

CAWP News & Notes

CENTER for the
AMERICAN
WOMAN and
POLITICS

Winter 1993
Vol. 9 No.1

1992 POST-ELECTION WRAP UP



By permission of Signe Wilkinson
The Washington Post National Weekly Edition

CONTENTS

Success for Women in 1992	1
Solid Gains for Women in State Legislatures	3
The Gender Gap in Voting: What It Is and Why It Is Significant	5
The Gender Gap in the Presidential Race	5
Gender Gap a Factor in a Majority of Races in 1992	6
1992 Races Where Female and Male Voters Made Different Voting Choices	7
The Gender Gap and Women Candidates in U.S. Senate and Gubernatorial Races in 1992	8
Women Senate and Gubernatorial Candidates in 1992	
Votes Received, Money Raised, and Gender Gap Data (table)	9
Women's PACs Dramatically Increase Their Support in 1992: An Overview	10
Women's PACs: A Contact List and 1992 Activities	11
Women's PACs in 1992: Summary of Support (table)	20
Women Congressional Candidates: 1992 Campaign Receipts	22
Women Candidates in 1992: A Summary	24
Women Congressional Candidates and Holdovers in 1992: A List	
Votes Received and Money Raised	25
CAWP Receives Major New Grant	34
CAWP's Benefactors	34

About CAWP

The Center for the American Woman and Politics (CAWP) is a unit of the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey. CAWP is a unique think tank, education, and resource center specializing in women's relationship to politics and government.

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

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

Eagleton Institute of Politics

Since its founding in 1956, the Eagleton Institute has built a national reputation for its graduate fellowship program and for its research and public service activities in the field of American politics. The Institute houses three major centers (CAWP; the Center for Public Interest Polling; and the Consortium for Policy Research in Education) and a number of special programs about American public policy and the political process.

Would you like to contribute to
CAWP News & Notes?

If you or your organization has information which you think may be of interest to our readers, please contact Lucy Baruch at (908) 828-2210.

CAWP Staff

Ruth B. Mandel, *Director and Professor*
Lucy D. Baruch, *Editor, CAWP News & Notes and Information Services Coordinator*
Susan J. Carroll, *Senior Research Associate and Associate Professor*
Martha Casisa, *Secretary*
Debra L. Dodson, *Senior Research Associate and Assistant Research Professor*
Katherine E. Kleeman, *Senior Program Associate*
Susan Nemeth, *Director of Development*
Ronnee Schreiber, *Graduate Assistant*
Michele A. Treadwell, *Secretary*
Tobi Walker, *Assistant Director, NEW Leadership*
Debbie Walsh, *Director, Program for Women Public Officials*

Success for Women in 1992

Ruth B. Mandel, Director, CAWP

Ruth Mandel delivered a version of these remarks at the National Press Club in Washington, DC on November 5, 1992 at a joint press conference held by women's political organizations reporting on the 1992 elections. These remarks have been updated to include information that was not available on November 5.

"It may not quite be the Year of the Woman, but neither in this election season is the women's movement going to go away."

Sound familiar? That sentence was twenty years old last June! It comes from *Life* magazine's June 9, 1972 issue. Even then some people were implying that some year — one year — we would "take care" of women. We did not do it in 1972 or 1984; and in 1992 we did not overturn a centuries-old pattern of exclusion from the centers of political power. Yet 1992 did mark a new chapter in women's political history.

What was responsible for all the remarkable progress in this year? Many have asked, "Was it Anita Hill?" Without doubt, the women's political movement owes Professor Hill a tremendous debt of gratitude. She is a heroine in the 1992 story of women and politics.

But neither Anita Hill nor any other single person or event could have given political women a life they did not have. American women stood in readiness for the special circumstances of this extraordinary year. They were prepared for opportunity. This is a twenty-year story of building a women's political base — a base of candidates for elective and appointive offices at all levels. Had it not been for the early workshops and pioneering races of the 1970s, had it not been for all the organizing and training and pep-talking over the last two decades, there would never have been a solid roster of women ready to move up from local and state levels of political participation. Women with experience and savvy knew how to take advantage of the special opportunities that come with redistricting and the retirement of incumbents. They were positioned to respond to the anger and frustration felt by millions of women in that moment of collective consciousness-

raising when one black woman faced a "jury" of fourteen powerful white men who did not understand the content of her testimony, regardless of whether they doubted her veracity.

U.S. Senate

The previous all-time high number of women elected to the U.S. Senate tripled in the 1992 elections. When the 103rd Congress convenes, six women will take their seats among the 100 senators. Among them will be the first African-American female senator, Carol Moseley Braun (D-IL). She will be joined by the first pair of women to represent a single state at the same time: Democrats Barbara Boxer and Dianne Feinstein of California. State Senator Patty Murray (D-WA), a self-proclaimed "mom in tennis shoes," will also enter what was formerly the world's most exclusive male club, along with newly-reelected Senator Barbara Mikulski (D-MD) and holdover Senator Nancy Kassebaum (R-KS).

U.S. House

In 1992 women took an unprecedented leap forward in the U.S. House of Representatives. The 47 women who won seats in the new 435-member House include 23 incumbents and 24 newcomers, 35 Democrats and 12 Republicans, making up 10.8% of all House members. A quarter of these winners are women of color, a record number: eight African-American women, three Latinas, and one Asian-Pacific woman. In addition, the District of Columbia's delegate to the House is an incumbent African-American Democratic woman.

Statewide Elective Executive Office

In 1992, 21 women were elected statewide to executive offices below the gubernatorial level; none of the three women running for governor won. With 51 holdovers already in statewide office, women will now occupy 72, or 22.2 percent, of these positions. As a result of the 1992 elections, more women hold the following statewide elective executive posts than ever before: lieutenant governors (11); attorneys general (9); state treasurers (16); chief education officials (9); and insurance commissioners (2). Utah elected its first woman to statewide elective executive positions in 1992 and Indiana elected the first African-American female attorney general in the United States. In five states

(Colorado, Delaware, Indiana, Nevada, and Oregon) in 1993, at least one-half of the statewide elective executive posts are held by women as compared to three states in 1992.

State Legislatures

The focus of 1992s women and politics story has been on women at the top — women in the U.S. Congress. Yet there is a broader picture we can illuminate by spotlighting the middle level of elective office — the state legislatures.

The 1992 lineup of women candidates for state legislatures fits the pattern of the past twenty years. It has been a period of great progress marked by steady increments every election season, with no single dramatic leap forward. This year a record 2,373 women were nominated for state legislative seats, up 15 percent over 1990s figure. And — not unexpected for the first election following redistricting — the number of women vying for open seats increased significantly. A third of the candidates won nominations for such slots, compared with about one-fifth of 1988 women candidates. These candidates knew how to take advantage of the predictable openness and fluidity in the system which comes once in a decade.

In the states, female candidates kept up the pace of progress we have come to count on them for each election season. Women will constitute a record one-fifth (20.4%) of all state legislators in 1993. The new figure is a two percentage point increase over the 1992 high of 18.4 percent. Twenty years ago, women were under five percent of legislators. This year political women took another step forward on the long road to parity.

More women lawmakers means more women well-positioned to seek higher offices in the future. Of the 54 women (including Eleanor Holmes Norton) who will serve in the next Congress (48 in the House and six in the Senate), 22 sat in state legislatures earlier in their careers. Many of tomorrow's Senators and Congresswomen are undoubtedly holding office in statehouses today.

Will Women Make A Difference?

The numbers game creates big excitement at election time. And then we turn to the big post-election question: what impact will the newly-elected women have? Here our knowledge of state legislatures is suggestive for the congressional level. If women in Congress act similar to women in state legislatures, what can we expect?

We can expect that:

- Women will place higher priority and spend more time on equity issues, especially on women's rights. They will give higher priority to public policies related to women's traditional roles as nurturers and caregivers in the family and society.
- Whether they are Democrats or Republicans, women will choose these priorities more frequently than their male colleagues of either party.
- The officeholders most active in these issue areas will be Democratic, feminist, liberal, younger and African-American women. Many of the women headed for the 103rd Congress fit one or more of these categories. It all adds up to the potential for forceful new action on issues that have foundered in recent years.
- Women will enhance their effectiveness in office by collaborating on legislation with other women in office. One network which is already in place to serve this end is the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues.

The so-called "Year of the Woman" is the product of decades of hard work and preparation, and we will be doing the new Congresswomen a terrible disservice if we expect them to create an instant revolution. Their success is part of a much larger time frame — an era of change which moves toward a new partnership of strong women and strong men who share public leadership.

Remarkable successes in election year 1992 leave behind a legacy for change — an enlarged pool of talented, experienced political women ambitious for leadership; a significantly expanded base of donors ready to invest in advancing women in politics; millions of women voters inclined to cheer on and elect women to office.

Solid Gains for Women in State Legislatures

This press release, which was issued November 17, 1992 and included preliminary data about women legislators, has been updated to reflect final election results. CAWP gratefully acknowledges the contributions of the following students who worked tirelessly collecting information about women in the 1992 elections: Dara Botvinick; Robin Cincotta; Marlaina Murray; Laila Olsen; and Maureen Prado.

In races for Congress, women made remarkable, precedent-setting progress in 1992. In contests for state legislative seats, women also made important advances here — following a precedent for progress which has now sustained itself for two decades. The picture of the state legislatures for 1993 reveals that women's forward movement continues at its long-established pace.

"In the states, this year political women kept up the pace of progress we've come to count on them for each election season," noted Ruth B. Mandel, CAWP's director. "Inch by inch, election year by election year, these women in the states move us toward parity for women and men in politics."

Women will constitute a record one-fifth (20.4 percent) of all state legislators in 1993, according to newly released figures from the Center for the American Woman and Politics (CAWP). The new figure is a two percentage point increase over the 1992 high of 18.4 percent. Women will hold 1,516 of the 7,424 seats in legislatures around the country. This includes 336 (16.9 percent) women in state senates and 1,180 (21.7 percent) women in state houses of representatives. Among the women lawmakers, 921 (60.8 percent) are Democrats, 584 (38.5 percent) are Republicans, one is an independent, and 10 were elected to Nebraska's unicameral, non-partisan legislature. Every state will have at least one woman in its senate and at least five women in its house of representatives.

Most of the 45 states which held regular legislative elections saw their proportion of women lawmakers increase. In 34 states, the proportion increased, in nine

it decreased and in two there was no change. The largest percentage-point increase was eight points which occurred in both Nevada and Rhode Island. Nevada's ranking climbed from 20th to 11th in the nation and Rhode Island's ranking rose from 27th to 14th for the proportion of women serving. The greatest percentage-point decrease (4.8) was in South Dakota, which fell from 10th to 24th place nationally.

The state with the highest proportion of women lawmakers will now be Washington, with 39.5 percent women. Washington's elected officials will also include one woman out of two U.S. Senators, three women out of nine U.S. House members, and four women out of nine statewide elective executive officials.

All of the top ten states have 27.3 percent or more women in their legislatures, and the top five all have at least one-third women. Ten years ago, no state had as many as one-third women; what would then have ranked a state in the top ten (18.8 percent) would now be below the national average. The top ten states for 1993 in descending order are: Washington (39.5 percent); Arizona (35.6 percent); Colorado (34.0 percent); Vermont (33.9 percent); New Hampshire (33.5 percent); Maine (31.2 percent); Idaho (30.5 percent); Kansas (28.5 percent); Minnesota (27.4 percent); and Wisconsin (27.3 percent).

The bottom-ranked state in 1993 will be Kentucky, with 4.3 percent. All the bottom ten states except Pennsylvania and New Jersey are in the South. In ascending order, they are: Kentucky (4.3 percent); Alabama (5.7 percent); Louisiana (6.9 percent); Oklahoma (9.4 percent); Arkansas (9.6 percent); Pennsylvania (9.9 percent); Mississippi (10.9 percent); Virginia (11.4 percent); Tennessee (12.1 percent); and New Jersey (12.5 percent).

The proportion of women candidates who won their legislative races was in line with the figures from recent years. According to CAWP information services coordinator Lucy Baruch, "We saw a consistent pattern at the congressional and state legislative levels: women incumbents were highly likely to win and women challenging incumbents had the toughest races, winning only rarely. It's especially important for women to pursue nominations for open seats, which is where

newcomers stand the best chance of winning office. More than half the women who sought open seats in the Congress and in the state legislatures won."

