



# The Freedom Index

*A Congressional Scorecard Based on the U.S. Constitution*

*Our third look at the 113th Congress shows how every member of the House and Senate voted on key issues, such as the debt limit, farm and food programs, indefinite military detention (House), and the minimum wage (Senate).*

## House Vote Descriptions

**21 Budget Agreement.** During consideration of the Budget Agreement for fiscal 2014 (House Joint Resolution 59), Rep. Paul Ryan (R-Wis.) moved that the House concur with the Senate version of the fiscal 2014 continuing resolution (H. J. Res 59) that would increase the discretionary spending caps for fiscal 2014 and 2015 to \$1.012 trillion and \$1.014 trillion, respectively. This represents an increase of \$26 billion for 2014 and \$19 billion for 2015. Furthermore, this amounts to the elimination of \$63 billion in sequester cuts for 2014 and 2015. Rep. Justin Amash (R-Mich.) explained his no vote on this budget agreement in a Facebook post for December 24, 2013: “Instead of real compromise to reform the biggest budget items contributing to our \$17 trillion debt — Social Security, military spending, and Medicare — the bill increases federal spending for special interests by tens of billions of dollars and pays for it by raising taxes on millions of Americans.”



AP Images

**Gaseous emissions:** The Environmental Protection Agency, repeating the now almost-entirely discredited claim that human-released CO<sub>2</sub> will cause the world to warm disastrously, is limiting CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from power plants. The House passed legislation to try to end the EPA's misguided efforts.

## About This Index

“**T**he 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 21-30) is 39 per-

cent, and the average Senate score is 28 percent. In the House, seven representatives earned 100 percent; in the Senate, the highest score is 89 percent. We encourage readers to examine how their own congressmen voted on each of the 10 key measures, as well as overall. We also encourage readers to commend legislators for their constitutional votes and to urge improvement where needed.

This is our third index for the 113th Congress. Our first index for the current Congress appeared in our July 22, 2013 issue, and our second index appeared in our January 6, 2014 issue. An online version of the “Freedom Index” is also available (click on “Voting Index” at [TheNewAmerican.com](http://TheNewAmerican.com)). ■



The House concurred with the Senate version of the Budget Resolution on December 12, 2013 by a vote of 332 to 94 (Roll Call 640). We have assigned pluses to the nays because with this budget agreement Congress is failing to address its fiscally and constitutionally irresponsible budgeting and appropriating process that is currently yielding annual federal deficits measured in the hundreds of billions of dollars that contribute directly to the dramatic growth of our \$17 trillion national debt.

**22 Omnibus Appropriations.** During consideration of the omnibus appropriations bill (H.R. 3547), Rep. Hal Rogers (R-Ky.) moved that the House concur with the Senate version of the bill that would provide about \$1.1 trillion in discretionary spending in fiscal 2014 for the following federal departments and agencies: Agriculture (\$20.9 billion), Commerce-Justice-Science (\$51.6 billion), Defense (\$572 billion), overseas contingency operations associated with the war in Afghanistan and other counterterrorism operations (\$85.2 billion), Energy-Water (\$34.1 billion), Financial Services (\$21.9 billion), Homeland Security (\$39.3 billion), Interior-Environment (\$30.1 billion), Labor-HHS-Education (\$156.8 billion), Legislative Branch (\$4.3 billion), Military Construction-VA (\$73.3 billion), State-Foreign Affairs (\$49 billion), and Transportation-HUD (\$50.9 billion). The legislation satisfies the \$1.012 trillion cap on discretionary spending established by the December budget deal, which had repealed a portion of sequestration cuts provided by the 2011 debt limit law. This amounts to a 2.6 percent increase in discretionary spending compared to the sequester-reduced level for fiscal 2013. The bill also includes \$98 billion not subject to the budget cap, including funding for war-related and anti-terrorism programs, as well as disaster relief.

The House concurred with the Senate version of the omnibus appropriations bill on January 15, 2014 by a vote of 359 to 67 (Roll Call 21). We have assigned pluses to the nays because with this budget agreement Congress is failing to address its fiscally and constitutionally irresponsible budgeting and appropriating process that is currently yielding annual federal deficits measured in the hundreds of billions of dol-

lars that contribute directly to the dramatic growth of our \$17 trillion national debt.

**23 Abortion Funding.** This bill (H.R. 7) would permanently prohibit any federal funding or resources to be used to facilitate the coverage or performance of an abortion, except in cases involving the endangerment of the mother's life, incest, or rape. It would also prohibit abortions from being performed at any federal or District of Columbia healthcare facility and by any physician in the employment of the federal government or D.C.

The House passed H.R. 7 on January 28, 2014 by a vote of 227 to 188 (Roll Call 30). We have assigned pluses to the yeas not only because the government should not be subsidizing the killing of innocent human life, but also because there is no constitutional authority for the government to manage or finance the healthcare sector.

**24 Farm and Food Programs.** This bill (H.R. 2642) would reauthorize federal farm and nutrition programs through fiscal 2018, including crop subsidies and the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP, formerly known as food stamps. Though this bill is entitled the Agriculture Act of 2014, most of the funding in the bill is not for agricultural programs but for food programs. The Congressional Budget Office estimated that the final version of this legislation (conference report) would cost \$956 billion over 10 years, of which \$756 billion would be for nutrition programs.

The House passed the conference report on January 29, 2014 by a vote of 251 to 166 (Roll Call 31). We have assigned pluses to the nays because both farm aid and food aid are unconstitutional. The food subsidy programs are supposed to help the poor, but in practice they have done little to lift people out of poverty, as evidenced by the growing number of recipients of these programs.

**25 Debt Limit Suspension.** This bill (S. 540), entitled the "Temporary Debt Limit Extension Act," would suspend the national debt limit on federal debt through March 15, 2015 — the temporary aspect of the legislation. But the additional debt accumulated between enactment of this bill and March 15, 2015 would not be "temporary," since on the following day the legislation would automatically re-establish the debt limit at a higher level, reflecting the additional debt.

