

# THE FREEDOM INDEX A Congressional Scorecard Based on the U.S. Constitution

Our second look at the 111th Congress shows how every Representative and Senator voted on key issues, such as (in the House) cap and trade and healthcare "reform"; and (in the Senate) the Sotomayor confirmation.

#### House Vote Descriptions

Supplemental Appropriations. This final version (conference report) of the fiscal 2009 supplemental appropriations bill (H.R. 2346) would provide an additional \$105.9 billion in so-called emergency funds over and above the regular appropriations for 2009. This outrageous supplemental package would include \$79.9 billion for defense funding (including for the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan), \$10.4 billion for foreign aid programs, \$7.7 billion to address the national flu scare, and \$5 billion for International Monetary Fund activities. This supplemental bill would also include \$1 billion for the Cash for Clunkers program.

A day prior to the House vote, Representative Ron Paul (R-Texas) urged his fellow lawmakers to reject the bill, stating, "I continue to believe that the best way to support our troops is to bring them home from Iraq and Afghanistan.... Our continued presence in Iraq and Afghanistan does not make us safer at home, but in fact it undermines our national security."

The House adopted H.R. 2346 on June 16, 2009 by a vote of 226-202 (Roll Call 348). We have assigned pluses to the

"nays" because the spending is over and above what the federal government had already budgeted, the United States never declared war against Iraq and Afghanistan, and some of the spending (e.g., Cash for Clunkers and foreign aid) is unconstitutional. The Senate passed this legislation two days later. (See Senate vote #11.)



**Big spender:** President Obama signs the fiscal 2009 supplemental appropriations bill, which provides an *additional* \$105.9 billion for "emergency" funds over and above the regular appropriations for the current fiscal year. (See House vote #11 and Senate vote #11.)

## ABOUT THIS INDEX

"The Freedom Index: A Congressional Scorecard Based on the U.S. Constitution" rates Congressmen based on their adherence to constitutional principles of limited government, fiscal responsibility, national sovereignty, and a traditional foreign policy of avoiding foreign entanglements. To learn how any Representative or Senator voted on the key measures described herein, look him or her up in the vote charts.

The scores are derived by dividing a Congressman's constitutional votes (pluses) by the total number he cast (pluses and minuses) and multiplying by 100.

The average House score for this index (votes 11-20) is 38 percent. Forty-nine Congressmen earned 100 percent, as compared to three who earned 100-percent scores in the first "Freedom Index" (published in our July 20, 2009 issue) for the current Congress, and just one perfect scorer — Congressman Ron Paul of Texas — in our final index for the previous Congress (October 27, 2008 issue). Though the huge jump in 100-percent scores is encouraging, it must be kept in mind that many Republicans who are now voting against Obama- and Democrat-supported legislation often voted for big-government programs when they were in the majority and the President was a Republican. The average Senate score for this index is 32 percent. Three Senators scored 100 percent.

We encourage readers to commend legislators for their constitutional votes and to urge improvement where needed. For congressional contact information, go to www.votervoice.net/ groups/jbs/address. For a series of pre-written letters to Congress on key issues, go to JBS.org and click on "Legislative Action" under "Action."

#### 111<sup>th</sup> Congress, Votes 11-20



**Cap-and-trade** legislation, such as that passed by the House in June (see House vote #12), would negatively impact not just major utilities that emit carbon dioxide and other "greenhouse" gases, but other businesses as well, including the family-owned Belden Brick Co. (shown above) in Ohio.

**O** Cap and Trade. The American Clean Energy and Security Act (H.R. 2454), also known as the cap-andtrade bill, would not merely "cap" carbon dioxide and other "greenhouse" gas emissions, ostensibly to fight global warming, but would reduce the amount of allowable emissions over time - to 17 percent below 2005 levels by 2020, 42 percent by 2030, and 83 percent by 2050. The government would auction or freely distribute a limited number of emission allowances, which companies would be able to buy or sell. Of course, as the total amount of allowable emissions is reduced, the price of the allowances would skyrocket - and with them the price of electricity and whatever else is produced from burning fossil fuel. The Congressional Budget Office estimated that the effect of the House committee version of the bill would be to raise federal taxes by \$846 billion and direct federal spending by \$821 billion over the 2010-2019 period.

The House passed the cap-and-trade bill on June 26, 2009 by a vote of 219-212 (Roll Call 477). We have assigned pluses to the "nays" because this legislation would be devastating to the economy if enacted and the federal government has no constitutional authority to limit greenhouse-gas emissions. **13** State-Foreign Aid Appropriations. This fiscal 2010 spending bill (H.R. 3081) would appropriate \$49 billion for the State Department and various foreign-assistance and international activities. The foreign assistance in the bill includes \$5.8 billion to help combat HIV/AIDS, \$2.7 billion for Afghanistan, \$2.2 billion for Israel, \$1.5 billion for Pakistan, \$1.4 billion for the Millennium Challenge Corporation (a United Nations-inspired entity), and \$1.3 billion for Egypt.

Though foreign aid is supposed to help the poor and suffering in foreign countries, ultimately it transfers the wealth from American taxpayers to Third World elites who have become deficient in running their socialist regimes.

The House passed H.R. 3081 on July 9, 2009 by a vote of 318-106 (Roll Call 525). We have assigned pluses to the "nays" because foreign aid is unconstitutional and unworkable.

**14** Transportation-HUD Appropriations. The fiscal 2010 Transportation-HUD appropriations (H.R. 3288) would authorize a whopping \$123.1 billion for the Departments of Transportation and Housing and Urban Development. This includes \$68.8 billion

for discretionary spending for the two departments and their related agencies, a 25-percent increase from fiscal 2009 levels. The bill would provide \$1.5 billion in federal grants for Amtrak and \$18.2 billion for the Section 8 Tenant-based Rental Assistance program.

The House passed H.R. 3288 on July 23, 2009 by a vote of 256-168 (Roll Call 637). We have assigned pluses to the "nays" because virtually every dollar assigned to this bill, whether it is for transportation or housing assistance, is unconstitutional and unaffordable. The Senate passed similar legislation on September 17, 2009. (See Senate vote #17.)

**15** Labor-HHS-Education Appropriations. This fiscal 2010 spending bill (H.R. 3293) would appropriate a massive \$730.5 billion for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education. This bill, which is the largest of all the annual appropriations bills, includes \$67.8 billion for the Department of Education and \$603.5 billion for the Department of Health and Human Services, including \$518.8 billion in "mandatory" spending for Medicare and Medicaid.

The House passed H.R. 3293 on July 24, 2009 by a vote of 264-153 (Roll Call 646). We have assigned pluses to the "nays" because the array of social welfare programs funded by this bill is unconstitutional and has failed historically.

Cash for Clunkers Funding. U House vote #10 in our previous Freedom Index described the "Cash for Clunkers" program that Congress passed in June (see our July 20, 2009 issue). After running out of funds almost immediately, Congress quickly introduced yet another bill (H.R. 3435) that would provide an additional \$2 billion for the "Cash for Clunkers" program. Under the program consumers were offered rebates of up to \$4,500 if they traded in their old cars for more fuel-efficient ones. The vehicles traded in were destroyed, meaning cars not ready for the junkyard would be taken off the road, reducing the stock of used vehicles and inflating the prices of used cars.