Of the record 2,373 women who had major party nominations for legislative seats, 1,374, or 58 percent, won. These numbers include 867, or 92 percent of the 946 incumbents; 425, or 55 percent, of the 773 women seeking open seats; and 82, or 13 percent, of the 654 women challenging incumbents. The newly elected and re-elected women will join 142 holdovers who did not face elections this year.

The gains for women at the Congressional and statewide elective levels were more striking. When the new Congress convenes, there will be a record six women (6 percent) in the U.S. Senate and 47 (10.8 percent) of the 435 in the U.S. House of Representatives; in addition, the delegate to the House from the District of Columbia is a woman. Women will hold 72 (22.2

percent) of all statewide elected executive offices, also a new record.

"The gains at the state legislative level bode well for the future," commented Mandel. "Today's state legislators are making key domestic policy decisions. They also represent the growing pool of political leaders who will be tomorrow's candidates for offices at every level."

"As recent CAWP research has demonstrated, these women will have a distinctive impact on public policies, especially on issues affecting women, children and families," Mandel said.

The Center for the American Woman and Politics is a unique think tank — a university-based education, research and resource center specializing in women's participation in politics and government. CAWP is a unit of the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey.



"Well, one more minute and the goddam year of the woman will be over."

Drawing by Dana Fradon; © 1993
The New Yorker Magazine, Inc.

The Gender Gap in Voting: What It Is and Why It Is Significant

Susan Carroll, Senior Research Associate, CAWP

We did not hear much about the gender gap in voting in media coverage of the 1992 elections. In large part this was because the gender gap has become so much a part of America's political landscape that it is now taken for granted. In the early 1980s when a difference between the sexes in voting preferences — the so-called gender gap — was first discovered, it received considerable press attention. This was because the existence of a gender gap ran counter to the conventional wisdom of the time that said that women and men vote alike. In the early 1980s the gender gap was new, surprising, and newsworthy. However, as women continued to vote differently than men in all three presidential races and the majority of statewide races throughout the 1980s, the conventional wisdom changed. Now in the 1990s, journalists and other observers of elections have come to expect women to vote differently than men, and the gender gap would probably have to disappear in order to attract a lot of press attention.

The gender gap in voting — the difference in the proportion of women and men who vote for a candidate — appears to be rooted in differences between women and men in their preferences on public policy issues. Public opinion polls have shown that women and men differ in their attitudes on a wide variety of public policy issues, ranging from war and peace to environmental protection to civil rights to social welfare. Analysts have not been able to pinpoint any single issue that completely accounts for gender differences in voting. Rather, the gender gap seems to be the cumulative product of a number of attitudinal differences between women and men across a variety of important policy issues.

Some observers have come to view the gender gap as a Democratic phenomenon because in so many races in recent elections (including 1992) women have cast their votes disproportionately for Democratic candidates. However, the fact that the gender gap is issue-based means that one party or the other cannot always count

on attracting a disproportionate share of women's votes. Republican as well as Democratic candidates can attract strong support from women by paying attention to women's policy preferences and targeting their campaign messages to appeal to women voters.

Any difference between women and men in their voting preferences, even when the difference is only a few percentage points, is politically significant because women constitute a greater proportion of the electorate than do men, and they now turn out to vote at a slightly higher rate. U.S. Census figures are not yet available for the 1992 elections, but in the 1988 presidential election, 58.3 percent of women voted compared with 56.4 percent of men. While sex differences in rate of turnout were small, sex differences in actual numbers of voters were large because women are a majority of the population. According to U.S. Census figures, in 1988 almost seven million more women than men voted in the presidential election. If the estimates by Voter Research & Surveys are correct, this number should be even larger for 1992. They estimate that voting turnout in 1992 increased 13 percent for women but only four percent for men over what it was in 1988.

The Gender Gap in the Presidential Race

Susan Carroll, Senior Research Associate, CAWP

There has been a gender gap in every presidential election since 1980 and that pattern continued in 1992. Early reports in *USA Today* and *The New York Times*, relying on the exit poll conducted by Voter Research & Surveys, indicated a gender gap of five to six percentage points in the presidential race. However, after Voter Research & Surveys made final adjustments in their poll, the gender gap appeared to be four percentage points. The final, adjusted poll results show that Bill Clinton received 45 percent of women's votes compared with 41 percent of men's votes.

The exit poll conducted by Voter Research & Surveys also showed that there was a gender gap in support for Ross Perot with men more likely to support the Texas billionaire. Only 17 percent of women compared with

21 percent of men voted for Perot. There was not a gender gap in the vote for George Bush; 38 percent of the male voters cast their ballot for the President as compared to 37 percent of the female voters.

Unlike 1992 when the three major television networks consolidated their polling efforts and Voter Research & Surveys conducted the only official exit poll, in the 1980, 1984, and 1988 presidential elections the three major television networks conducted independent polls. These separate network polls showed gender gaps of six to nine percentage points in each of the presidential elections conducted during the 1980s.

Despite the fact that the gender gap in support for Clinton was only four percentage points overall, the gender gap was much larger, and support for Clinton much stronger, among certain key subgroups of women voters. For example, Voter Research & Surveys' figures reported in *The New York Times* showed the gender gap was particularly pronounced among younger voters, with 48 percent of women 18 to 29 years old compared with only 38 percent of men the same age voting for the Democratic ticket. Similarly, 49 percent of female college graduates compared with only 40 percent of male college graduates voted for Clinton. Women who worked outside the home were particularly likely to support the Democratic ticket; 45 percent of employed women voted for Clinton compared with 36 percent of full-time homemakers.

The fact that younger, better educated, and employed women were major contributors to the gender gap suggests that it is not likely to disappear. Rather, the gender gap is likely to continue to be a permanent fixture of presidential politics.

Gender Gap a Factor in a Majority of Races in 1992

Lucy Baruch, Information Services
Coordinator, CAWP

Angela Bell, Student Volunteer, CAWP

In 34, or 67 percent, of the 51 races where Voter Research & Surveys conducted exit polls on election

day, there was a gender gap of at least four percentage points. In addition to the four point gap in the presidential race, a gender gap was apparent in 22 of the 33 Senate races. (Although there were 35 Senate races, the winner of the Louisiana race was determined in October and the Georgia race was decided in a December run-off.) In other races where Voter Research & Surveys conducted exit polls, there was a gender gap in two of the four House races, eight of the 12 gubernatorial races, and in the Texas railroad commissioner race — the only other statewide race where Voter Research & Surveys polled.

In 30 of the 34 races with a gender gap, women voters supported Democratic candidates in larger numbers than did male voters. The four exceptions included races where women's votes went disproportionately to a female Republican candidate, a male independent, and two male Republican candidates.

In seven of the 34 races, female and male voters made different voting choices (see next page). Two Democrats — Senator-elect Barbara Boxer (CA) and Governor-elect Mike Lowry (WA) — owe their victories to female voters. Five Republican men (including two who defeated female candidates) — Senator-elect Lauch Faircloth (NC), Senator Alfonse D'Amato (NY), Senator Bob Packwood (OR), Senator Arlen Specter (PA), and Governor-elect Marc Racicot (MT) — won because of their strong support among male voters; women either showed a preference for their Democratic opponents or were evenly divided in their support for Republican and Democratic candidates.

The race with the largest gender gap (16 percentage points) was the Oregon Senate race between Les AuCoin (D), who received 56 percent of the women's vote, and Bob Packwood (R), who won re-election despite the fact that he received only 40 percent of the women's vote. The gender gap was almost as large (14 percentage points in each case) in the two California Senate races, both of which featured victorious women candidates — Barbara Boxer (D) and Dianne Feinstein (D).

1992 Races Where Female and Male Voters Made Different Voting Choices*

(Barbara Boxer and Mike Lowry owe their victories to women voters.)

St	Office	Candidates	GE Seat	GE WON/ LOST	Associated Press / Congressional Quarterly		Voter Res. & Surveys Exit Polls		Fed. Elect. Comm. \$ Raised as of 11/23/92
					# Votes	% Votes	% Women	% Men	
CA	US Sen.	Barbara Boxer (D)	Open	WON	4,859,119	48	57	43	10,343,300
		Bruce Herschensohn (R)	Open	LOST	4,292,237	43	37	51	7,614,895
NC	US Sen.	Terry Sanford (D)	Incum	LOST	1,176,939	48	51	44	4,619,987
		Lauch Faircloth (R)	Chall	WON	1,276,831	52	49	56	2,804,504
NY	US Sen.	Robert Abrams (D)	Chall	LOST	2,899,888	49	53	44	6,757,031
		Alfonse M. D'Amato (R)	Incum	WON	3,007,882	51	47	56	11,079,555
OR	US Sen.	Les AuCoin (D)	Chall	LOST	558,015	48	56	40	2,248,050
		Bob Packwood (R)	Incum	WON	612,238	52	44	60	8,158,957
PA	US Sen.	Lynn Yeakel (D)	Chall	LOST	2,215,472	49	54	44	4,996,203
		Arlen Specter (R)	Incum	WON	2,344,397	51	46	56	10,420,126
MT	Gov.	Dorothy Bradley (D)	Open	LOST	197,416	49	51	47	
		Marc Racicot (R)	Open	WON	208,841	51	49	53	
WA	Gov.	Mike Lowry (D)	Open	WON	1,030,126	53	57	50	
		Ken Eikenberry (R)	Open	LOST	913,629	47	43	50	

*Information on money raised by gubernatorial candidates was not available as of press time.

The Gender Gap and Women Candidates in U.S. Senate and Gubernatorial Races in 1992

Lucy Baruch, Information Services
Coordinator, CAWP
Angela Bell, Student Volunteer, CAWP

Voter Research & Surveys conducted exit polls in all 11 U.S. Senate and the three gubernatorial races where women were major party nominees. A gender gap was apparent in 12, or 86 percent, of the 14 races, with women in each instance voting in larger numbers than men for the woman candidate.

In 10 of the 11 Senate races with women candidates, there was a gender gap of six to 14 percentage points; Claire Sargent, an Arizona Democrat, was the only woman Senate candidate whose race produced no gender gap.

Women's votes were decisive in Barbara Boxer's (D-CA) Senate victory. Carol Moseley Braun (D-IL) and Patty Murray (D-WA) each won with 55 percent of the

vote; however, in both races men were about evenly divided between the candidates while women showed a clear preference for the woman candidate. If only women had voted in Lynn Yeakel's (D-PA) race, she would have easily defeated incumbent Senator Arlen Specter (R-PA). In Geri Rothman-Serot's (D-MO) race, women were about evenly divided between the two candidates whereas men showed a clear preference for the winner, incumbent Senator Christopher Bond (R-MO). In the only Senate race involving a Republican woman, Charlene Haar (R-SD) received 35 percent of women's votes but only 28 percent of men's in her bid to unseat incumbent Senator Tom Daschle (D-SD).

In two of the three gubernatorial races with women candidates, a gender gap was apparent. In Dorothy Bradley's (D-MT) race there was a four percentage point gender gap; women divided their votes about evenly between Bradley and her opponent whereas men preferred the victorious Republican male candidate. There was a seven point gap in Deborah "Arnie" Arneson's (D-NH) race; nevertheless, a majority of both women and men voted for her opponent. Rhode Island Republican Elizabeth Ann Leonard, who lost her bid, did not have a gender gap in her race.