The House passed S. 540 on February 11, 2014 by a vote of 221 to 201 (Roll Call 61). We have assigned pluses to the nays because the federal government should live within its means, suspending the debt limit is even worse than raising it, and most of the spending responsible for the ballooning national debt is unconstitutional.

**26 EPA Regulations.** This bill (H.R. 3826) would prohibit the Environmental Protection Agency from issuing, implementing, or enforcing any proposed rule under the Clean Air Act "that establishes a standard of performance for emis-



**Blotting out babies:** Under the Obama administration, the federal government has been increasingly using tax money to pay for abortions, though percentages of pro-abortion Americans have recently seen record lows, with most Americans deciding abortions are unnecessary or repugnant.

# House Vote Scores ✓

	Votes: 21-30	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	1-30
<b>ALABAMA</b>												
1	Byrne (R)	56%	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	56%
2	Roby (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	-	50%
3	Rogers, Mike D. (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	-	50%
4	Aderholt (R)	33%	-	-	+	-	?	+	+	-	-	52%
5	Brooks, M. (R)	60%	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	-	57%
6	Bachus, S. (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	-	43%
7	Sewell (D)	10%	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	13%
<b>ALASKA</b>												
AL	Young, D. (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	-	50%
<b>ARIZONA</b>												
1	Kirkpatrick (D)	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	17%
2	Barber (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%
3	Grijalva (D)	50%	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	43%
4	Gosar (R)	86%	+	+	+	+	?	?	?	+	+	78%
5	Salmon (R)	80%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	80%
6	Schweikert (R)	80%	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	80%
7	Pastor (D)	43%	-	-	-	+	?	-	?	-	+	30%
8	Franks (R)	70%	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	67%
9	Sinema (D)	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	13%
<b>ARKANSAS</b>												
1	Crawford (R)	56%	+	+	+	-	+	?	+	-	-	59%
2	Griffin (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	57%
3	Womack (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	47%
4	Cotton (R)	70%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	63%
<b>CALIFORNIA</b>												
1	LaMalfa (R)	50%	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	60%
2	Huffman (D)	20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	30%
3	Garamendi (D)	11%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	?	+	24%
4	McClintock (R)	80%	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	93%
5	Thompson, M. (D)	20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	24%
6	Matsui (D)	22%	-	-	-	-	-	-	?	-	+	34%
7	Bera (D)	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	10%
8	Cook (R)	50%	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	53%
9	McNerney (D)	20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	17%
10	Denham (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	-	47%
11	Miller, George (D)	33%	-	-	-	+	-	-	?	-	+	38%
12	Pelosi (D)	22%	-	-	-	-	-	-	?	-	+	28%
13	Lee, B. (D)	40%	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	40%
14	Speier (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	39%
15	Swalwell (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	33%
16	Costa (D)	11%	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	?	-	14%
17	Honda (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	34%
18	Eshoo (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	33%
19	Lofgren (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	37%
20	Farr (D)	20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	31%
21	Valadao (R)	30%	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	-	37%
22	Nunes (R)	30%	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	-	39%
23	McCarthy, K. (R)	30%	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	-	43%
24	Capps (D)	20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	27%
25	McKeon (R)	30%	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	-	40%
26	Brownley (D)	20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	13%
27	Chu (D)	40%	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	38%
28	Schiff (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	33%
29	Cárdenas (D)	33%	-	-	-	+	?	-	-	-	+	32%
30	Sherman (D)	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	23%
31	Miller, Gary (R)	57%	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	?	?	63%

	Votes: 21-30	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	1-30
32	Napolitano (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	38%
33	Waxman (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	31%
34	Becerra (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	39%
35	Negrete McLeod (D)	33%	+	-	-	-	-	?	-	-	+	33%
36	Ruiz (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	20%
37	Bass (D)	25%	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	?	37%
38	Sánchez, Linda (D)	40%	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	40%
39	Royce (R)	40%	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	59%
40	Roybal-Allard (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	37%
41	Takano (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	30%
42	Calvert (R)	30%	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	-	43%
43	Waters (D)	40%	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	40%
44	Hahn (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	33%
45	Campbell (R)	33%	-	-	?	?	?	+	+	?	-	50%
46	Sanchez, Loretta (D)	22%	+	-	?	+	-	-	-	-	-	25%
47	Lowenthal (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	30%
48	Rohrabacher (R)	89%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	-	90%
49	Issa (R)	30%	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	-	50%
50	Hunter (R)	50%	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	60%
51	Vargas (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	30%
52	Peters, S. (D)	20%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	17%
53	Davis, S. (D)	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	20%
<b>COLORADO</b>												
1	DeGette (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	39%
2	Polis (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	36%
3	Tipton (R)	75%	-	+	?	?	?	+	+	+	+	71%
4	Gardner (R)	60%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	62%
5	Lamborn (R)	60%	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	63%
6	Coffman (R)	70%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	73%
7	Perlmutter (D)	20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	31%
<b>CONNECTICUT</b>												
1	Larson, J. (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	37%
2	Courtney (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	30%
3	DeLauro (D)	44%	+	-	-	+	-	-	?	-	+	41%
4	Himes (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	24%
5	Esty (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	27%
<b>DELAWARE</b>												
AL	Carney (D)	20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	20%
<b>FLORIDA</b>												
1	Miller, J. (R)	38%	-	-	?	?	?	+	+	+	-	52%
2	Southerland (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	60%
3	Yoho (R)	50%	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	73%
4	Crenshaw (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	45%
5	Brown, C. (D)	11%	?	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	21%
6	DeSantis (R)	70%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	80%
7	Mica (R)	50%	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	63%
8	Posey (R)	90%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	97%
9	Grayson (D)	40%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	40%
10	Webster (R)	50%	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	57%
11	Nugent (R)	60%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	69%
12	Bilirakis (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	53%
13	Jolly (R)											
14	Castor (D)	20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	24%
15	Ross (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	60%
16	Buchanan (R)	50%	-	?	?	?	?	+	+	?	-	61%
17	Rooney (R)	56%	-	-	+	-	+	+	?	+	-	66%
18	Murphy, P. (D)	20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	20%

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 rep. did not vote; a “P” means he voted “present.” If a rep. cast fewer than five votes in this index, a score is not assigned.) Match numbers at the top of the chart to House vote descriptions on pages 1, 2, and 4.

sions of any greenhouse gas from any new source that is a fossil fuel-fired electric utility generating unit” unless such rule meets certain requirements as provided in this bill.