The House passed H.R. 3435 on July 31, 2009 by a vote of 316-109 (Roll Call

# House Vote Scores

Votes:	11-20	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	1-20
ALABAMA												
1 Bonner (R)	80%	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	75%
2 Bright (D)	30%	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	40%
3 Rogers, Mike D. (R)	-	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	50%
4 Aderholt (R)	70%	+	+	-	+	+	-		+	+	+	68%
5 Griffith (D )	30%	-	+	-	-	-	-		-	+	+	40%
6 Bachus, S. (R)	80%	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	75%
7 Davis, A. (D)	20%	-	+	+	Ŧ	+	-		+	+	+	25%
ALASKA	2070	-	Ŧ	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Ŧ	2970
Young, D. (R)	60%	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	53%
ARIZONA												
1 Kirkpatrick (D)	20%	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	25%
2 Franks, T. (R)	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	90%
3 Shadegg (R)	90%	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	85%
4 Pastor (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%
5 Mitchell (D )	40%		+	-	-	-	+	-	+	+		35%
6 Flake (R)	100%	+	?	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	100%
7 Grijalva (D)	100%	+	-	т -	т -	т -	т -	т -	- -	т -	т -	15%
8 Giffords (D)	10%	- -	-			-	+	-			-	15%
ARKANSAS	1070	-					т					1970
	10%		,									16%
1 Berry (D) 2 Snyder (D)	10%	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	16%
3 Boozman (R)	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	90%
4 Ross (D)	20%	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	25%
CALIFORNIA												
1 Thompson, M. (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%
2 Herger (R)	90%	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	85%
3 Lungren (R)	90%	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	85%
4 McClintock (R)	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	95%
5 Matsui (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%
6 Woolsey (D)	10%	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15%
7 Miller, George (D )	0%	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11%
8 Pelosi (D)	070	-	-	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	-	0%
9 Lee (D)	10%	+					-		-		-	15%
10 Garamendi (D)	1070										-	1)/0
	0%		-				-	-				10%
11 McNerney (D) 12 Speier (D)	10%		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20%
1 ( )		+		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
13 Stark (D)	30%	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	33%
14 Eshoo (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%
15 Honda (D)	10%	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%
16 Lofgren (D)	10%	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15%
17 Farr (D )	10%	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15%
18 Cardoza (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%
19 Radanovich (R)	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	+	+	95%
20 Costa (D)	10%	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15%
21 Nunes (R)	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	+	95%
22 McCarthy, K. (R)	89%	+	+	-	+	+	+	?	+	+	+	89%
23 Capps (D )	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%
24 Gallegly (R)	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	85%
25 McKeon (R)	90%	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	80%
26 Dreier (R)	70%	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	75%
27 Sherman (D)	10%	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%
28 Berman (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%
29 Schiff (D)	0%	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	5%
30 Waxman (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%
31 Becerra (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%

	Votes:	11-20	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	1-20
33	Watson (D)	11%	+	-	_	_	?	_	-	-	-	-	16%
34	Roybal-Allard (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%
35	Waters (D)	10%	+		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%
36	Harman (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%
37	Richardson (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%
38	Napolitano (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15%
39	Sanchez, Linda (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6%
40	Royce (R)	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	95%
41	Lewis, Jerry (R)	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	85%
42	Miller, Gary (R)	90%	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	84%
43	Baca (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%
44	Calvert (R)	90%	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	75%
45	Bono Mack (R)	70%	+	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	53%
46	Rohrabacher (R)	90%	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	85%
47	Sanchez, Loretta (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11%
48	Campbell (R)	90%	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	83%
49	Issa (R)	80%	+	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	85%
50	Bilbray (R)	70%	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	60%
51	Filner (D)	10%	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20%
52	Hunter (R)	90%	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	85%
53	Davis, S. (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%
	LORADO												
	DeGette (D)	0%	-					-				-	0%
	Polis (D)	20%	+	-	-	-		+	-	-	-	-	25%
3	Salazar, J. (D)	11%	- -	+	-	-	-	?	-	-	-	-	16%
4	Markey, B. (D)	20%		+	-	+		-	-	-	-	+	20%
	Lamborn (R)	20% 90%	+	+	-	++	+	+	+	+	+	++	20 % 90%
	Coffman (R)	90%	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	75%
7	Perlmutter (D)	0%	- -	+	-	- -	-	-	+	+	+	- -	5%
		070											170
	NNECTICUT												
	Larson, J. (D)	0%	-	-	?	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%
2	Courtney (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%
	DeLauro (D)	0%	-	-	?	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%
	Himes (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%
5	Murphy, C. (D)	0%	-	-	-	?	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%
DE	LAWARE												
	Castle (R)	50%	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	40%
FLO	ORIDA												
1	Miller, J. (R)	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	90%
2	Boyd, A. (D)	20%	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	25%
3	Brown, C. (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%
4	Crenshaw (R)	90%	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	80%
5	Brown-Waite, G. (R)	60%	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	65%
6	Stearns (R)	70%	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	70%
7	Mica (R)	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	85%
8	Grayson (D)	10%	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20%
	Bilirakis (R)	90%	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	75%
10	Young, C.W. (R)	78%	?	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	63%
11	Castor (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%
	Putnam (R)	70%	+	+	-	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	68%
13	Buchanan (R)	67%	+	+	-	+	-	?	-	+	+	+	61%
14	Mack (R)	90%	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	89%
	Posey (R)	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	90%
16	Rooney (R)	70%	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	70%
17	Meek, K. (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%
18	Ros-Lehtinen (R)	40%	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	35%
19	Wexler (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	?	-	-	-	-	-	5%



682). We have assigned pluses to the "nays" because the federal government should not be subsidizing the car industry and because it is unconstitutional and wasteful. The Senate passed a similar bill on August 6, 2009. (See Senate vote #15.)

#### **17** Energy-Water Appropriations.

The final version (conference report) of H.R. 3183 would appropriate \$34 billion in fiscal 2010 for energy and water projects. The funds would provide \$27.1 billion for the Energy Department, \$5.4 billion for the Army Corps of Engineers, and \$1.1 billion for the Interior Department's Bureau of Reclamation.

The House passed the final version of H.R. 3183 on October 1, 2009 by a vote of 308-114 (Roll Call 752). We have assigned pluses to the "nays" because the Department of Energy is not authorized by the Constitution. The Senate adopted this legislation on October 15, 2009. (See Senate vote #19.)

#### **4 Q** Agriculture Appropriations.


The final version (conference report) of the Agriculture appropriations bill (H.R. 2997) would authorize \$121.2 billion in fiscal 2010 for the Agriculture Department and related agencies. This social-welfare bill would include \$21 billion for the Agriculture Department, \$2.4 billion for the Food and Drug Administra-

tion, \$58.3 billion to fund the food stamp program, \$17 billion for the child nutrition program, \$7.3 billion for the Women, Infants, and Children program, and \$1.7 billion for the Food for Peace program.

Excluding emergency spending, H.R. 2997 would represent a \$2.7 billion increase from the 2009 appropriations level. More than 80 percent of the funds for H.R. 2997 would be reserved for mandatory programs such as food stamps and crop support.

The House passed the final version of H.R. 2997 on October 7, 2009 by a vote of 263-162 (Roll Call 761). We have assigned pluses to the "nays" because federal aid to farmers and federal food aid to individuals are not authorized by the Constitution. The Senate passed this legislation the following day. (See Senate vote #18.)

**19** Interior-Environment Appropriations. This appropriations bill (H.R. 2996) would authorize \$32.3 billion in fiscal 2010 for the Interior Department, the EPA, and related agencies. The bill would provide \$11 billion for the Interior Department, \$10.3 billion for the EPA, \$3.5 billion for the Forest Service, and \$4.1 billion for the Indian Health Service. Additionally, H.R. 2996 would authorize \$168 million each for the National Endowment for the Humanities,




The spending in H.R. 2996 is about \$4.7 billion, or roughly 17 percent, more than what was received in fiscal 2009 for the same programs. Representative Jerry Lewis (R-Calif.) argued that the increased spending is "irresponsible, especially in light of the fact Congress must soon consider legislation to increase our national debt limit."

The House adopted the conference report for H.R. 2996 on October 29, 2009 by a vote of 247-178 (Roll Call 826). We have assigned pluses to the "nays" because the majority of funding in the bill is unconstitutional and wasteful. The Senate passed this legislation on the same day. (See Senate vote #20.)

Healthcare "Reform." The pro-**ZU** visions in this bill (H.R. 3962) would cost about a trillion dollars (although such estimates are notoriously unreliable) over the next 10 years and complete the government takeover of our healthcare industry that was started with congressional passage of the original Medicare bill in 1965. This bill would overhaul the nation's health insurance system and require most individuals to buy health insurance by 2013. A Health Choices Administration would be created that would be tasked with establishing a federal health insurance exchange, including a government-run public health insurance option to allow individuals without coverage to obtain insurance. A federal excise tax would be levied on those that do not obtain coverage. Employers would be required to offer health insurance to employees or contribute to a fund for coverage. Failure to provide coverage would subject businesses to penalties of up to eight percent of their payroll. This bill would also bar insurance companies from denying or reducing coverage based on pre-existing medical conditions.