Organizations of Women Officials To Meet

CAWP is convening the third meeting of the Organizations of Women Public Officials Policy Network. The group will gather in Washington, D.C. March 4-6, 1993 in conjunction with a National League of Cities' conference. Participants will discuss their mutual interests as women elected officials and focus on one area of policymaking: streamlining delivery of social services. The program is funded by a grant from the Ford Foundation. Participating organizations include:

Black Women Mayors' Caucus, National Conference of Black Mayors
Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues
National Order of Women Legislators
National Organization of Black Elected Legislative Women
Women Executives in State Government
Women in Municipal Government, National League of Cities
Women Officials in NACo, National Association of Counties
Women's Network, National Conference of State Legislatures

Women Senate and Gubernatorial Candidates in 1992

Votes Received, Money Raised, and Gender Gap Data*

St	Office	Candidates	GE Seat	GE WON/ LOST	Associated Press / Congressional Quarterly		Voter Res. & Surveys Exit Polls		Fed. Elect. Comm. \$ Raised as of 11/23/92
					# Votes	% Votes	% Women	% Men	
AZ	US Sen.	Claire Sargent (D) John McCain (R)	Cha Inc	LOST WON	421,405 740,758	32 56	33 56	31 57	286,984 3,619,273
CA	US Sen.	Barbara Boxer (D) Bruce Herschensohn (R)	Ope Ope	WON LOST	4,859,119 4,292,237	48 43	57 37	43 51	10,343,300 7,614,895
CA	US Sen.	Dianne Feinstein (D) John Seymour (R)	Cha Inc	WON LOST	5,496,905 3,780,880	55 38	64 33	50 46	7,977,431 6,886,648
IA	US Sen.	Jean Lloyd-Jones (D) Charles E. Grassley (R)	Cha Inc	LOST WON	349,461 894,235	28 72	34 66	22 78	413,998 2,811,860
IL	US Sen.	Carol Moseley Braun (D) Richard Williamson (R)	Ope Ope	WON LOST	2,555,304 2,107,955	55 45	58 42	51 49	6,557,856 2,296,100
KS	US Sen.	Gloria O'Dell (D) Bob Dole (R)	Cha Inc	LOST WON	349,379 700,534	32 64	35 60	29 67	257,604 3,139,540
MO	US Sen.	Barbara Mikulski (D) Alan Keyes (R)	Inc Cha	WON LOST	1,247,386 503,956	71 29	76 24	66 34	3,784,898 1,185,385
MO	US Sen.	Geri Rothman-Serot (D) Christopher Bond (R)	Cha Inc	LOST WON	1,057,357 1,221,453	46 54	49 51	40 60	1,104,938 5,080,622
PA	US Sen.	Lynn Yeakel (D) Arlen Specter (R)	Cha Inc	LOST WON	2,215,472 2,344,397	49 51	54 46	44 56	4,996,203 10,420,126
SD	US Sen.	Charlene Haar (R) Tom Daschle (D)	Cha Inc	LOST WON	108,573 216,869	33 66	35 64	28 70	477,167 4,115,675
WA	US Sen.	Patty Murray (D) Rod Chandler (R)	Ope Ope	WON LOST	1,035,909 856,595	55 45	58 42	51 49	1,477,677 2,591,227
MT	Gov.	Dorothy Bradley (D) Mark Racicot (R)	Ope Ope	LOST WON	197,416 208,841	49 51	51 49	47 53	
NH	Gov.	Deborah Arnie Arneson (D) Steve Merrill (R)	Ope Ope	LOST WON	205,553 286,083	40 56	44 53	35 60	
RI	Gov.	Elizabeth Ann Leonard (R) Bruce Sundlun (D)	Cha Inc	LOST WON	138,934 250,400	36 64	37 63	35 65	

*Information on money raised by gubernatorial candidates was not available as of press time.

Women's PACs Dramatically Increase Their Support in 1992: An Overview

Lucy Baruch, Information Services

Coordinator, CAWP

Katheryne McCormick, Volunteer, CAWP

Background

In 1992, there are 42 PACs which either give money predominately to women candidates or have a predominately female donor base (not including state affiliates of national organizations or issue PACs.) We were able to contact 40 of the 42 women's PACs for this issue of *CAWP News & Notes*; 36 of the PACs reported being active in the 1992 election cycle.

Women's PACs gave
\$11,558,712
to women candidates
in 1992.

The following information was provided by the individual PACs, not by the Federal Election Commission or offices of the Secretaries of State. The PACs, some of which are volunteer organizations and some of which have many paid staff, raised funds through a variety of means ranging from direct mailings to special events to the sale of donated works of art. Some of the PACs are involved in recruitment and training and provide technical assistance to candidates while others only contribute funds. Many of the PACs have boards or voting members that are all female, and most of the PACs have some members/donors who are male. The vast majority of women's PACs reported a very small percentage of men among their ranks.

We attempted to make a distinction between candidates who were endorsed but *did not* receive funds and those who were endorsed and *did* receive funds; however not all PACs were able to provide that information. In some cases, it was difficult to distinguish between the PACs

who provided information about direct contributions as opposed to in-kind contributions; some PACs reported only on the number of active members/donors while others reported on the number of people who may have come to one recent fundraising event. For detailed information on a particular PAC, contact that organization directly.

There are 11 national women's PACs in the country, most of which are based in Washington, DC: American Nurses' Association PAC (ANA-PAC); EMILY's List; Hollywood Women's Political Committee (CA); Leader PAC (VA); National Federation of Business and Professional Women's PAC; National Organization for Women PAC; National Women's Political Caucus PAC; WISH List (NJ); Women in Psychology for Legislative Action (MA); Women's Campaign Fund; and the Women's Council of the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee.

Sixteen states have women's PACs: AL; AR; CA; CT; IL; LA; MI; MN; MO; NJ; NY; OH; OR; PA; TN; and TX. Three states have more than one PAC: PA has two; AL has three; and CA has 13. Two of the state PACs place an emphasis on Latina issues (HOPE-PAC in CA and Latina PAC in CA); and two of the state PACs focus on the needs of African-American women (Ain't I A Woman PAC in PA and Los Angeles African American Women's PAC). While most of the state PACs contribute to candidates running throughout the state (and sometimes beyond their borders), some focus on a particular municipality, county, or region.

Women's PACs in 1992

The 1992 elections have seen phenomenal growth for women's PACs both in dollars contributed and in the number of candidates supported. In 1992, 35 of the PACs responded to questions about the amount of money they contributed to candidates. Women's PACs gave a total of \$11,852,688 to candidates; \$11,558,712, or 98 percent, of which went to women. Seventy-nine percent of the candidates supported by women's PACs were women. In 1992, 22 of the women's PACs contributed only to women candidates. (These figures do not include contributions made by state chapters of national organizations.)

In comparison, in our 1990 survey of women's PACs (see *CAWP News & Notes*, Vol. 8, No. 1) 26 women's PACs responded to questions about the amount of money they contributed to candidates. In 1990, women's PACs gave a total of \$3,114,417 to candidates; of that amount, \$2,695,354, or 87 percent, was given to women candidates. In 1990, 68 percent of the candidates supported by women's PACs were women.

If you know of any other women's PACs around the country that are not on our list, please contact Lucy Baruch at 908-828-2210 or FAX: 908-932-6778. Thank you.

For the first time in history, not only was EMILY's List the women's PAC that contributed the most money to women candidates in 1992 (\$6.2 million), it was the largest funder of U.S. Senate and House candidates (*female or male*) in the country. In addition to EMILY's List, two other women's PACs gave over one million dollars each to women candidates: the Women's Campaign Fund (\$1.5 million) and the newly created Women's Council of the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee (\$1.5 million). The other 32 PACs included eight that gave at least \$100,000 to women candidates; two that gave at least \$50,000; nine that gave at least \$10,000; and thirteen that gave less than \$10,000. The Minnesota Women's Campaign Fund gave more money (\$136,083) to women candidates than any other state PAC; close behind Minnesota was the Los Angeles-based Women's Political Committee (\$120,000).

Comparisons between our 1990 survey of women's PACs (see *CAWP News & Notes*, Vol. 8, No. 1) and the 1992 figures show that eight of the PACs which responded in both years more than doubled their contributions to women candidates. The Hollywood Women's Political Committee took the lead by increasing its contributions to women almost nine-fold; EMILY's List quadrupled their contributions while the Women's Campaign Fund tripled its support. The other PACs which more than doubled their funds to women

are: ANA-PAC; BPW/PAC; Latina PAC; NOW/PAC; and the Santa Barbara Women's Political Committee. In addition, although data from the National Women's Political Caucus was not included in our 1990 survey, in 1992 it increased its contributions to women five-fold. Three other state PACs (MO, MN, and OR) came close to doubling their support in 1992.

Another exciting development which took place in 1992 is that thirteen new women's PACs were formed. In addition to three new national PACs (Leader PAC, WISH List, Women's Council of the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee), eight states (AL, AR, CA, NY, OH, PA, TN, TX) saw the founding of ten new PACs. In Alabama, which currently ranks 49th in the nation for the percentage of women serving in its state legislature, three PACs were formed in different parts of the state and are in close contact with one another. In this election cycle, we have also lost a few PACs: Campaign California/Women's Equity Fund; East Bay Women's Political Action Committee (CA); GOP Women's Political Action League; The Sullivan PAC (CA); and Illinois WISH List.

Women's PACs: A Contact List and 1992 Activities

Lucy Baruch, Information Services
Coordinator, CAWP
Katheryne McCormick, Volunteer, CAWP

Ain't I A Woman Network/PAC

Contact: Wanda Bailey-Green, Chair
1501 Cherry Street
Philadelphia, PA 19102
(215) 248-1147

Ain't I A Woman Network/PAC was created in March 1992 in the Philadelphia area. Comprised of African American Women, the PAC is committed to supporting legislation, issues, and candidates who speak positively to the condition of African American women, their families, and their communities. *[Editor's Note: The above is taken from materials put out by the organization; we were not able to contact the PAC directly about our survey prior to press time.]*

Alabama Solution

Contact: Cameron Vowell, Treasurer
P.O. Box 370821
Birmingham, AL 35237
Phone/FAX: (205) 939-1166

The Alabama Solution, founded in August 1992, is a bipartisan PAC still in the process of forming. It will support "qualified and electable" women candidates running at the federal, state, and local levels. This year, as part of the qualifying process, it gave \$400 to eight women candidates, six of whom won.

American Nurses' Association, Inc. (ANA-PAC)

Contact: Marie Morse or Debbie Campbell
1101 14th Street, NW, Suite 200
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 554-4444, ext. 450

The American Nurses Association's ANA-PAC was established in 1971 and has approximately 10,000 members/donors. ANA-PAC supports congressional and presidential candidates; funding is based on the relationship of the candidates with nurses in the locale, position on issues of importance to the organization, and, for incumbents, their voting records on those issues. For the 1992 election cycle, the PAC supported 260 candidates, of whom 69 were women. Forty-one of those women won their elections. The PAC contributed a total of \$300,000 to candidates in 1992; approximately half (\$150,000) of their funds were given to the 69 women candidates. In addition to the contributions made at the national level, there are 43 state chapters that have PACs that were active at the state and local levels.

Arkansas Women's Action Fund

Contact: Mary Dillard, President
1100 North University
Little Rock, AR 72707
(501) 663-1202
FAX: (501) 663-1218

The Arkansas Women's Action Fund is a bipartisan PAC that was founded in June 1992 to support both female and male candidates running for state and local offices in Arkansas. The PAC has 70 members/donors and contributes to progressive women candidates as well as men who support progressive women's issues. In

1992 it contributed to seven candidates including four women, all of whom won. Of the \$4,250 distributed, \$1,750 went to women candidates (\$500 of the \$4,250 went to a ballot issue).

Committee of 21

Contact: Louadrian Reed, President
P.O. Box 19287
New Orleans, LA 70179
(504) 286-8867

The Committee of 21, founded in 1981, was created to support qualified women candidates of either party running for office in or around New Orleans. More recently it has supported candidates running in other parts of the state. The PAC has a governing board of 21 and a mailing list of approximately 1,000. It contributed \$2,000 to six women candidates, four of whom won; it also spent an additional \$2,600 on ads. In Louisiana, 1992 is an off year for state races.

The Committee for the Election of Western New York Women

Contact: Jane Griffin
64 Tudor Place
Buffalo, NY 14222

The Committee for the Election of Western New York Women was founded in December 1992. It is a bipartisan PAC that will support women running in state and local races in western New York.

Eleanor Roosevelt Fund of California

Contact: Andrea Leiderman
1001-158 Evelyn Terrace East
Sunnyvale, CA 94086
(408) 773-9791

The Eleanor Roosevelt Fund, a subgroup of the Women's Caucus of the California State Democratic Party, was established in 1984 to support pro-choice Democratic women running in California for congressional, statewide, and state legislative posts. The PAC has 1,000 members/donors and contributed \$3,100 to 20 candidates in 1992, 17 of whom won their races. The California State Democratic Party as a whole gave \$1.2 million to women candidates in 1992.

EMILY's List

Contact: Karin Johanson, Political Director
1112 16th Street, NW, Suite 750
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 887-1957
FAX: (202) 452-1997

EMILY's List (Early Money is Like Yeast - It Makes the Dough Rise), founded in 1985, is a donor network for viable, pro-choice Democratic women running in congressional and gubernatorial races. During the 1992 election cycle their donor base increased eight-fold, rising to 24,000. In 1992, EMILY's List gave \$6.2 million to 55 women candidates, 25 of whom won. It made direct contributions totaling \$193,635 to 171 Democratic pro-choice state and local candidates running in 19 states and the District of Columbia. EMILY's List was the largest funder of U.S. Senate and House candidates in the U.S. in 1992.