The House passed H.R. 3826 on March 6, 2014 by a vote of 229 to 183 (Roll Call 106). We have assigned pluses to the yeas because restricting greenhouse-gas emissions would be harmful to the economy, carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases are not pollutants, and the federal government has no constitutional authority to limit such emissions.

**27 Enforcing Existing Laws.** This bill (H.R. 4138) would authorize either the House or Senate, upon adoption of a resolution, to bring civil action charges against the president, the head of any department or agency of the United States, or any other employee of the United States who has failed to enforce an existing law, policy, program, regulation, rule, or statute, in violation of the president’s constitutional obligation to faithfully execute the laws (Article II, Section 3). This bill provides that such a civil action shall be filed in a U.S. district court and shall be heard by a three-judge panel. The panel’s decisions would be reviewable only by appeal directly to the Supreme Court.

The House passed H.R. 4138 on March 12, 2014 by a vote of 233 to 181 (Roll Call 124). We have assigned pluses to the yeas because Article II, Section 3 of the Constitution requires that the president “shall take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed.” When instead the president picks and chooses which laws to enforce and which to ignore, he is usurping the powers of Congress, which under the Constitution possesses sole legislative powers.

**28 Ukraine Aid.** This bill (H.R. 4152), as amended by the Senate (see Senate vote #27), would provide \$150 million for direct aid to Ukraine. It would also provide for loan guarantees (meaning that U.S. taxpayers would be stuck holding the bag if the loans are not paid). And it would impose sanctions on Russian and ex-Ukrainian officials deemed responsible for the crisis in the Ukraine.

The House voted for this legislation on April 1, 2014 by a vote of 378 to 34 (Roll



AP Images

**Sham saviors:** Amidst the unrest in Ukraine, Russia’s Vladimir Putin has been vilified as the bad guy. Congress plans to send more than \$150 million to Ukraine to stave off a takeover by Russia — though there’s no chance the money will influence Ukraine’s future and the United States is broke.

Call 149). We have assigned pluses to the nays because foreign aid is unconstitutional. The rationale for providing U.S. aid to Ukraine is that the country needs our assistance to resist Russian hegemony and build “democracy.” Yet the oligarchs wielding power in Ukraine are hardly “democrats,” and (because money is fungible) U.S. assistance could effectively be funneled to Russia in the form of Ukrainian energy and debt payments.

**29 Indefinite Military Detention.** During consideration of the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal 2015 (NDAA, H.R. 4435), Rep. Adam Smith (D-Wash.) introduced an amendment to prohibit the indefinite military detention of any person detained under the Authorization for the Use of Military Force authority in the United States, its territories, or possessions by providing immediate transfer to a trial and proceedings by a court. It also would strike language that would provide for mandatory military custody of covered parties.

The House rejected Smith’s amendment on May 22, 2014 by a vote of 191 to 230 (Roll Call 234). We have assigned pluses to the yeas because any attempt to limit or prohibit indefinite military detention is desirable, especially since persons detained may include U.S. citizens. Indefinite military detention is a blatant violation of the Sixth Amendment, and an executive who can wield such powers is akin to a monarch or dictator. As

Rep. Smith said during consideration of the amendment: “That is an enormous amount of power to give the Executive: to take someone and lock them up without due process. It is not necessary. This President has not used the authority. President George W. Bush did not use it after about 2002 and then only in a couple of instances. It is not necessary. It is an enormous amount of power to grant the Executive, and I believe places liberty and freedom at risk in this country.”

**30 Use of Military Force.** During consideration of the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal 2015 (NDAA, H.R. 4435), Rep. Adam Schiff (D-Calif.) introduced an amendment to sunset the 2001 Authorization for the Use of Military Force 12 months after the enactment of the 2015 NDAA.

The House rejected Schiff’s amendment on May 22, 2014 by a vote of 191 to 233 (Roll Call 237). We have assigned pluses to the yeas because the Authorization for the Use of Military Force, while granted by Congress, gives the president almost unlimited powers to invade countries, overthrow governments, and assassinate people under the pretext of waging the “war on terror.” Congress essentially handed over its constitutional authority to declare war to the executive branch, thus giving the executive unconstitutional abilities. Any attempt to end the Authorization for the Use of Military Force is a step in the right direction. ■