The House passed H.R. 3962 on November 7, 2009 by a vote of 220-215 (Roll Call 887). We have assigned pluses to the "nays" because a federal government takeover of our healthcare system is not authorized by the Constitution and will cost most Americans more for healthcare.



**Tall order:** House Republicans sift through and read some of the nearly 2,000 pages of the healthcare "reform" bill prior to House passage on Saturday, November 7. (See House vote #20.)

#### Freedom Index

Votes:	11-20	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	1-20	Votes: <u>1</u>	1
20 Wasserman Schultz (	(D) 0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%	KANSAS	
21 Diaz-Balart, L. (R)	50%	+	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	45%	1 Moran, Jerry (R)	
22 Klein, R. (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%	2 Jenkins (R)	
23 Hastings, A. (D)	0%	-	?	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	5%	3 Moore, D. (D)	
24 Kosmas (D)	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	15%	4 Tiahrt (R)	
25 Diaz-Balart, M. (R)	50%	+	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	45%	KENTUCKY	
GEORGIA													1 Whitfield (R)	
1 Kingston (R)	90%	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	85%	2 Guthrie (R)	
2 Bishop, S. (D)	10%					-		+				10%	3 Yarmuth (D)	
3 Westmoreland (R)	90%	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	90%	4 Davis, G. (R)	
4 Johnson, H. (D)	0%	-	-		-	-		-		-	-	10%	5 Rogers, H. (R)	
5 Lewis, John (D)	11%	?	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	18%	6 Chandler (D)	
6 Price, T. (R)	90%	+	+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	90%		
7 Linder (R)	100%	+	+	+	+	+	?	+	+	+	+	94%	LOUISIANA	
8 Marshall (D)	50%	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	45%	1 Scalise (R)	
9 Deal (R)	100%	+	+	+	+	+	?	+	+	+	+	94%	$2 \operatorname{Cao}(\mathbf{R})$	
10 Broun (R)	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	95%	3 Melancon (D)	
11 Gingrey (R)	89%	+	+	+	+	?		+	+	+	+	79%	4 Fleming (R)	ļ
12 Barrow (D)	30%	-	+			-		+		-	+	30%	5 Alexander, R. (R)	
13 Scott, D. (D)	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	10%	6 Cassidy (R)	
- , , , ,	1070											1070	7 Boustany (R)	ľ
HAWAII	0.07											=0(	MAINE	
1 Abercrombie (D)	0%	-	-	-	?	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%	1 Pingree (D)	
2 Hirono (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%	2 Michaud (D)	
IDAHO													MARYLAND	
1 Minnick (D)	40%	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	35%	1 Kratovil (D)	
2 Simpson (R)	80%	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	65%	2 Ruppersberger (D)	
ILLINOIS													3 Sarbanes (D)	
1 Rush (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%	4 Edwards, D. (D)	
2 Jackson, J. (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6%	5 Hoyer (D)	
3 Lipinski (D)	0%		-			-					-	11%	6 Bartlett (R) 1	
4 Gutierrez (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%	7 Cummings (D)	
5 Quigley (D )	0%					-					-	6%	8 Van Hollen (D)	
6 Roskam (R)	90%	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	85%		
7 Davis, D. (D)	0%		-			-	-	-			-	5%	MASSACHUSETTS	
8 Bean (D)	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	5%	1 Olver (D) 2 Nort (D)	
9 Schakowsky (D)	0%		-	-	-	-			-	-	-	5%	2 Neal (D)	
10 Kirk, M. (R)	40%	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	-	+	35%	3 McGovern (D)	
11 Halvorson (D)	0%		-	-	-	-			-			5%	4 Frank, B. (D)	
12 Costello (D)	20%	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	20%	5 Tsongas (D)	
13 Biggert (R)	70%	+	+		+	+	-	-	+	+	+	60%	6 Tierney (D)	
14 Foster (D)	10%	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%	7 Markey, E. (D)	
15 Johnson, Timothy (R		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	85%	8 Capuano (D)	
16 Manzullo (R)	90%	+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	+	85%	9 Lynch (D)	
17 Hare (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	10%	10 Delahunt (D)	
18 Schock (R)	70%	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	70%	MICHIGAN	
19 Shimkus (R)	90%	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	79%	1 Stupak (D)	
	)0/0			·	·	·			·	·	·	1910	2 Hoekstra (R)	
INDIANA	100/											100/	3 Ehlers (R)	
1 Visclosky (D)	10%	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%	4 Camp (R)	
2 Donnelly (D)	20%	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	20%	5 Kildee (D)	
3 Souder (R)	60%	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	50%	6 Upton (R)	
4 Buyer (R)	89%	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	?	+	84%	7 Schauer (D)	
5 Burton (R)	80%	+	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	75%	8 Rogers, Mike (R)	
6 Pence (R)	89%	+	+	-	+	?	+	+	+	+	+	89%	9 Peters (D)	
7 Carson, A. (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%	10 Miller, C. (R)	
8 Ellsworth (D)	10%	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20%	11 McCotter (R)	
9 Hill (D)	40%	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	-	30%	12 Levin, S. (D)	
IOWA													13 Kilpatrick (D)	
1 Braley (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%	14 Conyers (D)	
2 Loebsack (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%	15 Dingell (D)	
3 Boswell (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%	MINNESOTA	
4 Latham (R)	80%	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	65%	1 Walz (D)	
5 King, S. (R)	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	90%	2 Kline, J. (R)	1
-													2 mine, j. (K)	

Vo	otes: <u>11-20</u>	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	1-2
KANSAS												
1 Moran, Jerry (R	) 90%	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	84
2 Jenkins (R)	90%	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	90
3 Moore, D. (D)	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	10
4 Tiahrt (R)	80%	+	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	80
KENTUCKY												
1 Whitfield (R)	89%	+	+	-	+	+	+	?	+	+	+	83
2 Guthrie (R)	70%	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	65
3 Yarmuth (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
4 Davis, G. (R)	90%	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	85
5 Rogers, H. (R)	90%	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	75
6 Chandler (D)	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	15
LOUISIANA												
1 Scalise (R)	90%	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	85
2 Cao (R)	10%	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	25
3 Melancon (D)	20%	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	25
4 Fleming (R)	80%	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	75
5 Alexander, R. (F		?	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	74
6 Cassidy (R)	70%	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	60
7 Boustany (R)	80%	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	74
MAINE												
1 Pingree (D)	10%	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20
2 Michaud (D)	10%	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20
MARYLAND												
1 Kratovil (D)	40%	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	30
2 Ruppersberger	(D) 0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	?	-	-	6
3 Sarbanes (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
4 Edwards, D. (D	) 10%	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15
5 Hoyer (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
6 Bartlett (R)	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	95
7 Cummings (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
8 Van Hollen (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
MASSACHUSETTS												
1 Olver (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
2 Neal (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10
3 McGovern (D)	10%	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15
4 Frank, B. (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
5 Tsongas (D)	11%	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	?	-	-	16
6 Tierney (D)	20%	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	20
7 Markey, E. (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10
8 Capuano (D)	11%	+	-	-	-	-	-	?	-	-	-	16
9 Lynch (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10
10 Delahunt (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11
MICHIGAN												
1 Stupak (D)	10%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15
2 Hoekstra (R)	90%	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	75
3 Ehlers (R)	60%	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	60
4 Camp (R)	80%	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	75
5 Kildee (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
6 Upton (R)	70%	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	60
7 Schauer (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
8 Rogers, Mike (F		+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	65
9 Peters (D)	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	10
10 Miller, C. (R)	40%	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	40
11 McCotter (R)	70%	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	60
12 Levin, S. (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
13 Kilpatrick (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
14 Conyers (D)	10%	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	21
15 Dingell (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
MINNESOTA												
1 Walz (D)	0%	_	-		~			-	-	-	-	10