Focus 2020

Contact: Cindy Paler
P.O. Box 660
Huntsville, AL 35804-0660

Focus 2020 is a new PAC in Huntsville, Alabama that was established in December 1992. It is a bipartisan organization and will support both female and male candidates running for office at all levels who have experience and are electable. Its primary purpose is to get women elected and appointed to office; Focus 2020 also plans to do recruitment and training in addition to fundraising. It has 30 members as well as a larger mailing list.

Hollywood Women's Political Committee

Contact: Margery Tabankin, Executive Director
10536 Culver Boulevard
Culver City, CA 90232
(310) 559-9334
FAX: (310) 838-2367

The Hollywood Women's Political Committee was established in 1984 and is a bipartisan PAC that supports progressive female and male candidates. Its focus is on choice, the environment, children's issues, nuclear disarmament, and the separation of church and state. Although it occasionally supports candidates

running at the state and local levels, its emphasis is on federal races around the country. The PAC has 250 members/donors from the entertainment industry. It contributed to 93 candidates in 1992, 60 of whom were women; it gave a total of \$616,420 to candidates, \$543,671 of which went to women.

H.O.P.E. Chest

Contact: Celia Collins, Chair
P.O. Box 1988
Mobile, AL 36633
(205) 432-7682

H.O.P.E. Chest (Helping Open Politics for Everyone), established in October 1992 in Mobile, Alabama, is a new bipartisan PAC for state and local candidates. There are currently approximately 65 members; the group plans to support primarily women but will also contribute to male candidates if there are no qualified women running.

The Hope Chest

Contact: Melodee S. Kornakcer, Treasurer
P.O. Box 21772
Columbus, OH 43221-0772
(614) 451-9444
FAX: (614) 451-8776

The Hope Chest is a donor network in Ohio that was established in August 1992 to assist pro-choice Democratic women running for state offices. The candidates must be viable but cannot be incumbents, and must not be opposing pro-choice incumbents. The network has approximately 80 members/donors and gave \$10,000 to five women candidates in 1992. Two of those candidates won their elections.

HOPE-PAC

Contact: Maria Contreras-Sweet, President
611 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 1202
Los Angeles, CA 90017
(213) 267-5853

HOPE-PAC, established in California in 1991, is a bipartisan PAC that supports both female and male candidates running for state and local offices in California; particular emphasis is placed on Latino/Latina candidates. Campaign viability, support

for choice, for women's issues generally, and for inclusion of Latinos/Latinas in all aspects of society are prime considerations in selecting candidates. HOPE-PAC has approximately 500 members/donors and contributed to 15 candidates including 11 women; six of the women won their races. Women candidates received \$1,000 of the \$7,000 distributed.

Kathleen Recommends

(California State Treasurer Kathleen Brown)

Contact: Cathy Unger
315 Conway Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90024-2603
(310) 446-4820

Kathleen Recommends is a donor network established in 1992 by California State Treasurer Kathleen Brown to support pro-choice female Democratic candidates for the California legislature; it has more than 100 members/donors. Brown also raised money for female U.S. House candidates and organized a separate network to support pro-choice Democratic male candidates. Through all of her efforts, \$100,000 was raised for candidates in California, \$76,000 of which was given to women. A total of 30 candidates were supported, 18 of whom were women.

Latina PAC

Contact: Dina Hidalgo, Co-chair
915 L Street, Suite C, #222
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 395-7915

Latina PAC, founded in 1990, was formed primarily to support Latina candidates running for state and local offices in California; it also contributes to other candidates who support Latina issues. There are 35 full members of the PAC plus a group of more than 100 women and men from whom support is sought. The PAC contributed \$15,000 to 14 candidates with \$13,300 going to the 11 women receiving their support. Four of the women were successful.

The Leader PAC

Contact: Sally Atwater, Chair
P.O. Box 7001
Fairfax Station, VA 22039-7001
(703) 503-7891
FAX: (703) 503-2877

The Leader PAC was established in February 1992 to support women candidates for Congress who are in good standing within the Republican party. It has a membership of approximately 300. In its first year of activity it raised \$100,000 which it contributed to all 37 Republican women nominated for Senate and House seats; 12 of these candidates were elected to the House.

Los Angeles African American Women's PAC

Contact: Celestine Palmer, Chair
4102 Olympiad Drive
Los Angeles, CA 90043
(213) 295-2382

The Los Angeles African American Women's PAC was founded in October 1990 to elect Democratic female and male candidates who support African American issues and needs. It gives to candidates running at the federal, state, and local levels and has supported candidates running outside of California. Its membership/donor base, which is now up to 150, doubled in this election cycle. It gave \$5,000 to six women candidates in 1992; five of these women won their races.

Los Angeles Women's Campaign Fund

Contact: Barbara Rosenbaum, Treasurer
c/o Kreff & Rosenbaum
1410 Ventura Blvd., Suite 402
Sherman Oaks, CA 91423
(818) 990-7377
FAX: (818) 990-1840

The Los Angeles Women's Campaign Fund, founded over ten years ago, primarily supports Democratic and Republican female candidates but does occasionally support men who are aggressively supporting women's issues. The PAC contributes to candidates who are running for all levels of office and supports candidates running outside of California. It has 200 members/donors and supported 17 female candidates in 1992.

Marin County Women's PAC

Contact: Johanna Willmann, Chair
3310 Paradise Drive
Tiburon, CA 94920
(415) 435-2504

The Marin County Women's PAC, established in 1980, is a bipartisan PAC that supports pro-choice female candidates running primarily at the local level. The PAC has supported candidates running for all levels of office as well as candidates running outside of California. It has 15 members and a mailing list of over 100 individuals who attend events. In 1992, it gave \$10,000 to seven women candidates, four of whom won.

Michigan Women's Campaign Fund

Contact: Mary Fowlie, Chair
2600 W. Big Beaver
Troy, MI 48084
Phone/FAX: (313) 548-9563

The Michigan Women's Campaign Fund, established in 1981, supports Republican and Democratic women running at the local, county and state levels in Michigan who are viable, pro-ERA, pro-choice, and oppose sex discrimination. Thirty-five candidates were endorsed and 29 of them were given contributions totaling approximately \$42,000. Seventeen of the 35 endorsed candidates were successful in the elections.

Minnesota Women's Campaign Fund

Contact: Kristin Hanson
550 Rice Street, Suite 106
St. Paul, MN 55103
(612) 222-1603
FAX: (612) 292-9417

The Minnesota Women's Campaign Fund, a bipartisan PAC established in 1982 to support female candidates, increased its members/donors by nearly two-fold during the current election cycle rising to over 500. The PAC contributes to candidates running for all levels of office in Minnesota. Candidates must be viable, concerned with women's issues including the right to reproductive choice; demonstrate interest and knowledge in a broad spectrum of political and economic issues; and exhibit a commitment to democratic principles and ethical processes. In 1992, it provided \$136,083 to 124 women candidates.

Missouri Women's Action Fund

Contact: Vivian Eveloff, First Vice-chair
1108 Hillside Drive
St. Louis, MO 63117
(314) 781-1081
FAX: (314) 781-1078

The Missouri Women's Action Fund, founded in 1987, is a bipartisan PAC that supports female and male candidates who are progressive, pro-choice, and viable. The PAC has approximately 250 members/donors and supports candidates for all levels of government; it occasionally contributes to candidates running outside of Missouri. In 1992 it contributed only to women, giving \$30,000 to 36 women, 24 of whom won their races.

National Federation of Business & Professional Women's Clubs (BPW/PAC)

Contact: Mariwyn Heath, BPW/PAC Chair
2012 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 293-1100, ext.: Gov't Relations

The National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs created its bipartisan PAC in 1979 to support female and male candidates for Congress and the Presidency who agree with the BPW's positions on selected issues. In 1992, BPW/PAC endorsed 98 congressional candidates and presidential candidate Bill Clinton; 54 of the endorsed candidates were women, 34 of whom won their races. Of the 98 endorsed candidates, 70 received financial support including 42 women, 24 of whom were successful. Of the \$35,000 distributed, \$20,000 was given to women candidates. In addition to the contributions made at the national level, there are 37 state chapters that have PAC's that were active at the state and local levels.

National Organization for Women PAC

Contact: Alice Cohan
Political Director
1000 16th Street, NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036-5705
(202) 331-0066
FAX: (202) 785-8576

The National Organization for Women's PACs, organized in 1977, support female and male candidates of any party affiliation running for all levels of office. Candidates must be: pro-choice (regardless of a woman's age or ability to pay); pro-ERA; pro-civil rights (including lesbian and gay rights); and support domestic spending over military spending. It has 280,000 members/donors and provided \$460,000 of support including bundling and in-kind contributions to 317 candidates in 1992; 258 women candidates received \$447,523. In addition, the 46 state chapters gave \$146,322 to candidates in 1992. NOW state chapters endorsed a total of 1,090 candidates and contributed to 632 women, 415 of whom won.

National Women's Political Caucus

Contact: Mary Beth Lambert, Political Directors
Political Caucus PAC, established in 1975, is bipartisan and contributes only to female candidates who are pro-choice and support public funding for abortions and birth control information, passage and ratification of the ERA, and publicly and privately funded child care programs. During the 1992 election cycle the NWPC doubled its member/donor ranks to 35,000. In 1992, the NWPC endorsed 134 women candidates, 43 of whom won. Of the 134 endorsed candidates, 76 women received financial support amounting to \$250,000. In addition to the contributions made at the national level, many of the state chapters of the Caucus have PACs that were active at the state and local levels.

Pennsylvania Women's Campaign Fund

Contact: Nancy Neuman
P.O. Box 767
Hazleton, PA 18201
(717) 524-4713
FAX: (717) 455-4236

The Pennsylvania Women's Campaign Fund, established in 1982, supports Republican and Democratic women running for the Pennsylvania legislature. Endorsements and financial assistance are based on a list of issues related to women and minorities. The PAC's membership/donor base increased five-fold in this election cycle, rising to 700. Of the 33 women who received the \$29,150 of financial support, nine were elected. In addition, six other candidates who were endorsed but given no financial assistance were elected.

Republican Women's PAC

Contact: Diann Rogers
1817 Capitol Ave., Suite A
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 447-8186

The Republican Women's PAC is currently inactive. It used to consist of the Republican women in the California legislature but this is no longer legal. The PAC may be revived in the future with an altered constituency which will meet the legal constraints in California.

Sacramento Women's Campaign Fund

Contact: Linda Turnquist, Chair
P.O. Box 162212
Sacramento, CA 95816
(916) 445-5598

The Sacramento Women's Campaign Fund is a bipartisan PAC that was established in 1981 to support feminist female and male candidates running for state and local offices in California. The PAC has approximately 70 people who are active in the organization but has a mailing list of some 900 individuals who have contributed over time. In 1992, it supported 72 candidates including 55 women; 33 of the women were successful. A total of \$7,500 was distributed to candidates; women received \$7,100.

Santa Barbara Women's Political Committee

Contact: Susan Rose, President
P.O. Box 90618
Santa Barbara, CA 93190
(805) 568-5556

The Santa Barbara Women's Political Committee, founded in 1988, is a bipartisan PAC that supports female and male candidates running on a feminist agenda. This year's emphasis was on three issues: choice, health care, and violence against women. Although it is currently a state PAC, it will soon become a federal PAC. It has approximately 375 members/donors and grew by 40 percent in this election cycle. It contributed to seven candidates in 1992, four of whom were women; it gave \$5,950 to candidates, \$3,300 of which went to women. In addition, through print and radio ads it spent another \$3,186 in this election cycle.

Task Force 2000 PAC

Contact: P.O. box 36183
Houston, TX 77036
(713) 782-7004

Editor's Note: Although we were not able to contact the PAC directly prior to press time, earlier reports indicated that the Task Force was established in 1992 to support women candidates running in the Houston area.

Wednesday Committee

Contact: Adrianna Babior
1531 Purdue
Los Angeles, CA 90025
(310) 477-8081

The Wednesday Committee is not a PAC but is a network of PACs in the Los Angeles area.