	Votes: 21-30	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	1-30
19 Vacant												
20 Hastings, A. (D)	20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	30%
21 Deutch (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	30%
22 Frankel (D)	33%	+	-	-	-	-	-	?	-	-	+	28%
23 Wasserman Schultz (D)	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	24%
24 Wilson, F. (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	34%
25 Diaz-Balart (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	-	-	43%
26 Garcia (D)	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	13%
27 Ros-Lehtinen (R)	33%	-	-	+	-	+	?	+	-	-	-	41%
<b>GEORGIA</b>												
1 Kingston (R)	67%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	?	-	-	75%
2 Bishop, S. (D)	22%	?	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	24%
3 Westmoreland, L. (R)	50%	-	-	?	?	+	+	+	+	-	-	63%
4 Johnson, H. (D)	22%	-	-	-	-	-	?	-	-	+	+	24%
5 Lewis (D)	33%	-	-	-	+	?	-	-	-	+	+	33%
6 Price, T. (R)	44%	-	-	+	+	+	?	+	+	-	-	69%
7 Woodall (R)	60%	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	63%
8 Scott, A. (R)	50%	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	57%
9 Collins, D. (R)	50%	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	62%
10 Broun (R)	100%	+	+	?	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	100%
11 Gingrey (R)	78%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	?	-	79%
12 Barrow (D)	30%	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	40%
13 Scott, D. (D)	22%	-	-	-	-	?	-	-	-	+	+	17%
14 Graves, T. (R)	60%	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	73%
<b>HAWAII</b>												
1 Hanabusa (D)	30%	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	30%
2 Gabbard (D)	22%	-	?	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	34%
<b>IDAHO</b>												
1 Labrador (R)	90%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	90%
2 Simpson (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	53%
<b>ILLINOIS</b>												
1 Rush (D)		?	?	?	?	?	-	-	-	?	?	37%
2 Kelly, R. (D)	20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	24%
3 Lipinski (D)	10%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13%
4 Gutiérrez (D)	33%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	?	+	+	29%
5 Quigley (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	24%
6 Roskam (R)	30%	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	43%
7 Davis, D. (D)	33%	?	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	41%
8 Duckworth (D)	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	13%
9 Schakowsky (D)	44%	+	-	-	+	-	-	?	-	+	+	39%
10 Schneider (D)	11%	-	-	-	-	-	?	-	-	+	-	14%
11 Foster (D)	20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	21%
12 Enyart (D)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	23%
13 Davis, R. (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	57%
14 Hultgren (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	63%
15 Shimkus (R)	30%	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	52%
16 Kinzinger (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	47%
17 Bustos (D)	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	15%
18 Schock (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	50%
<b>INDIANA</b>												
1 Visclosky (D)	44%	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	?	+	+	28%
2 Walorski (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	50%
3 Stutzman (R)	50%	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	67%
4 Rokita (R)	50%	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	-	62%
5 Brooks, S. (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	50%
6 Messer (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	57%
7 Carson (D)	20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	31%
8 Bucshon (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	57%
9 Young, T. (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	47%
<b>IOWA</b>												
1 Braley (D)	20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	27%
2 Loeb sack (D)	22%	-	-	-	-	-	-	?	-	-	+	24%

	Votes: 21-30	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	1-30
3 Latham (R)	33%	-	-	+	-	?	+	+	-	-	-	48%
4 King, S. (R)	60%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	67%
<b>KANSAS</b>												
1 Huelskamp (R)	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	100%
2 Jenkins (R)	50%	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	57%
3 Yoder (R)	50%	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	63%
4 Pompeo (R)	70%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	63%
<b>KENTUCKY</b>												
1 Whitfield (R)	50%	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	-	45%
2 Guthrie (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	53%
3 Yarmuth (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	40%
4 Massie (R)	90%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	97%
5 Rogers, H. (R)	30%	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	37%
6 Barr (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	57%
<b>LOUISIANA</b>												
1 Scalise (R)	70%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	73%
2 Richmond (D)	13%	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	?	?	30%
3 Boustany (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	43%
4 Fleming (R)	50%	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	73%
5 McAllister (R)	50%	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	-	50%
6 Cassidy (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	57%
<b>MAINE</b>												
1 Pingree (D)	44%	+	-	-	+	-	-	?	-	+	+	41%
2 Michaud (D)	20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	27%
<b>MARYLAND</b>												
1 Harris (R)	60%	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	67%
2 Ruppertsberger (D)	0%	-	-	?	?	-	-	-	-	-	-	4%
3 Sarbanes (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	38%
4 Edwards (D)	25%	-	-	-	?	-	-	?	-	+	+	32%
5 Hoyer (D)	30%	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	23%
6 Delaney (D)	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	17%
7 Cummings (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	33%
8 Van Hollen (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	30%
<b>MASSACHUSETTS</b>												
1 Neal (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	26%
2 McGovern (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	38%
3 Tsongas (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	31%
4 Kennedy (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	31%
5 Clark, K. (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	30%
6 Tierney (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	31%
7 Capuano (D)	33%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	?	+	37%
8 Lynch (D)	13%	-	-	-	?	-	-	-	-	?	-	28%
9 Keating (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	28%
<b>MICHIGAN</b>												
1 Benishek (R)	50%	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	57%
2 Huizenga (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	60%
3 Amash (R)	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	97%
4 Camp (R)	30%	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	47%
5 Kildee (D)	20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	33%
6 Upton (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	50%
7 Walberg (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	53%
8 Rogers, Mike (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	47%
9 Levin, S. (D)	30%	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	27%
10 Miller, C. (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	53%
11 Bentivolio (R)	80%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	80%
12 Dingell (D)	22%	-	-	-	-	-	-	?	-	+	+	21%
13 Conyers (D)	40%	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	40%
14 Peters, G. (D)	20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	27%
<b>MINNESOTA</b>												
1 Walz (D)	20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	21%
2 Kline, J. (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	47%

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 rep. did not vote; a “P” means he voted “present.” If a rep. cast fewer than five votes in this index, a score is not assigned.) Match numbers at the top of the chart to House vote descriptions on pages 1, 2, and 4.