### 111<sup>TH</sup> CONGRESS, VOTES 11-20

	The second												
	Votes:	11-20	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	1-20
3	Paulsen (R)	90%	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	70%
	McCollum (D)	0%	-	-		-		-	-	-	-	-	10%
	Ellison (D)	10%	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15%
	Bachmann (R)	90%	+	+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	90%
7	Peterson (D)	30%	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-		+	30%
	Oberstar (D)	0%					-	-				-	5%
		070											970
	SSISSIPPI	2004											2501
	Childers (D)	30%	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	35%
	Thompson, B. (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%
	Harper (R)	67%	+	+	-	+	+	?	-	-	+	+	78%
4	Taylor (D)	70%	-	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	65%
MIS	SSOURI												
1	Clay (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%
2	Akin (R)	89%	+	+	?	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	84%
3	Carnahan (D )	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%
4	Skelton (D)	11%	-	-	-	?	-	-	-	-	-	+	6%
5	Cleaver (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%
	Graves (R)	100%	+	+	?	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	84%
	Blunt (R)	89%	+	+	+	?	+	-	+	+	+	+	84%
	Emerson (R)	80%	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	65%
	Luetkemeyer (R)	80%	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	80%
	NTANA												
MU		000/											700/
	Rehberg (R)	80%	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	70%
	BRASKA												
1	Fortenberry (R)	80%	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	75%
2	Terry (R)	70%	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	65%
3	Smith, Adrian (R)	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	95%
NEV	VADA												
1	Berkley (D)	0%	?	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11%
	Heller (R)	100%	+	+	?	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	84%
	Titus (D)	0%	-				-	-	-	-		-	10%
-	. ,	070											10/0
	W HAMPSHIRE	100/											2001
	Shea-Porter (D)	10%	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20%
2	Hodes (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%
NEV	W JERSEY												
1	Andrews (D)	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	5%
2	LoBiondo (R)	20%	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	25%
3	Adler (D)	22%	-	-	-	-	-	-	?	+	-	+	21%
4	Smith, C. (R)	30%	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	40%
	Garrett (R)	90%	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	90%
	Pallone (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%
7	Lance (R)	60%	+	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	45%
	Pascrell (D)	0%	-	-	-	?	-	-	?	-	-	-	6%
	Rothman (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%
	Payne (D)	10%	+	-	-	-		_		-	-	-	15%
	Frelinghuysen (R)	80%	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	55%
	Holt (D)	0%	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	5%
	Sires (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%
		070	-					-					J /0
	W MEXICO												
	Heinrich (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%
2	Teague (D)	20%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	26%
3	Lujan (D )	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%
NEV	W YORK												
	Bishop, T. (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%
	Israel (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%
	King, P. (R)	50%	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	50%
	McCarthy, C. (D)	0%	-	-	-	?	?	?	-	-	-	-	0%
	Ackerman (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%
	Meeks, G. (D)	0%	-	-				-		-	-	-	5%
7	Crowley (D)	0%	-	-	-		-	-		-	-	-	5%
	Nadler (D)	0%						-			?	-	5%
0	multi (D)	070	-	-	-	-	•	-			·		J/0

