rep. Weiner's letter opposing Saudi arms sale.
- 20** Black caucus members who signed Rep. Weiner's letter opposing Saudi arms sale.
- 87** Percentage of Jews who vote Democratic.
- 2** Months until Kirk's involuntary retirement.

¹ <http://www.govtrack.us/congress/person.xpd?id=400222>

² <http://www.govtrack.us/congress/person.xpd?id=400222>

³ http://www.congress.org/congressorg/power_rankings/overall.tt

⁴ <http://www.njdc.org/njdcspeaks/detail.php?id=713>

Visit our website
for new features

TenthDems.org

The *Tenth News* is distributed free monthly via email to our list of subscribers. Receiving the newsletter by e-mail is the most efficient and fastest way to keep up to date with events and news in the Tenth Congressional District. **If you take delivery via bulk rate mail, you may receive the *Tenth News* as much as two weeks after publication.** Sign up for email delivery at www.tenthdems.org.



Tenth Dems
P.O. Box 523
Deerfield, IL 60015

Paid for by the Illinois Tenth Congressional District Democrats, P.O. Box 523, Deerfield, Illinois 60015, and not authorized by any candidate or candidate's committee.

PRSRT STD
US POSTAGE
PAID
HIGHLAND PARK, IL
PERMIT NO.199

Pro-Israel Politics *continued from page 6*

healthcare, taxes, and women's issues, to name a few, and not treat Israel as the centerpiece of the election debate. Voters also should look at the philosophy and actions of the two political parties the candidates represent where, Sheffey points out, they will find major differences.

As for Barack Obama, Sheffey views him as being excellent on Israel, in both word and deed. His votes in the Senate have always demonstrated strong support of Israel, and he has great advisers on Israel on his campaign staff.

The session concluded with some questions from the audience. When asked about McCain's record on Israel, Sheffey responded that it was pretty good, but not perfect. Another questioner asked why Israel allowed Hamas to participate in the Gaza elections. Sheffey replied that there were two factors that pushed Israel to allow Hamas to participate: pressure from George Bush and Israel's commitment to free elections.

Our thanks to Steve Sheffey for providing an articulate and passionate presentation that demonstrated his commitment to both Israel and the Democratic Party. It was clear from the audience's attention and questions that he was absolutely correct in his assertion that Israel is an emotional and meaningful issue with voters in the 10th District.

Interns *continued from page 1*

It has been an unforgettable summer—and different for each of us. Anyone who was interested was able to find a local candidate to work closely with. Jonathan Cheng has been working with David Weinstein, a Lake County judicial candidate who is vying to be the first Democrat in years elected to the position. Daniel Goldberg and

Emily Garmisa both connected with Daniel Biss, a strong newcomer running for state representative. And there's a niche for everyone. Jordan Silver, a law student, had no trouble finding law-related work around the office; Dan Murphy balanced his internship at Tenth Dems with another job for the Democratic National Committee.

It's not difficult to imagine that a keen interest in politics unites all of the interns, but diverse concerns also informed our community. Barack Obama has been mentioned again and again as a reason for looking into this internship, even by those still too young to vote. Perhaps nobody was more enthusiastic than Alexander Pappas, a high school sophomore who spent weekends during the school year organizing Obama phone banks. Certainly, there have been enough issues to keep us busy this election year.

And so, on behalf of Alexander Pappas, Jonathan Cheng, Rachel Waddick, Daniel Goldberg, Barrett Monie, Jordan Silver, Lexi Zarecky, Dan Murphy, Zach Lygizos, Vlad Voskoboynikov, and Emily Garmisa, goodbye to Tenth Dems. It was a busy and exciting summer, and we can't wait until November.

Kirk, Issa *continued from page 6*

Rifle Association gave Boehner a rating of A.

John Boehner's agenda would be the House agenda if he were elected Speaker.

Do you want people like John Boehner and Darrell Issa in positions of power? If you do, then stick with Kirk. But if you're pro-Israel and you disagree with the Republican agenda, please consider Dan Seals—he shares a commitment to Israel AND our other Democratic values. Here is a link to Dan Seals' position paper on Israel and the Middle East in its entirety: <http://www.dansealsforcongress.com/issues/israel.php>

There is no need to compromise your values in this election.