	Votes:	21-30	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	1-30
3 Paulsen (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+		+	+	-	-	-	50%
4 McCollum (D)	20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	33%
5 Ellison (D)	40%	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	40%
6 Bachmann (R)	80%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	86%
7 Peterson (D)	30%	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	40%
8 Nolan (D)	20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	30%
<b>MISSISSIPPI</b>													
1 Nunnelee (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+		+	+	-	-	-	53%
2 Thompson, B. (D)	30%	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	34%
3 Harper (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+		+	+	-	-	-	47%
4 Palazzo (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+		+	+	-	-	-	53%
<b>MISSOURI</b>													
1 Clay (D)	25%	-	-	?	?	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	29%
2 Wagner (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+		+	+	-	-	-	55%
3 Luetkemeyer (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+		+	+	-	-	-	53%
4 Hartzler (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+		+	+	-	-	-	50%
5 Cleaver (D)	22%	-	?	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	31%
6 Graves, S. (R)	44%	-	-	+	-	+		+	+	?	-	-	59%
7 Long (R)	60%	+	+	+	-	+		+	+	-	-	-	57%
8 Smith, J. (R)	60%	+	+	+	-	+		+	+	-	-	-	68%
<b>MONTANA</b>													
AL Daines (R)	60%	+	+	+	-	+		+	+	-	-	-	60%
<b>NEBRASKA</b>													
1 Fortenberry (R)	50%	-	-	+	+	+		+	+	-	-	-	53%
2 Terry (R)	50%	-	+	+	-	+		+	+	-	-	-	53%
3 Smith, Adrian (R)	60%	+	+	+	-	+		+	+	-	-	-	57%
<b>NEVADA</b>													
1 Titus (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-		-	-	-	+	+	23%
2 Amodoi (R)	17%	-	-	?	?	?		+	?	-	-	-	56%
3 Heck, J. (R)	50%	+	-	+	-	+		+	+	-	-	-	57%
4 Horsford (D)	20%	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	+	+	16%
<b>NEW HAMPSHIRE</b>													
1 Shea-Porter (D)	20%	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	+	+	21%
2 Kuster (D)	20%	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	+	+	20%
<b>NEW JERSEY</b>													
1 Andrews (D)	20%	-	-	-	+	-							24%
2 LoBiondo (R)	30%	-	-	+	+	-		-	+	-	-	-	47%
3 Runyan (R)	22%	-	-	?	-	-		+	+	-	-	-	31%
4 Smith, C. (R)	30%	-	-	+	-	-		+	+	-	-	-	50%
5 Garrett (R)	80%	+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	-	-	77%
6 Pallone (D)	40%	+	-	-	+	-		-	-	-	+	+	38%
7 Lance (R)	50%	-	-	+	+	+		+	+	-	-	-	50%
8 Sires (D)	11%	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	?	+	22%
9 Pascarella (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-		-	-	-	+	+	37%
10 Payne (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-		-	-	-	+	+	28%
11 Frelinghuysen (R)	50%	-	-	+	+	+		+	+	-	-	-	40%
12 Holt (D)	50%	+	+	-	+	-		-	-	-	+	+	43%
<b>NEW MEXICO</b>													
1 Lujan Grisham, M. (D)	20%	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	+	+	23%
2 Pearce (R)	56%	+	+	+	-	+		?	+	-	-	-	66%
3 Luján, B. (D)	20%	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	+	+	30%
<b>NEW YORK</b>													
1 Bishop, T. (D)	20%	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	+	+	23%
2 King, P. (R)	30%	-	-	+	-	-		+	+	-	-	-	40%
3 Israel (D)	30%	-	-	+	-	-		-	-	-	+	+	23%
4 McCarthy, C. (D)	20%	?	?	?	?	-		?	-	-	+	-	8%
5 Meeks, G. (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-		-	-	-	+	+	31%
6 Meng (D)	38%	-	-	-	+	-		-	?	?	+	+	22%
7 Velázquez (D)	50%	+	-	-	+	-		-	?	?	+	+	41%
8 Jeffries (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-		-	-	-	+	+	33%
9 Clarke, Y. (D)	40%	+	-	-	+	-		-	-	-	+	+	37%

	Votes:	21-30	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	1-30
10 Nadler (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-		-	-	-	+	+	37%
11 Grimm (R)	30%	-	-	+	-	-		+	+	-	-	-	38%
12 Maloney, C. (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-		-	-	-	-	+	33%
13 Rangel (D)	33%	-	-	-	+	-		-	?	-	+	+	38%
14 Crowley (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-		-	-	-	+	+	37%
15 Serrano (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-		-	-	-	+	+	37%
16 Engel (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-		-	-	-	+	+	28%
17 Lowey (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-		-	-	-	+	+	30%
18 Maloney, S. (D)	10%	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	+	17%
19 Gibson, C. (R)	60%	-	-	+	-	+		-	+	+	+	+	70%
20 Tonko (D)	20%	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	+	+	30%
21 Owens (D)	10%	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	+	23%
22 Hanna (R)	22%	-	-	-	-	-		+	+	?	-	-	37%
23 Reed, T. (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+		+	+	-	-	-	53%
24 Maffei (D)	20%	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	+	+	30%
25 Slaughter (D)	25%	+	-	-	+	-		-	-	-	?	?	30%
26 Higgins (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-		-	-	-	+	+	30%
27 Collins, C. (R)	22%	-	-	+	-	-		?	+	-	-	-	48%
<b>NORTH CAROLINA</b>													
1 Butterfield (D)	20%	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	+	+	13%
2 Ellmers (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+		+	+	-	-	-	50%
3 Jones (R)	100%	+	?	?	?	?		?	+	+	+	+	100%
4 Price, D. (D)	20%	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	+	+	27%
5 Foxx (R)	50%	-	-	+	+	+		+	+	-	-	-	57%
6 Coble (R)	30%	-	-	+	-	-		+	+	-	-	-	50%
7 McIntyre (D)	40%	+	+	+	-	-		+	-	-	-	-	52%
8 Hudson (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+		+	+	-	-	-	60%
9 Pittenger (R)	50%	-	-	+	+	+		+	+	-	-	-	54%
10 McHenry (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+		+	+	-	-	-	54%
11 Meadows (R)	60%	+	+	+	-	+		+	+	-	-	-	70%
12 Vacant													
13 Holding (R)	80%	+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	-	-	72%
<b>NORTH DAKOTA</b>													
AL Cramer (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+		+	+	-	-	-	50%
<b>OHIO</b>													
1 Chabot (R)	70%	+	+	+	+	+		+	+	-	-	-	73%
2 Wenstrup (R)	70%	+	+	+	+	+		+	+	-	-	-	63%
3 Beatty (D)	20%	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	+	+	24%
4 Jordan (R)	70%	+	+	+	+	+		+	+	-	-	-	73%
5 Latta (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+		+	+	-	-	-	57%
6 Johnson, B. (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+		+	+	-	-	-	60%
7 Gibbs, B. (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+		+	+	-	-	-	57%
8 Boehner (R)		-	-	?	?	-		?	?	?	?	?	
9 Kaptur (D)	20%	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	+	+	24%
10 Turner (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+		+	+	-	-	-	50%
11 Fudge (D)	30%	+	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	+	+	30%
12 Tiberi (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+		+	+	-	-	-	50%
13 Ryan, T. (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-		-	-	-	+	+	33%
14 Joyce (R)	44%	-	-	+	-	+		+	+	?	-	-	48%
15 Stivers (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+		+	+	-	-	-	47%
16 Renacci (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+		+	+	-	-	-	57%
<b>OKLAHOMA</b>													
1 Bridenstine (R)	70%	+	+	+	+	+		+	+	-	-	-	83%
2 Mullin (R)	70%	+	+	+	-	+		+	+	+	-	-	70%
3 Lucas (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+		+	+	-	-	-	50%
4 Cole (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+		+	+	-	-	-	45%
5 Lankford (R)	60%	-	+	+	+	+		+	+	-	-	-	60%
<b>OREGON</b>													
1 Bonamici (D)	20%	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	+	+	30%
2 Walden (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+		+	+	-	-	-	53%
3 Blumenauer (D)	33%	-	-	?	+	-		-	-	-	+	+	34%
4 DeFazio (D)	40%	+	-	-	+	-		-	-	-	+	+	40%
5 Schrader (D)	20%	+	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	+	-	30%