9         Weiner (D)         0%         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         0 <th< th=""><th></th><th>Votes</th><th>s: 11-20</th><th>11</th><th>12</th><th>13</th><th>14</th><th>15</th><th>16</th><th>17</th><th>18</th><th>19</th><th>20</th><th>1-20</th></th<>		Votes	s: 11-20	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	1-20
10       10       0%       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       0%         11       Carke (D)       0%       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       0       0       0       0       -       -       -       -       -       0       0       0       0       -       -       -       -       -       0       0       0       0       0       -       -       -       -       -       0       0       0       0       0       -       -       -       -       0       0       0       0       0       0       -       -       -       -       0       0       0       0       0       0       -       -       -       -       0       0       0       0       0       0       -       -       -       -       0       0       0       0       0       0       -       -       -       -       0       0       0       -       -       -       0       0       0       0       0       0       0	9	Weiner (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%
12       Velazquez (D)       0%       -				-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	?	-	
13       McMahon (D)       10%       -			0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
14       Maloney (D)       0%       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       0       0%         15       Rangel (D)       0%       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       0       0%         16       Serrano (D)       0%       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       0%         17       Engel (D)       0%       -	12	Velazquez (D )	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%
15       Rangel (D)       0%       - <t< td=""><td>13</td><td>McMahon (D)</td><td>10%</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>+</td><td>11%</td></t<>	13	McMahon (D)	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	11%
16       Serrano (D)       10%       +       -	14	Maloney (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	?	?	-	-	6%
17       Engel (D)       0%       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       0%         18       Lowey (D)       0%       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       0%         20       Murphy, S. (D)       20%       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       5%         20       Murphy, S. (D)       00%       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       5%         23       Owens (D)       0%       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       5%         25       Maffei (D)       0%       -       -       -       -       -       -       15%         26       Lec, C, (R)       0%       +       +       +       +       +       47%       7%         28       Slaughter (D)       0%       -       -       -       -       -       -       5%         29       Massa (D)       0%       -       -       -       -       -       -       5%         3       Jones	15	Rangel (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%
18       Lowey (D)       0%       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       0%         19       Hall, J. (D)       0%       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       5%         20       Murphy, S(D)       0%       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       5%         21       Inche (D)       0%       -       -       -       -       -       -       5%         23       Owers (D)       0%       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       5%         24       Arcuri (D)       10%       -       +       +       +       +       +       +       4       11%         26       Lee, C. (R)       60%       +       +       +       +       +       +       +       4       4       30%         7       Higgins (D)       0%       -       -       -       -       -       -       5%         29       Massa (D)       30%       +       +       +       +       +       7       -       -       - <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>+</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td></td></td<>				+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
19       Hall, J. (D)       0%       -		0						-	-					
20 Murphy S. (D) 20% + + + 21% 21 Tooko (D) 0%		•				-		-	-					
21       Tonko (D)       0%       -       -       -       -       -       -       5%         21       Hinchey (D)       0%       -       -       -       -       -       5%         23       Owens (D)       -       -       -       -       -       -       5%         24       Arcuri (D)       10%       -       +       +       +       +       +       4         25       Maffei (D)       0%       -						-			-					
22       Hinchey (D)       0%       -       -       -       -       -       -       5%         23       Owens (D)       10%       +       +       - <td< td=""><td></td><td>A 1.</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>+</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>		A 1.							+					
23 Ovens (D) 10% - +				-	-	-	-		-	-		-		
24       Arcuri (D)       10%       -       +       -			0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		5%
25       Maffei (D)       0%       -       <	-		10%											15%
26 Lee, C. (R) 60% + + + - + + + + + + + 47% 27 Higgins (D) 0%									-					
27       Higgins (D)       0%       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       5%         28       Slaughter (D)       0%       -       -       ?       -       -       -       -       5%         29       Massa (D)       30%       +       +       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       5%         29       Massa (D)       30%       +       +       -<	-													
28       Slaughter (D) $0\%$ $  -$		, , ,							-					
29       Massa (D) $30\%$ +       +       -       -       -       -       -       + $30\%$ NORTH CAROLINA       I       Butterfield (D) $0\%$ -       -		00				-		?						
NORTH CAROLINA         1         Butterfield (D)       0%       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       0%         2       Etheridge (D)       0%       -				+	+	-			-	-	-	-	+	
1       Butterfield (D)       0%       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       0%         2       Etheridge (D)       0%       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       5%         3       Jones, W. (R)       67%       +			50,0											0.0,0
2       Etheridge (D)       0%       -       +			0%											0%
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$					-	-	-	-	-	-	-		-	
4       Price, D. (D)       0%       -       -       -       -       -       -       0%         5       Foxx (R)       100%       +       10%       10%       +       -       -       -       -       -       -       5%       10%       10%       10%       -       -       -       -       -       10%       10%       +       +       +       +       +       10%       10%       10%										-				
5       Foxx (R)       100%       + <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>														
6Coble (R)80%+++ <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>+</td><td>+</td><td>+</td><td>+</td><td>+</td><td>+</td><td>+</td><td>+</td><td></td><td></td></td<>					+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		
7 McIntyre (D) $30\%$ - + + + + $35\%$ 8 Kissell (D) $20\%$ - + + + $21\%$ 9 Myrick (R) $100\%$ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + $21\%$ 10 McHenry (R) $10\%$ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + $21\%$ 11 Shuler (D) $10\%$ + $25\%$ 12 Watt (D) $0\%$ $5\%$ 13 Miller, B. (D) $0\%$ - + $5\%$ 13 Miller, B. (D) $10\%$ - + $5\%$ 10 MCRTH DAKOTA Pomeroy (D) $10\%$ - + $5\%$ 10 Triehaus (D) $10\%$ - + + $5\%$ 2 Schmidt (R) $89\%$ + + + + + + + + + + + $84\%$ 3 Turner (R) $60\%$ + + + + + + + + + + + + $55\%$ 4 Jordan (R) $100\%$ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + $55\%$ 5 Latta (R) $100\%$ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + $55\%$ 7 Austria (R) $70\%$ + + - + + + $5\%$ 7 Austria (R) $70\%$ + + - + + + + + + + + + + $50\%$ 10 Kucinich (D) $10\%$ $5\%$ 11 Euler (R) $100\%$ + + + $2\%$ + + + + + + + + $50\%$ 11 Euler (R) $100\%$ + + + $2\%$ + $2\%$ + + + + + + $50\%$ 12 Tiberi (R) $70\%$ + + $5\%$ 14 LaTourette (R) $50\%$ + + $5\%$ 14 LaTourette (R) $50\%$ + + $5\%$ 15 Kilroy (D) $0\%$ $5\%$ 16 Kilroy (D) $0\%$ $5\%$ 17 Ryan, T. (D) $0\%$ $5\%$ 18 Space (D) $0\%$ 0\% 18 Space (D) $0\%$														
8       Kisseli (D) $20\%$ -       +       -       -       -       -       + $21\%$ 9       Myrick (R) $100\%$ +       +									-					
10McHenry (R)100%+++++++++++++++++95%11Shuler (D)0%5%12Watt (D)0%5%13Miller, B. (D)0%5%NORTH DAKOTAPomeroy (D)10%-++10%OHIO110%+++++++443Turner (R)60%++-+++++++443Turner (R)60%++5%4Jordan (R)100%+++++++++95%5Latta (R)100%+++++++++++96%6Wilson, Charlie (D)10%+++++++++96%8Boehner (R)100%++20%10Kucinich (D)60%+ </td <td></td> <td>•</td> <td></td> <td>-</td> <td>+</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>+</td> <td></td>		•		-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	
11       Shuler (D) $10\%$ -       -       -       -       -       -       + $25\%$ 12       Watt (D) $0\%$ -       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       5%         13       Miller, B. (D) $0\%$ -       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       5%         NORTH DAKOTA         Pomeroy (D) $10\%$ -       +       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       10%         Official (R) $89\%$ +       55%	9	Myrick (R)	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	90%
12       Watt (D)       0%       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       5%         13       Miller, B. (D)       0%       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       5%         NORTH DAKOTA       Pomeroy (D)       10%       -       +       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       10%         0HIO       1       Driehaus (D)       10%       -       -       + <td>10</td> <td>McHenry (R)</td> <td>100%</td> <td>+</td> <td>95%</td>	10	McHenry (R)	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	95%
13 Miller, B. (D)       0%       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       5%         NORTH DAKOTA         Pomeroy (D)       10%       -       +       -       -       -       -       -       -       10%         OHIO       1       Driehaus (D)       10%       -       -       +	11	Shuler (D)	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	25%
NORTH DAKOTA         Pomeroy (D)       10%       -       +       -       -       -       -       -       -       1       10%         OHIO       1       Driehaus (D)       10%       -       -       +       -       -       -       -       -       -       1       10%         2       Schmidt (R)       89%       + <td>12</td> <td>Watt (D)</td> <td>0%</td> <td>-</td> <td>5%</td>	12	Watt (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%
Pomeroy (D)       10%       -       +       -       -       -       -       -       -       10%         OHIO       1       Driehaus (D)       10%       -       -       +       -       -       -       -       -       15%         2       Schmidt (R)       89%       +       +       -       +	13	Miller, B. (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%
OHIO         1 Driehaus (D)       10%       -       -       +       -       -       -       -       15%         2 Schmidt (R)       89%       + <td>NO</td> <td>RTH DAKOTA</td> <td></td>	NO	RTH DAKOTA												
1Driehaus (D) $10\%$ +15%2Schmidt (R) $89\%$ ++-++ <td< td=""><td></td><td>Pomeroy (D)</td><td>10%</td><td>-</td><td>+</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>10%</td></td<>		Pomeroy (D)	10%	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%
1Driehaus (D) $10\%$ +15%2Schmidt (R) $89\%$ ++-++ <td< td=""><td>он</td><td>10</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>	он	10												
2Schmidt (R) $89\%$ +++ <td></td> <td></td> <td>10%</td> <td>-</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>+</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>15%</td>			10%	-			+							15%
3Turner (R) $60\%$ +++				+	+	-			+	?	+	+		
4Jordan (R)100%+++100%6Wilson, Charlie (D)10%-+5%7Austria (R)70%+++++++++++490%68Boehner (R)100%+++++++++410%10%10%++++++++410%10									-					
5       Latta (R)       100%       +       <						+	+		+	+				
6Wilson, Charlie (D) $10\%$ -+5%7Austria (R) $70\%$ ++-+++5%8Boehner (R) $100\%$ ++?+++++++60%8Boehner (R) $100\%$ ++?+?++++94%9Kaptur (D) $10\%$ +20%10Kucinich (D) $60\%$ +++++++50%11Fudge (D) $0\%$ ?5%12Tiberi (R) $70\%$ ++++++++58%13Sutton (D) $0\%$ 5%14LaTourette (R) $50\%$ ++10%16Boccieri (D) $10\%$ 10%16Boccieri (D) $10\%$ 0%18Space (D) $0\%$ 10%OKLAHOMA1Sullivan (R) $88\%$ ??-+ </td <td></td> <td></td> <td>100%</td> <td>+</td> <td></td>			100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
8       Boehner (R)       100%       +       +       ?       +       50%       +       +       -       -       -       -       -				-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
9       Kaptur (D)       10%       +       -       -       -       -       -       -       20%         10       Kucinich (D)       60%       +       +       +       -       -       -       +       -       -       20%         11       Fudge (D)       0%       -       -       ?       -       -       +       +       +       50%         11       Fudge (D)       0%       -       ?       -       -       -       -       -       5%         12       Tiberi (R)       70%       +       45%         14       LaTourette (R)       0%       -       -       -       -       -       -       -       10%	7	Austria (R)	70%	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	60%
10Kurinich (D) $60\%$ +++++++50%11Fudge (D) $0\%$ ?5%12Tiberi (R) $70\%$ ++-++++++58%13Sutton (D) $0\%$ 5%14LaTourette (R) $50\%$ ++-+-+++45%15Kilroy (D) $0\%$ 10%16Boccieri (D) $10\%$ 10%16Boccieri (D) $10\%$ 0%18Space (D) $0\%$ 10%OKLAHOMA1Sullivan (R) $88\%$ ??-++++425%3Lucas (R) $100\%$ ++++++++485%4Cole (R) $80\%$ ++++++++75%	8	Boehner (R)	100%	+	+	?	+	?	+	+	+	+	+	94%
11Fudge (D) $0\%$ ?5%12Tiberi (R) $70\%$ ++++++++++58%13Sutton (D) $0\%$ 5%14LaTourette (R) $50\%$ +++++45%15Kilroy (D) $0\%$ 10%16Boccieri (D) $10\%$ 10%16Boccieri (D) $10\%$ 10%16Boccieri (D) $0\%$ 10%18Space (D) $0\%$ 10%OKLAHOMA1Sullivan (R) $88\%$ ??-++++81%2Boren (D) $20\%$ -++25%3Lucas (R) $100\%$ ++++++++75%4Cole (R) $80\%$ ++++++++75%	9	Kaptur (D)	10%	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20%
12Tiber (R) $70\%$ +++ <td>10</td> <td>Kucinich (D)</td> <td>60%</td> <td>+</td> <td>+</td> <td>+</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>+</td> <td>-</td> <td>+</td> <td>+</td> <td>50%</td>	10	Kucinich (D)	60%	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	50%
13Sutton (D) $0\%$ 5%14LaTourette (R) $50\%$ ++-+-+-++45%15Kilroy (D) $0\%$ 10%16Boccieri (D) $10\%$ 10%16Boccieri (D) $10\%$ +15%17Ryan, T. (D) $0\%$ 0%18Space (D) $0\%$ 10%OKLAHOMA1Sullivan (R) $88\%$ ??-+++++81%2Boren (D) $20\%$ -++25%3Lucas (R) $100\%$ ++++++++++++45%4Cole (R) $80\%$ +++++++++75%	11		0%	-	-	?	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%
14LaTourette (R) $50\%$ +++-+-+45%15Kilroy (D) $0\%$ 10%16Boccieri (D) $10\%$ 10%16Boccieri (D) $10\%$ +15%17Ryan, T. (D) $0\%$ 0%18Space (D) $0\%$ 0%OKLAHOMA1Sullivan (R) $88\%$ ??-+++++81%2Boren (D) $20\%$ -++25%3Lucas (R) $100\%$ +++++++++45%4Cole (R) $80\%$ ++++++++75%			70%	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	58%
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$				-	-	-	-		-	-		-		
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$														
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$									-					
18 Space (D)       0%       -       -       -       -       -       -       10%         OKLAHOMA         1 Sullivan (R)       88%       ?       ?       -       +       +       +       +       +       +       +       +       81%         2 Boren (D)       20%       -       +       -       -       -       -       +       25%         3 Lucas (R)       100%       +       +       +       +       +       +       +       +       85%         4 Cole (R)       80%       +       +       +       +       +       +       +       +       75%									-					
OKLAHOMA         1 Sullivan (R)       88% ? ? - + + + + + + + + 81%         2 Boren (D)       20% - + + 25%         3 Lucas (R)       100% + + + + + + + + + + + + + 85%         4 Cole (R)       80% + + - + + + + + + + + + 75%														
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		•	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$														
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$						-	+	+	+	+	+	+		
4 Cole (R) $80\% + + - + + + + - + 75\%$									-					
5 ramm (K) $90% + + + + + + + + - + 90%$														
	)	railli (K)	90%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	90%