WISH List

Contact: Lynn S. Shapiro, Executive Director
210 W. Front Street
Red Bank, NJ 07701
(908) 747-4221
FAX: (908) 530-9743

WISH List (Women in the Senate and House) was established in December 1991 to support pro-choice Republican women candidates for Congress and governorships who are running well organized viable campaigns and have demonstrated their ability to raise money in their districts. With over 1,500 members, the PAC contributed \$250,000 to 22 candidates, nine of whom won their races.

Women For:

Contact: Marilyn Kizziah or Lucie Bava
8913 West Olympic Boulevard, Ste. 103
Beverly Hills, CA 90211
(310) 657-7411

Women For: was established in California in 1964 before there were political action committees. It supports female and male candidates running for all levels of office and occasionally contributes to individuals running outside of California. The organization has approximately 2,000 members/donors. Funding decisions are based on the candidates' views on peace,

environmental problems, public education and civil rights. In 1992, 30 of the 40 candidates supported were women, 14 of whom won; \$17,750 of the \$20,000 distributed went to women candidates. When there is particular interest in a candidate, the PAC asks its members to make contributions directly to that candidate as well as to support the PAC's fundraising.

Women For: Orange County

Contact: Shirley Palley, Political Chair
21 Whitman Court
Irvine, CA 92715
(714) 854-8024

The Women For: Orange County is about ten years old. It supports men and women of both parties for local, county, state legislative, and statewide elective offices in California. It contributes to candidates who are pro-choice and support the group's positions on the environment, world peace, health care, and public education. In 1992 it supported 21 candidates with \$5,700. The 12 women candidates, seven of whom won, received \$3,850.

Women in Illinois Needed Now (WIINN)

Contact: Joyce Holmberg, Chair
P.O. Box 1555
Rockford, IL 61105
(815) 987-7555

Women in Illinois Needed Now supports Democratic women running for statewide elective executive offices. In 1992 no state-level elections were held.

Women in Psychology for Legislative Action

Contact: Noreen Johnson, Treasurer
13 Ashfield Street
Roslindale, MA 02131
(617) 327-8015

Women in Psychology for Legislative Action, established in 1988, is a bipartisan PAC that contributes to women candidates running for Congress. The PAC gives to candidates who support its mental health agenda and who are viable, pro-choice, and supportive of women's issues. The membership/donor base has more than doubled during the 1992 election cycle; there are

approximately 60 active members and a mailing list of 250. It provided \$5,000 to seven women candidates for Congress, five of whom won.

Women in the Nineties (WIN)

Contact: Elliott McNeil, Chief Staff Officer
1215 7th Avenue North
Nashville, TN 37208
(615) 242-1215
FAX: (615) 254-9017

Women in the Nineties is a bipartisan donor network that was organized in May 1992 to support progressive, pro-choice women candidates running for office at all levels within Tennessee. It has approximately 350 members/donors and contributed \$50,000 to 14 women, seven of whom won.

Women Organizing Women PAC (WOW PAC)

Contact: Barbara Pearce, Treasurer
P.O. Box 1652
New Haven, CT 06507-1652
(203) 281-3400

Women Organizing Women PAC, established in 1989, supports women and men of both parties running for state and local offices in Connecticut. The PAC has approximately 400 members. In 1992, it supported 15 candidates, including eight women. Candidates were given approximately equal shares of the \$5,000 distributed; hence women candidates received a total of approximately \$2,700.

Women's Campaign Fund

Contact: Julie Tippens, Political Director
120 Maryland Avenue, NE
Washington, DC 20002
(202) 544-4484
FAX: (202) 544-4517

The Women's Campaign Fund, founded in 1974, was the first national PAC in the country established solely to support women candidates. It contributes to Democratic and Republican women candidates running in races around the country for all levels of office who are viable, pro-ERA, and pro-choice. The number of WCF members/donors doubled in the 1992 election

cycle, rising to 15,000. In 1992 it contributed \$1.5 million to 242 women, 115 of whom won their races.

Women's Council of the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee

Contact: Christine Keoner, Director
430 South Capitol St., SE
Washington, DC 20003
(202) 224-2447
FAX: (202) 485-3120

The Women's Council of the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee, established in May 1992, supports and recruits Democratic female candidates for the Senate. Over 10,000 individuals became members or contributed to the PAC's activities in 1992. It distributed \$1.5 million to 10 Democratic, pro-choice women candidates for the general election. The amount given to each candidate was based on need and competitiveness of the race, but each received at least \$50,000. Five of those 10 candidates were elected in November 1992.

Women's Investment Network (WIN-PAC)

Contact: Jewel Lansing, Treasurer
3333 SW Arnold
Portland, OR 97219
(503) 246-6022

The Women's Investment Network PAC, established in 1987, supports non-incumbent Republican and Democratic women candidates for the Oregon legislature who are pro-choice and are not challenging pro-choice incumbents. The PAC has 276 donors. In 1992 it supported 17 women with \$21,760. Four of the women were successful.

Women's Political Action Committee of NJ

Contact: Patricia Connolly, President
P.O. Box 170
Edison, NJ 08818
(908) 638-6784

The Women's Political Action Committee of New Jersey, founded in 1985, is a bipartisan PAC which supports pro-choice, pro-ERA women candidates running for state, county and municipal posts in New

Jersey. The PAC has approximately 500 members/donors. It contributed \$1,375 to nine women seeking the office of county Freeholder; four of the women won. There were no state-level elections in New Jersey in 1992.

Women's Political Committee

Contacts: Cathy Unger
315 Conway Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90024-2603
(310) 446-4820
FAX: (310) 446-4723

The Women's Political Committee, located in Los Angeles, was established in 1982 to foster the election of Democratic women candidates at all governmental levels who are pro-choice, support a feminist agenda, and are considered viable candidates. It sometimes contributes to candidates running outside of California.

The PAC, which now has 55 members, doubled its membership in this election cycle. In 1992, it supported 29 women candidates with \$120,000; 20 of the candidates won their races.

Women's Political Fund

Contact: D.J. Soviero
P.O. Box 421811
San Francisco, CA 94142-1811
(415) 861-5168

The Women's Political Fund in San Francisco was established in 1982; it supports pro-choice female and male candidates of either party who are running for all levels of office. The PAC concentrates its assistance on those candidates voters might otherwise not hear about; it sometimes contributes to candidates running outside of California. In 1992 the PAC provided \$5,000 to 10 candidates, nine of whom were women; the nine women received \$4,900 and were all successful.

Ruth B. Mandel

Director, Center for the American Woman and Politics

receives

New Jersey's Highest Honor

The 1992 Governor's Pride Award

The Woodrow Wilson Public Service Award

and

The New Jersey Women's Political Caucus

Barbara Boggs Sigmund Award

Leaders with Vision: Women in Politics

Women's PACs in 1992: Summary of Support¹

	\$ To All <u>Cand.</u>	\$ To Women <u>Cand.</u>	# All <u>Cand.</u>	# Women <u>Cand.</u>
Ain't I A Woman Network/PAC (PA)	*	*	*	*
Alabama Solution	400	400	8	8
American Nurses' Association, Inc. ⁺	300,000	150,000	260	69
Arkansas Women's Action Fund	4,250	1,750	7	4
The Committee for the Election of Western New York Women	**	**	**	**
Committee of 21 (LA) ²	2,000	2,000	6	6
Eleanor Roosevelt Fund (CA) ³	3,100	3,100	20	20
EMILY's List	6,200,000	6,200,000	55	55
Focus 2020 (AL)	**	**	**	**
Hollywood Women's Political Committee	616,420	543,671	93	60
H.O.P.E Chest (AL)	**	**	**	**
The Hope Chest (OH)	10,000	10,000	5	5
HOPE-PAC (CA)	7,000	1,000	15	11
Kathleen Recommends (CA)	100,000	76,000	30	18
Latina PAC (CA)	15,000	13,300	14	11
The Leader PAC	100,000	100,000	37	37
Los Angeles African American Women's PAC	5,000	5,000	6	6
Los Angeles Women's Campaign Fund (CA)	*	*	17	17
Marin County Women's PAC (CA)	10,000	10,000	7	7
Michigan Women's Campaign Fund	42,000	42,000	29	29
Minnesota Women's Campaign Fund	136,083	136,083	124	124
Missouri Women's Action Fund	30,000	30,000	36	36
National Federation of Business & Professional Women's Clubs ⁺	35,000	20,000	70	42
National Organization for Women ⁺	460,000	447,523	317	258
National Women's Political Caucus ⁺	250,000	250,000	76	76
Pennsylvania Women's Campaign Fund	29,150	29,150	33	33
Sacramento Women's Campaign Fund (CA)	7,500	7,100	72	55

Women's PACs in 1992: Summary of Support (continued)¹

	\$ To All <u>Cand.</u>	\$ To Women <u>Cand.</u>	# All <u>Cand.</u>	# Women <u>Cand.</u>
Santa Barbara Women's Political Committee (CA) ⁴	5,950	3,300	7	4
Task Force 2000 PAC (TX)	*	*	*	*
WISH List	250,000	250,000	22	22
Women For: (CA)	20,000	17,750	40	30
Women For: Orange County (CA)	5,700	3,850	21	12
Women in Illinois Needed Now	***	***	***	***
Women in the Nineties (TN)	50,000	50,000	14	14
Women in Psychology for Legislative Action	5,000	5,000	7	7
Women Organizing Women PAC (CT)	5,000	2,700	15	8
Women's Campaign Fund	1,500,000	1,500,000	242	242
Women's Council of the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee	1,500,000	1,500,000	10	10
Women's Investment Network (OR)	21,760	21,760	17	17
Women's Political Action Committee of NJ	1,375	1,375	9	9
Women's Political Committee (CA)	120,000	120,000	29	29
Women's Political Fund (CA)	<u>5,000</u>	<u>4,900</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>9</u>
Total	11,852,688	11,558,712	1,780	1,400

* Either the information was not available or we were not able to reach the PAC as of press time.

** PAC was newly established in 1992 and was not active in this election cycle.

*** Women in Illinois Needed Now supports women running for statewide elective executive offices; in 1992 there were no such races in Illinois.

+ For national organizations with state chapters, these figures only include information about the activities of the national organization, not the state chapter affiliates. The National Organization for Women was the only group that had figures on the activities of its state chapters; NOW state chapters contributed an additional \$146,322 to candidates in 1992.

¹ List does not include state affiliates of national organizations or issue PACs. See also the background section of "Women's PACs Dramatically Increase their Support in 1992: An Overview" on page 10.

² The Committee of 21 spent an additional \$2,600 on ads.

³ The Eleanor Roosevelt Fund of California is a part of the California Democratic party which supported many women candidates in 1992; the above figures do not include all of the funds the Democratic party contributed to numerous women candidates running in California.

⁴ The Santa Barbara Women's Political Committee spent an additional \$3,186 on ads.

Women Congressional Candidates: 1992 Campaign Receipts

Lucy Baruch, Information Services
Coordinator, CAWP

Katheryne McCormick, Volunteer, CAWP
Kris Ronan, Student Intern, CAWP

Unless otherwise noted, all monetary figures are for total receipts as reported by the Federal Election Commission as of November 23, 1992. Figures are for major party candidates only.

Campaign funding remained a critical factor in the 1992 elections, but in contrast to the early 1970s when CAWP was founded, women candidates this time were quite successful in raising money. Figures compiled by the Federal Election Commission as of November 23, 1992 provide insight into how women candidates fared and which types of candidates did especially well. As expected, with few exceptions female incumbents out-raised their opponents; female challengers raised less than their opponents; and female candidates for open seats sometimes raised more and sometimes raised less than their opponents.

Women congressional
candidates raised
\$79,429,425.

The 11 female Senate candidates and 108 (including two candidates for delegate from Washington, DC) female House candidates raised a total of \$79,429,425 in their bids for congressional posts in 1992. Although women candidates collectively raised less than their opponents, who raised a total of \$98,865,660, that is not surprising since there were more female challengers running than incumbents (particularly in the high finance Senate races).

Individual female Senate candidates raised from \$257,604 to \$10,343,300 while their opponents raised from \$1,185,385 to \$10,420,126. Individual female House candidates raised from \$2,100 to \$1,418,060 while their opponents raised from \$195 to \$5,412,862. (A few of the female House candidates and a few of their opponents did not report their receipts.)