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 rep. did not vote; a “P” means he voted “present.” If a rep. cast fewer than five votes in this index, a score is not assigned.) Match numbers at the top of the chart to House vote descriptions on pages 1, 2, and 4.

	Votes: 21-30	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	1-30
<b>PENNSYLVANIA</b>												
1 Brady, R. (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	33%
2 Fattah (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	32%
3 Kelly (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	50%
4 Perry (R)	60%	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	67%
5 Thompson, G. (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	57%
6 Gerlach (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	47%
7 Meehan (R)	30%	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	47%
8 Fitzpatrick (R)	30%	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	48%
9 Shuster (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	57%
10 Marino (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	50%
11 Barletta (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	52%
12 Rothfus (R)	50%	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	67%
13 Schwartz (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	?	-	-	?	?	15%
14 Doyle (D)	22%	-	-	-	?	-	-	-	-	+	+	36%
15 Dent (R)	30%	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	43%
16 Pitts (R)	50%	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	63%
17 Cartwright (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	33%
18 Murphy, T. (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	48%
<b>RHODE ISLAND</b>												
1 Ciciline (D)	44%	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	?	+	+	38%
2 Langevin (D)	20%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	17%
<b>SOUTH CAROLINA</b>												
1 Sanford (R)	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	92%
2 Wilson, J. (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	53%
3 Duncan, Jeff (R)	80%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	80%
4 Gowdy (R)	70%	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	73%
5 Mulvaney (R)	80%	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	77%
6 Clyburn (D)	20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	30%
7 Rice (R)	50%	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	-	63%
<b>SOUTH DAKOTA</b>												
AL Noem (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	53%
<b>TENNESSEE</b>												
1 Roe (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	60%
2 Duncan, John (R)	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	97%
3 Fleischmann (R)	50%	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	60%
4 DesJarlais (R)	90%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	83%
5 Cooper (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	33%
6 Black, D. (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	57%
7 Blackburn, M. (R)	50%	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	59%
8 Fincher (R)	44%	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	?	-	-	61%
9 Cohen (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	37%
<b>TEXAS</b>												
1 Gohmert (R)	80%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	90%
2 Poe (R)	60%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	73%
3 Johnson, S. (R)	56%	+	+	+	-	+	?	+	-	-	-	54%
4 Hall (R)	60%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	73%
5 Hensarling (R)	50%	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	60%
6 Barton (R)	60%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	63%
7 Culberson (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	57%
8 Brady, K. (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	53%
9 Green, A. (D)	33%	-	-	-	+	-	?	-	-	+	+	31%
10 McCaul (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	57%
11 Conaway (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	50%
12 Granger (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	50%
13 Thornberry (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	50%
14 Weber (R)	80%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	73%
15 Hinojosa (D)	25%	-	-	?	-	-	?	-	-	+	+	29%
16 O'Rourke (D)	40%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	33%
17 Flores (R)	40%	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	-	57%
18 Jackson Lee (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	34%
19 Neugebauer (R)	60%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	67%

	Votes: 21-30	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	1-30
20 Castro (D)	33%	?	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	28%
21 Smith, Lamar (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	53%
22 Olson (R)	50%	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	57%
23 Gallego (D)	20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	17%
24 Marchant (R)	60%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	70%
25 Williams (R)	60%	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	70%
26 Burgess (R)	80%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	77%
27 Farenthold (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	60%
28 Cuellar (D)	30%	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	27%
29 Green, G. (D)	22%	-	-	-	+	-	?	-	-	-	+	32%
30 Johnson, E. (D)	20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	23%
31 Carter (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	47%
32 Sessions, P. (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	55%
33 Veasey (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	27%
34 Vela (D)	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	20%
35 Doggett (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	33%
36 Stockman (R)	100%	+	?	+	+	+	+	+	?	+	+	96%
<b>UTAH</b>												
1 Bishop, R. (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	59%
2 Stewart (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	57%
3 Chaffetz (R)	33%	-	-	+	-	+	?	+	-	-	-	50%
4 Matheson (D)	50%	-	-	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	50%
<b>VERMONT</b>												
AL Welch (D)	20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	33%
<b>VIRGINIA</b>												
1 Wittman (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	47%
2 Rigell (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	53%
3 Scott, R. (D)	20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	30%
4 Forbes (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	50%
5 Hurt (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	60%
6 Goodlatte (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	57%
7 Cantor (R)	30%	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	40%
8 Moran, James (D)	22%	-	-	-	?	-	-	-	-	+	+	24%
9 Griffith (R)	60%	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	73%
10 Wolf (R)	30%	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	50%
11 Connolly (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	30%
<b>WASHINGTON</b>												
1 DelBene (D)	20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	27%
2 Larsen, R. (D)	20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	21%
3 Herrera Beutler (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	52%
4 Hastings, D. (R)	30%	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	47%
5 McMorris Rodgers (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	55%
6 Kilmer (D)	20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	23%
7 McDermott (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	37%
8 Reichert (R)	30%	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	40%
9 Smith, Adam (D)	20%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	18%
10 Heck, D. (D)	20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	20%
<b>WEST VIRGINIA</b>												
1 McKinley (R)	50%	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	53%
2 Capito (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	50%
3 Rahall (D)	50%	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	40%
<b>WISCONSIN</b>												
1 Ryan, P. (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	60%
2 Pocan (D)	40%	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	40%
3 Kind (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	23%
4 Moore (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	33%
5 Sensenbrenner (R)	70%	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	83%
6 Petri (R)	67%	-	+	?	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	76%
7 Duffy (R)	50%	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	?	?	59%
8 Ribble (R)	60%	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	63%
<b>WYOMING</b>												
AL Lummis (R)	70%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	70%