#### Freedom Index

	Votes: 11-20	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	1-20
OREGON	<u></u>	<u> </u>										<u> </u>
1 Wu (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%
2 Walden (R	) 90%	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	65%
3 Blumenaue	r (D) 10%	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	5%
4 DeFazio (D	) 10%	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15%
5 Schrader (1	D) 10%	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	10%
PENNSYLVANI	١											
1 Brady, R. (I	0) 0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%
2 Fattah (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%
3 Dahlkempe	r (D) 11%	-	+	-	-	?	-	-	-	-	-	16%
4 Altmire (D	) 30%	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	25%
5 Thompson,	G. (R) 70%	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	65%
6 Gerlach (R	) 60%	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	45%
7 Sestak (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%
8 Murphy, P.		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	?	-	0%
9 Shuster (R		+	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	75%
10 Carney (D)		-	+	-	-	-	-	?	?	-	-	17%
11 Kanjorski (		-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	10%
12 Murtha (D		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%
13 Schwartz (I		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%
14 Doyle (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%
15 Dent (R)	70%	+	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	55%
16 Pitts (R)	90%	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	85%
17 Holden (D		-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	15%
18 Murphy, T.		+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	?	+	42%
19 Platts (R)	60%	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	+	50%
RHODE ISLAN	D											
1 Kennedy (D	) 0%	?	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%
2 Langevin (I	)) 0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%
SOUTH CAROL	INA											
1 Brown, H. (	(R) 100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	95%
2 Wilson, J. (		+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	90%
3 Barrett (R)	100%	+	+	+	?	?	+	?	+	?	+	88%
4 Inglis (R)	90%	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	85%
5 Spratt (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%
6 Clyburn (D	) 0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%
SOUTH DAKO	ГА											
Herseth Sar		-	+	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	35%
	(_ )											57.0
TENNESSEE	000/											700/
1 Roe (R)	80%	+	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	70%
2 Duncan (R 3 Wamp (P)		+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	95% 70%
3 Wamp (R) 4 Davis, L. (D	80% 20%	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	79%
5 Cooper (D		-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	20% 10%
6 Gordon (D		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	10%
7 Blackburn		-+	-+	-+	+	+	-+	-+	-+	-+	++	90%
8 Tanner (D)		Ŧ	++	+	+	Ŧ	+	+	Ŧ	+	++	22%
9 Cohen (D)	0%	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	10%
	070						-					1070
TEXAS							0					0/0/
1 Gohmert (F		+	+	+	+	+	?	+	+	+	+	94%
2 Poe (R)	90%	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	79%
3 Johnson, S.		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	+	+	95%
4 Hall, R. (R		+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	70%
5 Hensarling		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	95%
6 Barton (R)		+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	80%
7 Culberson (		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	95% 05%
8 Brady, K. (F		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	95%
9 Green, A. (1		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5% 80%
10 McCaul (R		+	+	+	+	+	?	+	+	+	+	89%
11 Conaway (F 12 Granger (R		+	+	+ ?	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	95% 82%
12 Granger (R 13 Thornberry		++	++	? +	++	+	++	-	++	++	++	82% 90%
				+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	40%

	Votes:	11-20	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	1-20
14	Paul (R)	100%				?	?				-		100%
14 15	Hinojosa (D)	0%	+	+	+	؛ -	? -	+	+	+	+	+	5%
16	Reves (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-			-		5%
17	Edwards, C. (D)	20%	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	10%
	Jackson-Lee (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	?	-	-	-	-	-	0%
19	Neugebauer (R)	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	?	+	+	94%
20	Gonzalez (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%
21	Smith, Lamar (R)	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	95%
22	Olson (R)	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	95%
23	Rodriguez (D)	10%	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15%
24	Marchant (R)	89%	+	+	+	+	?	-	+	+	+	+	89%
	Doggett (D)	20%	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	30%
	Burgess (R)	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	89%
27	Ortiz (D)	10%	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%
	Cuellar (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%
	Green, G. (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%
	Johnson, E. (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%
31	Carter (R)	90%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	90%
32	Sessions, P. (R)	90%	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	89%
UT/													
1	Bishop, R. (R)	100%	+	+	+	?	?	+	+	+	+	+	94%
2	Matheson (D)	70%	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	+	50%
3	Chaffetz (R)	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	90%
VE	RMONT												
	Welch (D)	10%	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20%
VIR	GINIA												
1	Wittman (R)	90%	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	75%
2	Nye (D)	70%	-	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	45%
3	Scott, R. (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%
4	Forbes (R)	90%	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	85%
5	Perriello (D)	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	17%
6	Goodlatte (R)	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	95%
7	Cantor (R)	90%	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	85%
8	Moran, James (D )	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%
9	Boucher (D)	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	11%
10	Wolf (R)	70%	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	65%
11	Connolly (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%
WA	SHINGTON												
1	Inslee (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15%
2	Larsen, R. (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%
	Baird (D )	40%	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	30%
	Hastings, D. (R)	90%	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	85%
	McMorris Rodgers (H		+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	84%
	Dicks (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%
	McDermott (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15%
	Reichert (R)	30%	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	35%
	Smith, Adam (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%
	ST VIRGINIA												
1		10%	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%
2		67%	+	+	-	+	?	-	-	+	+	+	53%
	Rahall (D)	10%	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%
	SCONSIN												
	Ryan, P. (R)	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	95%
2	( )	10%	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15%
	Kind (D)	40%	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	-	30%
	Moore, G. (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%
	Sensenbrenner (R)	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	95%
	Petri (R)	80%	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	70%
	Obey (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%
	Kagen (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15%
WY	OMING												
	Lummis (R)	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	95%
									_				

111<sup>TH</sup> CONGRESS, VOTES 11-20

# Senate Vote Descriptions

**11** Supplemental Appropriations. The final version (conference report) of the fiscal 2009 supplemental appropriations bill (H.R. 2346), which would provide \$105.9 in "emergency" funding, is described in House vote #11.