Of the 11 women Senate candidates, four raised more money than their opponents and seven raised substantially less than their opponents. In 1992, five women won; four of the five winners raised more money than their male opponents. The only female incumbent running in 1992, Senator Barbara Mikulski (D-MD), raised three and one-half times the amount raised by her opponent, Alan Keyes, and won.

Of the seven female challengers, only one woman, Senator-elect Diane Feinstein (D-CA) raised more than her opponent; Feinstein defeated John Seymour who had been appointed to the Senate. Lynn Yeakel (D-PA), who during 1992 raised 48 percent of what Senator Arlen Specter had raised in the six years since his last election, lost by only two points. Specter was the second biggest money raiser of the 1992 Senate candidates.

All three of the women Senate candidates who ran for open seats won. Two of the three, Senator-elect Carol Moseley Braun (D-IL) and Senator-elect Barbara Boxer (D-CA), raised significantly more money than their opponents. Braun raised nearly three times as much as Richard Williamson (R-IL) and Boxer raised almost one and one-half times as much as Bruce Hershensohn (R-CA). Senator-elect Patty Murray (D-WA), who defeated her Republican opponent Congressman Rod Chandler by 10 percentage points, raised only 57 percent of what he raised.

The Federal Election Commission reports that among the 50 Senate candidates who raised the most money in 1991-1992 (not total receipts, just 1991-1992), there were seven women. Senator-elect Barbara Boxer (D-CA) and Senator-elect Diane Feinstein (D-CA) lead the list ranking first and second respectively; Senator-elect Carol Moseley Braun (D-IL) ranks seventh; Lynn Yeakel (D-PA), who lost, ranks tenth; Senator Barbara Mikulski (D-MD) ranks 22nd; Senator-elect Patty

Murray (D-WA) ranks 45th; and Geri Rothman-Serot (D-MO), who lost, ranks 50th.

Of the 108 women candidates for the U.S. House, almost half (48 percent) raised more money than their opponents. Forty-three of the 48 female winners (including Washington, DC Delegate Eleanor Holmes Norton) raised more money than their opponents.

Twenty-seven women (including Norton) ran for House seats as incumbents; twenty-four won, raising more funds than their opponents. Only three incumbents did not recapture their seats: Mary Rose Oakar (D-OH) and Elizabeth Patterson (D-SC) who both raised almost twice as much as their opponents; and Joan Kelly Horn (D-MO) who raised 91 percent of what her opponent raised.

Of the 42 female challengers, the only two who won raised less than their opponents: Representative-elect Patricia Danner (D-MO), who raised 95 percent of what her opponent raised; and Representative-elect Carolyn Maloney (D-NY), who raised only 14 percent of what her opponent raised. Of the 40 female challengers who lost, three raised more money than their opponents: Elaine Baxter (D-IA); Linda Bean (R-ME); and Susan Stokes (R-KY).

In 1992, 39 women candidates ran for open seats in the House, including eight women who ran in four women versus women races. Twenty-two of the women seeking open seats won their races; 19 of these women raised more money than their opponents. The three female candidates who raised less than their opponents and won are Representatives-elect: Leslie Byrne (D-VA); Karen English (D-AZ); and Marjorie Margolies-Mezvinsky (D-PA). Four women seeking open seats who lost their elections, but raised more money than their opponents are: Patricia Garamendi (D-CA); Cathey Steinberg (D-GA); Margaret Muller (R-OH); and Laurie Williams (D-OK).

In 1992, seven women candidates for House seats rank among the top 50 money raisers; FEC figures show 843 major party nominees. The women candidates are: Linda Bean (R-ME), 7th; Representative Mary Rose Oakar (D-OH), who lost, 14th; Representative Nita Lowey (D-NY), 23rd; Representative-elect Lynn Schenk (D-CA),

25th; Representative Rosa DeLauro (D-CT), 32nd; Representative Helen Delich Bentley, (R-MD), 39th; and Gwen Margolis (D-FL), 44th.

No women, in either the House or the Senate, made the top ten in PAC contributions.

In U.S. House races, in comparing median receipts of women candidates to total median receipts (men and women) by seat status, the median for women candidates was higher than the median for all candidates in three of the six categories.

U.S. House Races Median Receipts as of 11/23/92

	<u>FEC All Cand.</u>	<u>Women Cand.</u>
Incumbents		
Democrats	\$479,980	\$387,280
Republicans	468,268	581,793
Challengers		
Democrats	62,764	99,666
Republicans	83,182	79,749
Open Seats		
Democrats	395,276	540,959
Republicans	416,244	396,058

**Happy New Year
and
Best Wishes for 1993**

Women Candidates in 1992: A Summary

U.S. Senate, U.S. House, Statewide Elective Executive, State Legislature

Women Officeholders: 1993 vs 1992

	# <u>1993</u>	% <u>1993</u>	# <u>1992</u>	% <u>1992</u>
U.S. Senate	6	6.0	3*	3.0
U.S. House	47**	10.8	28**	6.4
Statewide Elective Exec.	72	22.2	59	18.2
State Legislature	1,516	20.4	1,375	18.4

*On election day, there were 3 women Senators; 2 elected and 1 appointed.

**In addition, Eleanor Holmes Norton serves as the delegate to the House from Washington, DC.

U.S. Senate

Candidates 11 (10D, 1R); Winners 5 (5D); Holdover¹ 1 (1R)

	Filed	Won Primary	Won General	Winners			Winners Race/Ethnic.	
				Incum.	Chall.	Open	Black	White
Total	29	11	5	1	1	3	1	4
Democrat	22	10	5	1	1	3	1	4
Republican	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0

U.S. House of Representatives

Candidates 108* (71D, 37R); Winners 48* (36D, 12R)

	Filed	Won Primary	Won General	Winners			Winners Race/Ethnic. ²				
				Incum.	Chall.	Open	AP	B	H	NA	W
Total	224*	108*	48*	24*	2	22	1	9*	3	0	35
Democrat	141	71	36	15	2	19	1	9	2	0	24
Republican	83	37	12	9	0	3	0	0	1	0	11

*These numbers include Eleanor Holmes Norton (D) who serves as the delegate to the House from Washington, DC and Susan Emmerson (R) who ran against Norton. Norton, an incumbent who won re-election, is African-American and Emmerson is white.

Statewide Elective Executive

Candidates 37 (21D, 14R, 2NP³); Winners 21 (12D, 8R, 1NP); Holdovers 51 (29D, 21R, 1ind)

State Legislature

Candidates 2,373 (1,399D, 961R, 12NP, 1ind)

Winners 1,374 (821D, 546R, 6NP, 1ind); Holdovers 142 (100D, 38R, 4NP)

¹Holdover = officeholder not up for re-election in 1992.

²Race/Ethnic.: AP = Asian/Pacific American; B = Black; H = Hispanic; NA = Native American; W = White.

³Candidate ran in a nonpartisan race.

Women Congressional Candidates and Holdovers in 1992: A List*

Votes Received and Money Raised

St	Office	Dist.	Candidates	Race/ Ethn.*	GE Seat	GE WON/ LOST	Associated Press / Congressional Quarterly # Votes	% Votes	Fed. Elect. Comm. \$ Raised as of 11/23/92
AZ	US Sen.		Claire Sargent (D) John McCain (R)	W	Chall Incum	LOST WON	421,405 740,758	32 56	286,984 3,619,273
CA	US Sen.		Barbara Boxer (D) Bruce Herschensohn (R)	W	Open Open	WON LOST	4,859,119 4,292,237	48 43	10,343,300 7,614,895
CA	US Sen.		Dianne Feinstein (D) John Seymour (R)	W	Chall Incum	WON LOST	5,496,905 3,780,880	55 38	7,977,431 6,886,648
IA	US Sen.		Jean Lloyd-Jones (D) Charles E. Grassley (R)	W	Chall Incum	LOST WON	349,461 894,235	28 72	413,998 2,811,860
IL	US Sen.		Carol Moseley Braun (D) Richard Williamson (R)	B	Open Open	WON LOST	2,555,304 2,107,955	55 45	6,557,856 2,296,100
KS	US Sen.		Gloria O'Dell (D) Bob Dole (R)	W	Chall Incum	LOST WON	349,379 700,534	32 64	257,604 3,139,540
KS	US Sen.		Nancy Kassebaum (R) ()	W	Hold				
MD	US Sen.		Barbara Mikulski (D) Alan Keyes (R)	W	Incum Chall	WON LOST	1,247,386 503,956	71 29	3,784,898 1,185,385
MO	US Sen.		Geri Rothman-Serot (D) Christopher Bond (R)	W	Chall Incum	LOST WON	1,057,357 1,221,453	46 54	1,104,938 5,080,622
PA	US Sen.		Lynn Yeakel (D) Arlen Specter (R)	W	Chall Incum	LOST WON	2,215,472 2,344,397	49 51	4,996,203 10,420,126
SD	US Sen.		Charlene Haar (R) Tom Daschle (D)	W	Chall Incum	LOST WON	108,573 216,869	33 66	477,167 4,115,675
WA	US Sen.		Patty Murray (D) Rod Chandler (R)	W	Open Open	WON LOST	1,035,909 856,595	55 45	1,477,677 2,591,227
AL	US Rep.	004	Martha "Mickey" Strickland (R) Tom Beville (D)	W	Chall Incum	LOST WON	66,907 157,937	30 70	14,993 304,415
AR	US Rep.	001	Blanche Lambert (D) Terry Hayes (R)	W	Open Open	WON LOST	146,318 63,876	70 30	423,122 38,015

*Holdovers are officeholders who were not up for re-election in 1992. Some candidates did not report campaign receipts.

**Race/Ethnicity: AP=Asian/Pacific American; B=Black; H=Hispanic; NA=Native American; W=White.

Congress: Women Candidates and Holdovers 1992* (continued)

St	Office	Dist.	Candidates	Race/ Ethn.*	GE Seat	GE WON/ LOST	Associated Press / Congressional # Votes	Quarterly % Votes	Fed. Elect. Comm. \$ Raised as of 11/23/92
AZ	US Rep.	006	Karen English (D) Doug Wead (R)	W	Open Open	WON LOST	120,865 93,653	56 44	363,587 661,838
CA	US Rep.	004	Patricia Malberg (D) John Doolittle (R)	W	Chall Incum	LOST WON	119,849 129,528	46 50	402,417 601,556
CA	US Rep.	006	Lynn Woolsey (D) Bill Filante (R)	W	Open Open	WON LOST	178,445 90,751	66 34	577,911 422,646
CA	US Rep.	008	Nancy Pelosi (D) Marc Wolin (R)	W	Incum Chall	WON LOST	182,564 24,064	83 11	416,144 42,168
CA	US Rep.	011	Patricia Garamendi (D) Richard W. Pombo (R)	W	Open Open	LOST WON	82,006 82,911	46 47	842,226 516,073
CA	US Rep.	014	Anna G. Eshoo (D) Tom Huening (R)	W	Open Open	WON LOST	136,174 92,091	57 39	899,959 663,897
CA	US Rep.	021	Debora Vollmer (D) Bill Thomas (R)	W	Chall Incum	LOST WON	63,673 119,256	35 65	28,568 588,996
CA	US Rep.	022	Gloria Ochoa (D) Michael Huffington (R)	AP	Open Open	LOST WON	82,137 120,356	35 52	653,207 5,412,862
CA	US Rep.	023	Anita Perez Ferguson (D) Elton Gallegly (R)	H	Chall Incum	LOST WON	83,543 108,152	42 54	571,974 677,811
CA	US Rep.	033	Lucille Roybal-Allard (D) Robert Guzman (R)	H	Open Open	WON LOST	30,235 14,383	63 30	279,685 141,559
CA	US Rep.	035	Maxine Waters (D) Nate Truman (R)	B	Incum Chall	WON LOST	98,338 16,122	83 14	191,424 7,643
CA	US Rep.	036	Jane Harman (D) Joan Milke Flores (R)	W	Open Open	WON LOST	117,202 100,062	49 42	877,215 855,937
CA	US Rep.	036	Joan Milke Flores (R) Jane Harman (D)	W	Open Open	LOST WON	100,062 117,202	42 49	855,937 877,215
CA	US Rep.	039	Molly McClanahan (D) Ed Royce (R)	W	Open Open	LOST WON	76,683 113,678	38 57	96,686 483,059

*Holdovers are officeholders who were not up for re-election in 1992. Some candidates did not report campaign receipts.