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 rep. did not vote; a "P" means he voted "present." If a rep. cast fewer than five votes in this index, a score is not assigned.) Match numbers at the top of the chart to House vote descriptions on pages 1, 2, and 4.



A Republic,  
If You Can Keep It

The John Birch Society

Appleton, WI 54912-8040 • (920) 749-3780 • [JBS.org](http://JBS.org)

“Less government, more responsibility, and — with God’s help — a better world.”



**TRUTHFUL. CONSTITUTIONAL. FEARLESS.**



**The essential news source for all  
freedom-loving Americans.  
Subscribe Today!**



Order Online

**New American**

Subscribe: (800) 727-8783 • [www.TheNewAmerican.com](http://www.TheNewAmerican.com)



# Senate Vote Descriptions



AP Images

**I swear to not care:** The Federal Reserve, a private entity, has pumped trillions of dollars into the world economy, yet economic activity is weak. Though printing money causes the value of money to drop, hurting the poor and elderly, Janet Yellen will continue to push more money creation.

**21 Budget Agreement.** On December 18, 2013, the Senate accepted the House concurrence in the Senate version of H. J. Res. 59, the budget agreement. See House vote #21 for more information.

The Senate agreed to the final version of H. J. Res. 59 on December 18, 2013 by a vote of 64 to 36 (Roll Call 281). We have assigned pluses to the nays because with this budget agreement Congress is failing to address its fiscally and constitutionally irresponsible budgeting and appropriating process that is currently yielding annual federal deficits measured in the hundreds of billions of dollars that contribute directly to the dramatic growth of our \$17 trillion national debt.

**22 Yellen Nomination.** On October 9, 2013, President Obama nominated Janet Yellen to succeed Ben Bernanke as chair of the Federal Reserve. Having served as vice-chair of the Fed since October 2010, Yellen is closely associated with Bernanke's decision to proceed with "QE (Quantitative Easing) unlimited," the Fed's unlimited purchasing of bonds until the market "substantially" improves. Yellen's promotion to chair is a clear indi-

cation that the Fed will continue to recklessly pump trillions of newly created fiat (unbacked) dollars into the economy, in turn radically expanding the money supply and further diminishing the purchasing power of the dollar to buy goods and services, which is especially burdensome to the poor and elderly. Furthermore, Yellen's policy of keeping interest rates artificially low will encourage additional irresponsible and excessive borrowing, as well as malinvestments.

The Senate confirmed the nomination on January 6, 2014 by a vote of 56 to 26 (Roll Call 1). We have assigned pluses to the nays because of the economic havoc, caused by inflation, that Yellen contributed to as vice-chair and that she intends to continue as the new chair of the Fed. Furthermore, a central bank, such as the Fed, that creates money out of thin air is not authorized by the Constitution.

**23 Omnibus Appropriations.** On January 16, 2014, the Senate accepted the House concurrence in the Senate version of the omnibus appropriations bill (H.R. 3547), completing congressional action. H.R. 3547 provides

about \$1.1 trillion in discretionary appropriations in fiscal 2014 for numerous federal departments and agencies. The legislation satisfies the \$1.012 trillion cap on discretionary spending established by the December budget deal, which had repealed a portion of sequestration cuts provided by the 2011 debt limit law. This amounts to a 2.6 percent increase in discretionary spending compared to the sequester-reduced level for fiscal 2013. See House vote #22 for more information.

The Senate agreed to the final version of H.R. 3547 on January 16, 2014 by a vote of 72 to 26 (Roll Call 13). We have assigned pluses to the nays because with this budget agreement Congress is failing to address its fiscally and constitutionally irresponsible budgeting and appropriating process that is currently yielding annual federal deficits measured in the hundreds of billions of dollars that contribute directly to the dramatic growth of our \$17 trillion national debt.

**24 Farm and Food Programs.** This bill (H.R. 2642) would reauthorize federal farm and nutrition programs through fiscal 2018, including crop subsidies and the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP, formerly known as food stamps. Though this legislation is entitled the Agriculture Act of 2014, most of the funding in the bill is not for agricultural programs but for food programs. The Congressional Budget Office estimated that the final version of this legislation (conference report) would cost \$956 billion over 10 years, of which \$756 billion would be for nutrition programs.

The Senate passed the conference report on February 4, 2014 by a vote of 68 to 32 (Roll Call 21). We have assigned pluses to the nays because both farm aid and food aid are unconstitutional. The food subsidy programs are supposed to help the poor, but in practice they have done little to lift people out of poverty, as evidenced by the growing number of recipients of these programs. (The House passed the conference report on January 29, 2014; see House vote #24.)