The Senate adopted the conference report (thus sending it to the President) on June 18, 2009 by a vote of 91-5 (Roll Call 210). We have assigned pluses to the "nays" because the spending is over and above what the federal government had already budgeted, the United States never declared war against Iraq and Afghanistan, and some of the spending (e.g., Cash for Clunkers and foreign aid) is unconstitutional.

**O** Koh Confirmation. On March 23, 2009, President Obama announced his intent to nominate Harold Hongju Koh to be the Legal Adviser of the U.S. State Department. During Senate floor debate on Koh's confirmation on June 23, Senator Jim DeMint provided evidence of Koh's positions regarding international law and the U.S. Constitution, and then concluded that "Mr. Koh believes that if our President and Congress, empowered by our Constitution, decide military action is needed to defend our Nation from harm, we must get United Nations approval or our actions are illegal." As further evidence of Koh's troubling beliefs regarding the Constitution and international law, Senator DeMint quoted from a 2004 law review article entitled "International Law as Part of Our Law," in which Koh states: "U.S. domestic courts must play a key role in coordinating U.S. domestic constitutional rules with rules of foreign and international law, not simply to promote American aims but to advance the broader development of a well-functioning international judicial system."

The Senate confirmed Harold Koh to be State Department Legal Adviser on June 25, 2009 by a vote of 62-35 (Roll Call 213). We have assigned pluses to the "nays" because subordination of U.S. sovereignty to international law and international organizations would undermine the Constitution.



**On Capitol Hill:** Senate Judiciary Committee Chairman Patrick Leahy (left) escorts Sonia Sotomayor on Capitol Hill prior to her confirmation for the U.S. Supreme Court. (See Senate vote #14.) Sotomayor's record and statements indicate she will not be guided by original intent.

**13** Hate Crimes. Senator Patrick Leahy (D-Vt.) attached an amendment to the Fiscal 2010 Defense Authorization bill (H.R. 1390) that would expand the federal hate-crimes law. Attaching such an amendment to a "must-pass" appropriations bill further ensured passage of the legislation by preventing "nay" votes from Senators who supported the annual appropriations bill. The expanded hate-crimes law would cover victims of crimes based on one's sexual orientation, gender identity, or disability. (Current law covers crimes based on race, color, religion, or national origin.)

The Senate agreed to invoke cloture on the Leahy amendment (thus limiting debate so that the amendment itself could be voted on) on July 16, 2009 by a vote of 63-28 (Roll Call 233). The amendment was subsequently adopted by unanimous consent. We have assigned pluses to the "nays" because this legislation would further federalize the criminal code, as well as punish not only criminal acts but the thoughts behind them.

**14** Sotomayor Confirmation. Judge Sonia Sotomayor revealed her view on our God-given right to keep and bear arms while on the Second Circuit Court in the case of *United States v. San*- *chez-Villar* (2004). In a footnote to their decision on this case, Sotomayor and two colleagues dismissed a Second Amendment claim by holding that "the right to possess a gun is clearly not a fundamental right." Her widely quoted remarks that the "court of appeals is where policy is made" and "I would hope that a wise Latina woman with the richness of her experiences would, more often than not, reach a better conclusion than a white male who hasn't lived that life" provide further evidence that Sotomayor does not base her judicial decisions on the original intent of the Constitution.

The Senate confirmed Sonia Sotomayor to be an Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court on August 6, 2009 by a vote of 68-31 (Roll Call 262). We have assigned pluses to the "nays" because Judge Sotomayor is not committed to adhering to the original intent of the Constitution in her judicial decisions.

**15** Cash for Clunkers Funding. H.R. 3435 would authorize an additional \$2 billion for the "Cash for Clunkers" vehicle trade-in program. Under the "Cash for Clunkers" program, consumers would trade in their old cars for more fuel-

efficient vehicles. (See House vote #16 for

more details.)

# Senate Vote Scores

	Votes: 11-20	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	1-20
ALABAMA												
Shelby (R)	50%	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	70%
Sessions, J. (R)	90%	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	89%
ALASKA												
Murkowski (R)		-	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	45%
Begich (D)	10%	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	11%
ARIZONA												
McCain (R)	89%	-	+	+	+	+	?	+	+	+	+	84%
Kyl (R)	80%	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	80%
ARKANSAS	100/											100/
Lincoln (D) Pryor (D)	10% 10%	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	10% 5%
	1070	-	-	-	-	-	Ŧ	-	-	-	-	)/0
CALIFORNIA	100/											<b>5</b> 0/
Feinstein (D) Boxer (D)	10% 10%	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	5% 5%
	1070	-	-	-	-	-	Ŧ	-	-	-	-	)/0
COLORADO	109/	_		_						_		110/
Udall, Mark (D) Bennet (D)	) 10% 10%	-	-	-	-	-	++	-	-	-	-	11% 5%
	1070				-		т	-	-	-	-	J70
CONNECTICUT	100/											<b>5</b> 0/
Dodd (D) Lieberman (I)	10% 10%	-	-	-	-	-	++	-	-	-	-	5% 5%
	1070						т					J70
DELAWARE	100/											<b>5</b> 0/
Carper (D) Kaufman (D)	10% 10%	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	5% 5%
	1070	-	-	-	-	-	Ŧ	-	-	-	-	)/0
FLORIDA	109/					-				_		E 0/
Nelson, Bill (D) LeMieux (R)	10% 80%	-	-	-	-	-	++	+	+	-	+	5% 80%
	0070											0070
GEORGIA Chambliss (R)	90%	-									+	84%
Isakson (R)	90% 80%	-	++	++	++	++	+	++	++	++	-	80%
	0070			•	•				•	•		0070
HAWAII Inouye (D)	10%	_	-	_	_	-	+	-	-	-	-	5%
Akaka (D)	10%	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	5%
IDAHO												2.0
Crapo (R)	60%	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	75%
Risch (R)	60%	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	75%
ILLINOIS												
Durbin (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%
Burris (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%
INDIANA												
Lugar (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	+	35%
Bayh (D)	50%	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	45%
IOWA												
Grassley (R)	90%	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	85%
Harkin (D)	10%	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	5%
KANSAS												
Brownback (R)	40%	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	65%
Roberts (R)	50%	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	70%
KENTUCKY												
McConnell (R)	80%	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	85%
Bunning (R)	89%	-	+	?	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	89%
LOUISIANA												
Landrieu (D)	13%	-	-	-	-	-	+	?	-	?	-	6%
Vitter (R)	67%	-	+	+	+	+	?	+	-	-	+	79%

	Votes:	11-20	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	1-20
MAINE		100/											150/
Snowe (R)		10%	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	15%
Collins (R)		10%	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	20%
MARYLAND													
Mikulski (D)		0%	-	-	-	-	?	?	-	-	-	-	0%
Cardin (D)		10%	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	5%
MASSACHUSETT	S												
Kerry (D)		13%	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	?	?	-	6%
Kirk, P. (D)										-	-	-	
MICHIGAN													
Levin, C. (D)		10%	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	5%
Stabenow (D)		10%	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	5%
MINNESOTA													
Klobuchar (D)		10%											10%
Franken (D)		13%	-	-	-	-	-	++	-	-	-		13%
		1370			-	-	-	т	-	-	-		1,570
MISSISSIPPI		- ( 0 (											(20)
Cochran (R)		56%	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	?	-	63%
Wicker (R)		60%	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	65%
MISSOURI													
Bond (R)		22%	-	+	?	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	47%
McCaskill (D)		50%	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	25%
MONTANA													
Baucus, M. (D)		10%	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	10%
Tester (D)		10%	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	5%
NEBRASKA		200/											200/
Nelson, Ben (D)		20%	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	-	30%
Johanns (R)		70%	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	74%
NEVADA													
Reid, H. (D)		10%	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	5%
Ensign (R)		100%	?	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	95%
NEW HAMPSHIR	Æ												
Gregg (R)		38%	-	+	?	-	+	?	-	+	-	-	50%
Shaheen (D)		10%	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	11%
NEW JERSEY													
Lautenberg (D)		10%	-	-			-	+	-	-	-	-	5%
Menendez (D)		10%	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	5%
		1070											110
NEW MEXICO		100/											
Bingaman (D)		10%	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	5%
Udall, T. (D)		10%	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	5%
NEW YORK													
Schumer (D)		10%	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	5%
Gillibrand (D)		0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%
NORTH CAROLI	NA												
Burr (R)		89%	-	+	+	+	+	?	+	+	+	+	84%
Hagan (D)		10%	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	5%
NORTH DAKOTA													
Conrad (D)	1	10%	-	_	_	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	5%
Dorgan (D)		10%	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	11%
0		10/0						т					11/0
OHIO													
Voinovich (R)		10%	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	30%
Brown, S. (D)		10%	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	5%
OKLAHOMA													
Inhofe (R)		90%	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	90%
Coburn (R)		100%	+	+	+	+	+	?	+	+	+	+	100%