**Race/Ethnicity: AP=Asian/Pacific American; B=Black; H=Hispanic; NA=Native American; W=White.

Congress: Women Candidates and Holdovers 1992* (continued)

St	Office	Dist.	Candidates	Race/ Ethn.*	GE Seat	GE WON/ LOST	Associated Press / Congressional Quarterly # Votes	% Votes	Fed. Elect. Comm. \$ Raised as of 11/23/92
CA	US Rep.	044	Georgia Smith (D) Al McCandless (R)	W	Chall Incum	LOST WON	76,910 101,806	41 54	7,693 312,155
CA	US Rep.	045	Patricia McCabe (D) Dana Rohrbacher (R)	W	Chall Incum	LOST WON	84,267 116,501	39 54	32,944 321,408
CA	US Rep.	049	Lynn Schenk (D) Judy Jarvis (R)	W	Open Open	WON LOST	118,101 96,135	52 42	1,136,467 423,929
CA	US Rep.	049	Judy Jarvis (R) Lynn Schenk (D)	W	Open Open	LOST WON	96,135 118,101	42 52	423,929 1,136,467
CA	US Rep.	051	Beatrice Herbert (D) Randy Cunningham (R)	W	Chall Incum	LOST WON	77,023 125,913	34 56	23,315 929,013
CA	US Rep.	052	Janet M. Gastil (D) Duncan Hunter (R)	W	Chall Incum	LOST WON	80,878 101,936	42 52	146,857 549,399
CO	US Rep.	001	Pat Schroeder (D) Raymond Aragon (R)	W	Incum Chall	WON LOST	155,037 70,407	69 31	357,068 93,011
CT	US Rep.	001	Barbara Kennelly (D) Phil Steele (R)	W	Incum Chall	WON LOST	164,381 74,367	69 31	521,685 5,902
CT	US Rep.	003	Rosa DeLauro (D) Tom Scott (R)	W	Incum Chall	WON LOST	162,075 84,950	66 34	1,020,395 204,810
CT	US Rep.	006	Nancy Johnson (R) Gene Slason (D)	W	Incum Chall	WON LOST	165,002 60,327	73 27	581,793 35,992
DC	US Rep.	AL	Eleanor Holmes Norton (D) Susan Emerson (R)	B	Incum Chall	WON LOST	166,808 20,108	85 10	178,839 10,299
DC	US Rep.	AL	Susan Emerson (R) Eleanor Holmes Norton (D)	W	Chall Incum	LOST WON	20,108 166,808	10 85	10,299 178,839
FL	US Rep.	003	Corrine Brown (D) Don Weidner (R)	B	Open Open	WON LOST	89,625 60,586	60 40	279,010 252,684
FL	US Rep.	004	Tillie K. Fowler (R) Mattox Hair (D)	W	Open Open	WON LOST	127,758 99,554	56 44	520,938 417,453

*Holdovers are officeholders who were not up for re-election in 1992. Some candidates did not report campaign receipts.

**Race/Ethnicity: AP=Asian/Pacific American; B=Black; H=Hispanic; NA=Native American; W=White.

Congress: Women Candidates and Holdovers 1992* (continued)

St	Office	Dist.	Candidates	Race/ Ethn.*	GE Seat	GE WON/ LOST	Associated Press / Congressional Quarterly # Votes	% Votes	Fed. Elect. Comm. \$ Raised as of 11/23/92
FL	US Rep.	005	Karen L. Thurman (D) Tom Hogan (R)	W	Open Open	WON LOST	129,677 114,331	53 47	328,633 144,110
FL	US Rep.	009	Cheryl Davis Knapp (D) Michael Bilirakis (R)	W	Chall Incum	LOST WON	110,002 157,786	41 59	268,124 778,750
FL	US Rep.	010	Karen A. Moffitt (D) C.W.(Bill) Young (R)	W	Chall Incum	LOST WON	114,890 149,657	43 57	202,132 271,047
FL	US Rep.	017	Carrie P. Meek (D) Unopposed ()	B	Open	WON			571,064
FL	US Rep.	018	Magda Montiel Davis (D) Ileana Ros-Lehtinen (R)	H	Chall Incum	LOST WON	52,095 104,715	33 67	337,627 657,997
FL	US Rep.	018	Ileana Ros-Lehtinen (R) Magda Montiel Davis (D)	H	Incum Chall	WON LOST	104,715 52,095	67 33	657,997 337,627
FL	US Rep.	020	Beverly Kennedy (R) Peter Deutch (D)	W	Open Open	LOST WON	91,289 130,895	41 59	90,009 845,133
FL	US Rep.	022	Gwen Margolis (D) E. Clay Shaw (R)	W	Chall Incum	LOST WON	91,540 128,254	42 58	935,484 944,300
GA	US Rep.	001	Barbara Howard Christmas (D) Jack Kingston (R)	W	Open Open	LOST WON	75,044 99,204	43 57	325,087 415,011
GA	US Rep.	004	Cathey Steinberg (D) John Linder (R)	W	Open Open	LOST WON	123,819 126,502	49 51	621,396 488,540
GA	US Rep.	011	Cynthia McKinney (D) Woodrow Wilson Lovett (R)	B	Open Open	WON LOST	120,187 44,359	73 27	285,815 27,792
HI	US Rep.	002	Patsy Mink (D) Kamuela Price (R)	AP	Incum Chall	WON LOST	131,256 39,963	77 23	333,978 195
IA	US Rep.	003	Elaine Baxter (D) Jim Ross Lightfoot (R)	W	Chall Incum	LOST WON	120,541 125,620	49 51	655,609 614,066
ID	US Rep.	001	Rachel S. Gilbert (R) Larry LaRocca (D)	W	Chall Incum	LOST WON	90,487 139,899	39 61	177,521 597,252

*Holdovers are officeholders who were not up for re-election in 1992. Some candidates did not report campaign receipts.

**Race/Ethnicity: AP=Asian/Pacific American; B=Black; H=Hispanic; NA=Native American; W=White.

Congress: Women Candidates and Holdovers 1992* (continued)

St	Office	Dist.	Candidates	Race/ Ethn.*	GE Seat	GE WON/ LOST	Associated Press / Congressional Quarterly # Votes % Votes	Fed. Elect. Comm. \$ Raised as of 11/23/92
IL	US Rep.	004	Hildegard Rodriguez-Schieman (R) Luis V. Gutierrez (D)	H	Open Open	LOST WON	24,426 23 83,340 77	3,857 433,803
IL	US Rep.	007	Cardiss Collins (D) Norman Boccia (R)	B	Incum Chall	WON LOST	166,236 83 33,141 17	328,640 7,695
IL	US Rep.	008	Sheila A. Smith (D) Phillip Crane (R)	W	Chall Incum	LOST WON	96,397 42 132,855 58	139,186 460,821
IN	US Rep.	004	Jill Long (D) Charles W. Pierson (R)	W	Incum Chall	WON LOST	129,980 62 78,716 38	358,416 6,094
IN	US Rep.	006	Natalie M. Bruner (D) Dan Burton (R)	W	Chall Incum	LOST WON	68,304 27 181,786 73	32,156 610,406
IN	US Rep.	007	Ellen E. Wedum (D) John T. Myers (R)	W	Chall Incum	LOST WON	88,005 41 129,189 59	44,086 323,952
KS	US Rep.	003	Jan Meyers (R) Tom Love (D)	W	Incum Chall	WON LOST	169,668 61 109,548 39	431,501
KY	US Rep.	003	Susan B. Stokes (R) Romano L. Mazzoli (D)	W	Chall Incum	LOST WON	132,689 47 148,066 53	366,715 217,382
MD	US Rep.	002	Helen Delich Bentley (R) Michael C. Hickey, Jr. (D)	W	Incum Chall	WON LOST	157,194 65 85,931 35	958,899 48,971
MD	US Rep.	004	Michele Dyson (R) Albert Wynn (D)	B	Open Open	LOST WON	42,743 24 132,776 76	137,528 568,721
MD	US Rep.	008	Connie Morella (R) Edward J. Heffernan (D)	W	Incum Chall	WON LOST	189,420 72 72,190 28	427,773 73,928
ME	US Rep.	001	Linda Bean (R) Thomas H. Andrews (D)	W	Chall Incum	LOST WON	126,079 35 231,363 65	1,418,060 858,631
ME	US Rep.	002	Olympia J. Snowe (R) Patrick K. McGowan (D)	W	Incum Chall	WON LOST	152,285 49 130,958 42	742,159 381,313
MI	US Rep.	003	Carol Kooistra (D) Paul Henry (R)	W	Chall Incum	LOST WON	96,666 37 164,518 63	43,238 347,024

*Holdovers are officeholders who were not up for re-election in 1992. Some candidates did not report campaign receipts.

**Race/Ethnicity: AP=Asian/Pacific American; B=Black; H=Hispanic; NA=Native American; W=White.

Congress: Women Candidates and Holdovers 1992* (continued)

St	Office	Dist.	Candidates	Race/ Ethn.*	GE Seat	GE WON/ LOST	Associated Press / Congressional Quarterly # Votes	% Votes	Fed. Elect. Comm. \$ Raised as of 11/23/92
MI	US Rep.	004	Lisa Donaldson (D) David Camp (R)	W	Chall Incum	LOST WON	87,662 157,032	36 64	14,446 506,688
MI	US Rep.	009	Megan O'Neil (R) Dale Kildee (D)	W	Chall Incum	LOST WON	112,322 133,980	46 54	135,192 714,058
MI	US Rep.	015	Barbara-Rose Collins (D) Charles Vincent (R)	B	Incum Chall	WON LOST	148,755 31,564	82 18	277,523 96,399
MO	US Rep.	002	Joan Kelly Horn (D) James Talent (R)	W	Incum Chall	LOST WON	148,658 157,556	49 51	827,352 905,343
MO	US Rep.	006	Patricia Danner (D) Tom Coleman (R)	W	Chall Incum	WON LOST	148,889 119,638	55 45	473,940 497,590
MS	US Rep.	002	Dorothy "Dot" Benford (R) Mike Epsy (D)	B	Chall Incum	LOST WON	37,853 134,453	22 78	297,287
NC	US Rep.	001	Eva Clayton (D) Ted Tyler (R)	B	Open Open	WON LOST	115,508 54,133	68 32	549,979 7,055
NC	US Rep.	004	Vicky Goudie (R) David E. Price (D)	W	Chall Incum	LOST WON	89,147 170,753	34 66	8,966 462,788
NC	US Rep.	006	Robin Hood (D) J. Howard Coble (R)	W	Chall Incum	LOST WON	66,810 161,880	29 71	27,893 503,254
NC	US Rep.	012	Barbara Gore Washington (R) Melvin Watt (D)	B	Open Open	LOST WON	49,191 126,836	28 72	25,388 464,151
NJ	US Rep.	005	Marge Roukema (R) Frank R. Lucas (D)	W	Incum Chall	WON LOST	193,468 66,746	74 26	429,956 2,080
NJ	US Rep.	011	Ona Spiridellis (D) Dean A. Gallo (R)	W	Chall Incum	LOST WON	65,024 179,803	27 73	99,666 564,227
NV	US Rep.	002	Barbara Vucanovich (R) Pete Sferrazza (D)	W	Incum Chall	WON LOST	125,118 113,364	48 44	656,203 206,362
NY	US Rep.	012	Nydia Velazquez (D) Angel Diaz (R)	H	Open Open	WON LOST	51,608 13,945	77 21	418,539

*Holdovers are officeholders who were not up for re-election in 1992. Some candidates did not report campaign receipts.