#### 111<sup>th</sup> Congress, Votes 11-20

	Votes:	11-20	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	1-20		Votes:	11-20	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	1-2
OREGON														UTAH													
Wyden (D)		10%	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	10%	Hatch (R)		70%	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	719
Merkley (D)		10%	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	5%	Bennett (R)		50%	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	65%
PENNSYLVANIA														VERMONT													
Specter (D)		10%	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	20%	Leahy (D)		10%	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	5%
Casey (D)		0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%	Sanders (I)		10%	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	209
RHODE ISLAND														VIRGINIA													
Reed, J. (D)		10%	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	5%	Webb (D)		10%	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	109
Whitehouse (D)		0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%	Warner (D)		20%	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	-	10%
SOUTH CAROLIN	JA													WASHINGTON													
Graham (R)		75%	-	+	?	-	+	?	+	+	+	+	83%	Murray (D)		10%	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	69
DeMint (R)		100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	95%	Cantwell (D)		10%	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	10%
SOUTH DAKOTA														WEST VIRGINIA													
Johnson, Tim (D	)	10%	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	5%	Byrd (D)		0%	?	?	?	-	?	?	-	?	-	-	179
Thune (R)		80%	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	85%	Rockefeller (D)		10%	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	6%
TENNESSEE														WISCONSIN													
Alexander, L. (R)	)	22%	-	+	?	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	37%	Kohl (D)		10%	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	5%
Corker (R)		67%	-	+	?	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	68%	Feingold (D)		30%	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	35%
TEXAS														WYOMING													
Hutchison (R)		67%	-	+	+	+	+	?	-	-	+	+	68%	Enzi (R)		90%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	85%
Cornyn (R)		80%	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	85%	Barrasso (R)		80%	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	859

The scores are derived by dividing the constitutionally correct votes (pluses) by the total number of pluses and minuses and multiplying by 100. (A "?" means a Senator did not vote; a "P" means he voted "present." If he cast fewer than five votes in this index, a score is not assigned.) Match numbers at the top of the chart to Senate vote descriptions on pages 8 and 10.

The Senate passed H.R. 3435 on August 6, 2009 by a vote of 60-37 (Roll Call 270). We have assigned pluses to the "nays" because the federal government should not be subsidizing the car industry and because it is unconstitutional and wasteful.

**ACORN Funding.** Senator Mike **6** Johanns (R-Neb.) offered an amendment to the fiscal 2010 Transportation-HUD appropriations bill (H.R. 3288) stating: "None of the funds made available under this Act may be directly or indirectly distributed to the Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now (ACORN)." According to a September 15 AP story, Johanns "said that ACORN has received \$53 million in taxpayer funds since 1994 and that the group was eligible for a wider set of funding in the pending legislation, which funds housing and transportation programs." ACORN has come under intense scrutiny since the release of videos on September 9 by two conservatives, who posed as a prostitute and her pimp, in which ACORN employees in Baltimore gave advice on buying a home with illicit funds and how to account on tax forms for the woman's income. Over the next few days, the pair released several other videos depicting similar situations in ACORN offices around the nation.

The Senate passed the ACORN Funding Ban amendment to H.R. 3288 on September 14, 2009 by a vote of 83-7 (Roll Call 275). We have assigned pluses to the "yeas" because federal government funding of community organizations is not authorized by the Constitution.

**17** Transportation-HUD Appropriations. The Senate version of H.R. 3288 is similar to the House-passed version. (See House vote #14.) The Senate version would authorize \$122 billion, including \$67.7 billion in discretionary spending, for the Departments of Transportation and Housing and Urban Development and related agencies.

The Senate passed H.R. 3288 on September 17, 2009 by a vote of 73-25 (Roll Call 287). We have assigned pluses to the "nays" because virtually every dollar assigned to this bill, whether it is for transportation or housing assistance, is unconstitutional and unaffordable.

**18** Agriculture Appropriations. The final version (conference report) of this fiscal 2010 spending bill (H.R. 2997) to appropriate \$121.2 billion for the Agriculture Department and related agencies is described in House vote #18.

The Senate adopted the conference re-

port (thus sending it to the President) on October 8, 2009 by a vote of 76-22 (Roll Call 318). We have assigned pluses to the "nays" because federal aid to farmers and federal food aid to individuals are not authorized by the Constitution.

**19** Energy-Water Appropriations. The final version (conference report) of this 2010 spending bill (H.R. 3183) to appropriate \$34 billion for energy and water projects is described in House vote #17.

The Senate adopted the conference report (thus sending it to the President) on October 15, 2009 by a vote of 80-17 (Roll Call 322). We have assigned pluses to the "nays" because the Department of Energy is not authorized by the Constitution.

**20** Interior-Environment Appropriations. The final version (conference report) of the \$32.3 billion Interior-Environment appropriations bill for fiscal 2010 (H.R. 2996) is described in House vote #19.

The Senate adopted the conference report (thus sending it to the President) on October 29, 2009 by a vote of 72-28 (Roll Call 331). We have assigned pluses to the "nays" because the majority of funding in the bill is unconstitutional and wasteful.



#### **Overview of America**

(2006, 32min, cased DVD, 1/\$5.95) DVD00A (2006, 32min, sleeved DVD, 1/\$1.00; 25/\$20.00; 50/\$37.50; 100/\$70.00) DVD00APS

#### Man, Freedom and Government

(2005, 24min, cased DVD, 1/\$5.95) DVDMFG (2005, 24min, sleeved DVD, 1/\$1.00; 25/\$20.00; 50/\$37.50; 100/\$70.00) DVDMFGPS

**Brushfires of Freedom** (2008, 52min, DVD, 1/\$1.00; 25/\$20.00; 50/\$37.50; 100/\$70.00) DVDBF

QUANTITY	TITLE	PRICE TOTAL PRICE
SUBTOTAL	WI RESIDENTS ADD SHIPPING/HANDLIN 5% SALES TAX (SEE CHART BELOW	
For shipments	s outside the U.S., please call for rates.	

For shipments outside the U.S., please call for rates.			_
Order Subtotal	Standard Shipping	Rush Shipping	
\$0-10.99	\$4.95	\$9.95	Standard: 4-14
\$11.00-19.99	\$7.75	\$12.75	business days.
\$20.00-49.99	\$9.95	\$14.95	Rush: 3-7 business
\$50.00-99.99	\$13.75	\$18.75	days, no P.O. Boxes,
\$100.00-149.99	\$15.95	\$20.95	HI/AK add \$10.00
\$150.00+	call	call	·

Shop JBS.org Official Store of The John Birch Society	Mail completed form to: ShopJBS • P.O. BOX 8040
Order Online: www.shopjbs.org Credit-card orders call toll-free now!	APPLETON, WI 54912 1-800-342-6491
Name	

	State	_ Zip		
	E-mail			
-		VISA/MC/Discover Three Diait V-Code	American Express Four Digit V-Code	
hopJBS				
	Exp.	Exp. Date		
	❑ VISA ❑ MasterCard hopJBS	E-mail VISA Discover MasterCard American Express hopJBS	E-mail VISA Discover MasterCard American Express VISAMC/Discover Three Digit V-Code	

Signature



## **ONLINE & SOCIAL NETWORKING** Network with like-minded people to preserve freedom

# **NEW American** THAT FREEDOM SHALL NOT PERISH

obs

Housing

## Understanding today's world

Gas Prives

Politics

www.TheNewAmerican.com Call 800-727-TRUE to Subscribe today!