**Race/Ethnicity: AP=Asian/Pacific American; B=Black; H=Hispanic; NA=Native American; W=White.

Congress: Women Candidates and Holdovers 1992* (continued)

St	Office	Dist.	Candidates	Race/ Ethn.*	GE Seat	GE WON/ LOST	Associated Press / Congressional Quarterly # Votes % Votes	Fed. Elect. Comm. \$ Raised as of 11/23/92
NY	US Rep.	013	Susan Molinari (R) Sal Albanese (D)	W	Incum Chall	WON LOST	102,715 56 70,447 38	527,560 240,752
NY	US Rep.	014	Carolyn Maloney (D) Bill Green (R)	W	Chall Incum	WON LOST	94,613 51 89,423 49	121,945 847,513
NY	US Rep.	018	Nita Lowey (D) Joseph DiGuardi (R)	W	Incum Chall	WON LOST	102,269 55 83,282 45	1,150,369 578,682
NY	US Rep.	021	Nancy Norman (R) Michael McNulty (D)	W	Chall Incum	LOST WON	82,668 35 147,173 62	14,620 210,270
NY	US Rep.	023	Paula Diperna (D) Sherwood Boehlert (R)	W	Chall Incum	LOST WON	56,841 29 126,879 64	60,343 366,620
NY	US Rep.	024	Margaret M. Ravenscroft (D) John McHugh (R)	W	Open Open	LOST WON	44,798 23 116,254 61	177,033
NY	US Rep.	025	Rhea Jezer (D) James Walsh (R)	W	Chall Incum	LOST WON	105,364 44 132,279 56	99,341 280,617
NY	US Rep.	028	Louise Slaughter (D) William Polito (R)	W	Incum Chall	WON LOST	138,318 55 111,233 45	469,795 243,841
OH	US Rep.	009	Marcy Kaptur (D) Ken D. Brown (R)	W	Incum Chall	WON LOST	176,877 77 52,431 23	284,567 44,782
OH	US Rep.	010	Mary Rose Oaker (D) Martin Hoke (R)	W	Incum Chall	LOST WON	102,573 43 134,711 57	1,229,532 660,923
OH	US Rep.	011	Beryl Rothschild (R) Louis Stokes (D)	W	Chall Incum	LOST WON	43,152 22 152,328 78	79,749 374,668
OH	US Rep.	013	Margaret Mueller (R) Sherrod Brown (D)	W	Open Open	LOST WON	88,202 40 133,489 60	662,970 490,735
OH	US Rep.	015	Deborah Pryce (R) Richard Cordray (D)	W	Open Open	WON LOST	115,710 44 97,599 37	543,700 310,083
OK	US Rep.	005	Laurie Williams (D) Ernest Istook (R)	W	Open Open	LOST WON	107,579 47 123,237 53	345,247 297,529

*Holdovers are officeholders who were not up for re-election in 1992. Some candidates did not report campaign receipts.

**Race/Ethnicity: AP=Asian/Pacific American; B=Black; H=Hispanic; NA=Native American; W=White.

Congress: Women Candidates and Holdovers 1992* (continued)

St	Office	Dist.	Candidates	Race/ Ethn.*	GE Seat	GE WON/ LOST	Associated Press / Congressional Quarterly # Votes	% Votes	Fed. Elect. Comm. \$ Raised as of 11/23/92
OR	US Rep.	001	Elizabeth Furse (D) Tony Wecker (R)	W	Open Open	WON LOST	118,133 100,955	54 46	766,329 716,801
PA	US Rep.	013	Marjorie Margolies-Mezvinsky (D) Jon Fox (R)	W	Open Open	WON LOST	127,534 126,445	50 50	531,939 722,831
SC	US Rep.	004	Elizabeth Patterson (D) Robert Inglis (R)	W	Incum Chall	LOST WON	94,179 99,878	49 51	351,573 198,426
TN	US Rep.	003	Marilyn Lloyd (D) Zach Wamp (R)	W	Incum Chall	WON LOST	106,900 103,409	51 49	455,560 275,205
TN	US Rep.	006	Marsha Blackburn (R) Bart Gordon (D)	W	Chall Incum	LOST WON	85,959 119,599	42 58	183,017 646,892
TX	US Rep.	002	Donna Peterson (R) Charles Wilson (D)	W	Chall Incum	LOST WON	91,100 116,246	44 56	349,433 1,171,183
TX	US Rep.	017	Jeannie Sadowski (R) Charles Stenholm (D)	W	Chall Incum	LOST WON	69,834 136,107	34 66	17,222 412,111
TX	US Rep.	025	Dolly Madison McKenna (R) Michael Andrews (D)	W	Chall Incum	LOST WON	68,407 97,656	41 59	587,319 957,303
TX	US Rep.	030	Eddie Bernice Johnson (D) Lucy Cain (R)	B	Open Open	WON LOST	107,830 37,853	74 26	278,495 2,100
TX	US Rep.	030	Lucy Cain (R) Eddie Bernice Johnson (D)	B	Open Open	LOST WON	37,853 107,830	26 74	2,100 278,495
UT	US Rep.	002	Karen Shepherd (D) Enid Greene (R)	W	Open Open	WON LOST	127,543 118,013	52 48	637,024 396,058
UT	US Rep.	002	Enid Greene (R) Karen Shepherd (D)	W	Open Open	LOST WON	118,013 127,543	48 52	396,058 637,024
VA	US Rep.	011	Leslie Byrne (D) Henry Butler (R)	W	Open Open	WON LOST	113,461 103,091	52 48	774,914 852,886
WA	US Rep.	001	Maria Cantwell (D) Gary Nelson (R)	W	Open Open	WON LOST	128,885 96,540	57 43	611,719 138,864

*Holdovers are officeholders who were not up for re-election in 1992. Some candidates did not report campaign receipts.

**Race/Ethnicity: AP=Asian/Pacific American; B=Black; H=Hispanic; NA=Native American; W=White.

Congress: Women Candidates and Holdovers 1992* (continued)

St	Office	Dist.	Candidates	Race/ Ethn.*	GE Seat	GE WON/ LOST	Associated Press / Congressional Quarterly # Votes	% Votes	Fed. Elect. Comm. \$ Raised as of 11/23/92
WA	US Rep.	003	Jolene Unsoeld (D) Pat Fiske (R)	W	Incum Chall	WON LOST	124,393 96,773	56 44	659,168 256,647
WA	US Rep.	006	Lauri Phillips (R) Norm Dicks (D)	W	Chall Incum	LOST WON	51,297 121,162	30 70	6,266 539,831
WA	US Rep.	008	Jennifer Dunn (R) George Tamblyn (D)	W	Open Open	WON LOST	129,475 73,654	60 34	701,458 407,677
WI	US Rep.	002	Ada Deer (D) Scott Klug (R)	NA	Chall Incum	LOST WON	107,480 181,845	37 63	451,092 876,637
WI	US Rep.	005	Donalda Hammersmith (R) Tom Barrett (D)	W	Open Open	LOST WON	68,676 159,446	30 70	96,814 348,736
WI	US Rep.	006	Peg Lautenschlager (D) Thomas Petri (R)	W	Chall Incum	LOST WON	128,353 143,843	47 53	330,185 425,676
WI	US Rep.	008	Katherine L. Helms (D) Toby Roth (R)	W	Chall Incum	LOST WON	82,032 191,649	30 70	40,687 587,895
WI	US Rep.	009	Ingrid Buxton (D) Jim Sensenbrenner (R)	W	Chall Incum	LOST WON	77,903 193,335	29 71	29,239 276,089

1993 PLEN Seminar on Women and Public Policy in Europe

The Public Leadership Education Network (PLEN), the consortium of women's colleges preparing women for public leadership, invites women active in the public policy arena to participate in its 1993 Seminar on Women and Public Policy in Europe. From May 16-30 the seminar will meet in London, Brussels, Luxembourg and Strasbourg to learn from women staff and members of the European Parliament. The itinerary includes several days in Berlin, where the seminar will focus on the impact of German reunification and developments in Eastern Europe on the political and economic roles of women. The cost of the seminar is \$2,500 with an additional \$300 fee for single accommodations. The price includes air transportation to Europe, rail transportation in Europe and hotel including breakfast. Contact PLEN for further details 202-872-1585 or 1001 Connecticut Avenue, NW #925, Washington, DC 20036.

CAWP Receives Major New Grant

What would it take to speed up the impact of women in public office? That question will be at the heart of CAWP's newest program of research, funded by a three-year, \$408,000 grant from the Charles H. Revson Foundation. This third major Revson grant to the Center will have three research components:

Assessment of Our State of Knowledge Regarding Women in Public Office: Inventory of what we have learned from data collected by CAWP and other researchers over the years that may be useful to those who wish to increase the numbers and impact of women in office.

Women in the 103rd Congress: With the recent election of record numbers of women members of Congress, CAWP will for the first time undertake a systematic assessment of women's roles within the institution.

Database on Women in Public Office: Expansion and enhancement of CAWP's database on women in public office to increase awareness of who women officeholders are, where their policy expertise lies, and how they might collaborate to achieve even greater influence on public policy.

In addition, the Revson Foundation has provided \$50,000 in development support for the Campaign for CAWP. This funding will help to lay the groundwork for the long-term effort to secure CAWP's future as a permanent center for the study of women's political leadership.

CAWP's Benefactors

Each year civic-minded corporations, unions, trade and professional associations make a commitment to fund CAWP's program for women public officials. Because of the sustained generosity of our private sector donors, we are able to serve a burgeoning population of women leaders.

We gratefully acknowledge the contributions of our:

1993 SUSTAINING FUND MEMBERS

(list in formation)

Donors

AT&T
RJR Nabisco, Inc.

Supporters

The Boeing Company
The Coastal Corporation
Eastman Kodak Company
Pfizer Inc.
Sandoz Pharmaceuticals Corporation
Searle

Contributors

AFL-CIO
The Association of Trial Lawyers
Avon Products, Inc.
Beneficial Management Corporation
The BFGoodrich Company
Burlington Resources
Burroughs Wellcome Co.
California Medical Association
Communications Workers of America
Dow Elanco
Eli Lilly and Company
FMC Corporation
Fred Meyer
GTE Telephone Operations
The Hershey Foods Corporation Fund
Johnson & Johnson Family of Companies
Joseph E. Seagram & Sons, Inc.
Marion Merrell Dow Inc.
Mobil Oil Corporation
National Education Association
New Jersey Bell Telephone Co.
Pacific Telesis Group
The Prudential Insurance Company of America
Schering-Plough
Shaklee Corporation
Southern California Edison Company
Southwestern Bell Telephone Company
Travelers Corporation
TRW Inc.

1993 SUSTAINING FUND MEMBERS (continued)

Friends

Crum and Forster Foundation
The DuPont Merck Pharmaceutical Company
Gramercy Capital Management Corporation
R.H. Macy & Company, Inc.

Special thanks to

TKO Design Group Inc.

AT&T

for their generous contributions
toward a new CAWP brochure.

FOUNDATIONS

We extend our thanks to the following foundations for their continued commitment to CAWP's projects for 1993:

Ford Foundation

Organizations of Women Public Officials

W.K. Kellogg Foundation

*National Education for Women's Leadership
(NEW Leadership)*

Charles H. Revson Foundation

Women in Public Office: Speeding Up the Impact

Helena Rubinstein Foundation

General Support

We also gratefully acknowledge grants from the following foundations for our project, *The Abortion Issue and the 1992 Elections*:

Robert Sterling Clark Foundation

The John Merck Fund

Huber Foundation

777 Women Fund/Tides Foundation

General Service Foundation

Joe & Emily Lowe Foundation

Preparing to Lead: The College Women's Guide to Internships and Other Public Policy Learning Opportunities in Washington, D.C.

Written by students for students, *Preparing to Lead* provides descriptions of over 100 internships, seminars, fellowships and other resources for women interested in public leadership. The 136 page guide is designed to help women students take full advantage of the myriad of learning opportunities in the nation's capital that will prepare them for leadership responsibilities in the public policy arena. The guide includes sections on:

- Research and Advocacy Internships with Non-governmental Organizations
- Political Internship Opportunities
- Governmental Internships, including Capitol Hill and the Executive Branch
- Seminars and Conferences on Public Leadership for Students
- Fellowships and Other Learning Opportunities for College Graduates

The guide is part of the National Education for Women's Leadership (NEW Leadership), a program designed to identify, educate and develop the next generation of women public leaders. Funded by the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, New Leadership is a collaborative effort of the Public Leadership Education Network (PLEN) and the Center for the American Woman and Politics of the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers University.

To order call 202-872-1585 or send checks (\$10 per copy) payable to PLEN to: PLEN, Book Orders, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 295, Washington, DC 20036.

**Know others who might be interested in
CAWP's Subscriber Information Service (SIS)?
Please pass on this form.**

___ Please enroll me in SIS; enclosed is \$25 for a one year subscription. SIS subscribers receive three packets, each of which includes: *CAWP News & Notes*; fact sheets; reports; reprints of articles; and other timely information. All subscriptions must be prepaid; please make checks payable to CAWP.

___ Enclosed is a ___ tax deductible contribution to CAWP.

Name & Title _____

Organization/Company (if applicable) _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

**Center for the American Woman and Politics
Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University
New Brunswick, New Jersey 08901 • (908) 828-2210**