# Senate Vote Scores ✓

	Votes:	21-30	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	1-30
<b>ALABAMA</b>													
Shelby (R)	70%		+	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	73%
Sessions, J. (R)	80%		+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	83%
<b>ALASKA</b>													
Murkowski (R)	30%		-	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	+	-	48%
Begich (D)	0%		-	?	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	19%
<b>ARIZONA</b>													
McCain (R)	56%		-	?	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	-	52%
Flake (R)	60%		+	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	-	67%
<b>ARKANSAS</b>													
Pryor (D)	0%		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	?	-	14%
Boozman (R)	50%		+	+	-	-	+	-	-	+	?	?	64%
<b>CALIFORNIA</b>													
Feinstein (D)	0%		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3%
Boxer (D)	0%		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3%
<b>COLORADO</b>													
Udall, Mark (D)	0%		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3%
Bennet (D)	0%		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%
<b>CONNECTICUT</b>													
Blumenthal (D)	10%		-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	7%
Murphy, C. (D)	10%		-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	7%
<b>DELAWARE</b>													
Carper (D)	0%		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3%
Coons (D)	0%		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3%
<b>FLORIDA</b>													
Nelson (D)	0%		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3%
Rubio (R)	80%		+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	77%
<b>GEORGIA</b>													
Chambliss (R)	25%		-	-	?	-	?	-	-	+	+	-	57%
Isakson (R)	40%		-	+	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	60%
<b>HAWAII</b>													
Schatz (D)	0%		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3%
Hirono (D)	0%		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3%
<b>IDAHO</b>													
Crapo (R)	60%		+	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	83%
Risch (R)	70%		+	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	86%
<b>ILLINOIS</b>													
Durbin (D)	0%		-	?	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%
Kirk (R)	40%		+	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	53%
<b>INDIANA</b>													
Coats (R)	40%		+	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	60%
Donnelly (D)	0%		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13%
<b>IOWA</b>													
Grassley (R)	70%		+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	-	80%
Harkin (D)	0%		-	?	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%
<b>KANSAS</b>													
Roberts (R)	80%		+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	83%
Moran, Jerry (R)	63%		+	?	-	-	+	?	-	+	+	+	78%
<b>KENTUCKY</b>													
McConnell (R)	67%		+	?	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	83%
Paul (R)	89%		+	?	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	93%
<b>LOUISIANA</b>													
Landrieu, M. (D)	0%		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	?	-	-	11%
Vitter (R)	60%		+	+	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	73%

	Votes:	21-30	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	1-30
<b>MAINE</b>													
Collins (R)	30%		-	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	+	-	37%
King, A. (I)	0%		-	?	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11%
<b>MARYLAND</b>													
Mikulski (D)	0%		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3%
Cardin (D)	0%		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3%
<b>MASSACHUSETTS</b>													
Warren (D)	11%		-	?	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	3%
Markey (D)	11%		-	?	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	6%
<b>MICHIGAN</b>													
Levin, C. (D)	0%		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%
Stabenow (D)	0%		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%
<b>MINNESOTA</b>													
Klobuchar (D)	0%		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%
Franken (D)	0%		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%
<b>MISSISSIPPI</b>													
Cochran (R)	50%		+	+	-	-	+	-	-	+	?	?	57%
Wicker (R)	44%		+	+	-	-	+	-	-	+	?	-	55%
<b>MISSOURI</b>													
McCaskill (D)	0%		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	?	-	?	4%
Blunt (R)	60%		+	+	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	63%
<b>MONTANA</b>													
Tester (D)	0%		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20%
Walsh (D)	0%		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%
<b>NEBRASKA</b>													
Johanns (R)	60%		+	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	67%
Fischer (R)	60%		+	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	67%
<b>NEVADA</b>													
Reid, H. (D)	10%		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	10%
Heller (R)	80%		+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	73%
<b>NEW HAMPSHIRE</b>													
Shaheen (D)	0%		-	?	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3%
Ayotte (R)	50%		+	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	60%
<b>NEW JERSEY</b>													
Menendez (D)	0%		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%
Booker (D)	10%		-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	9%
<b>NEW MEXICO</b>													
Udall, T. (D)	0%		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7%
Heinrich (D)	0%		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%
<b>NEW YORK</b>													
Schumer (D)	0%		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3%
Gillibrand (D)	10%		-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	3%
<b>NORTH CAROLINA</b>													
Burr (R)	60%		+	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	-	67%
Hagan (D)	0%		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13%
<b>NORTH DAKOTA</b>													
Hooven (R)	40%		-	+	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	50%
Heitkamp (D)	0%		-	?	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	14%
<b>OHIO</b>													
Brown, S. (D)	0%		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%
Portman (R)	33%		-	?	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	59%
<b>OKLAHOMA</b>													
Inhofe (R)	89%		+	+	+	+	+	?	-	+	+	+	88%
Coburn (R)	57%		+	-	?	+	?	+	-	?	+	-	85%

	Votes:	21-30	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	1-30
<b>OREGON</b>													
Wyden (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7%
Merkley (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7%
<b>PENNSYLVANIA</b>													
Casey (D)	10%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7%
Toomey (R)	70%	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	-	-	77%
<b>RHODE ISLAND</b>													
Reed, J. (D)	10%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%
Whitehouse (D)	10%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%
<b>SOUTH CAROLINA</b>													
Graham (R)	44%	+	?	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	-	52%
Scott, T. (R)	78%	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	?	-	86%
<b>SOUTH DAKOTA</b>													
Johnson, Tim (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7%
Thune (R)	67%	+	?	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	-	72%
<b>TENNESSEE</b>													
Alexander, L. (R)	40%	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	-	53%
Corker (R)	50%	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	60%
<b>TEXAS</b>													
Cornyn (R)	80%	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-	86%
Cruz (R)	80%	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-	90%

	Votes:	21-30	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	1-30
<b>UTAH</b>													
Hatch (R)	33%	-	?	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	-	56%
Lee, M. (R)	89%	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	?	-	93%
<b>VERMONT</b>													
Leahy (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3%
Sanders (I)	0%	-	?	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3%
<b>VIRGINIA</b>													
Warner (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%
Kaine (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%
<b>WASHINGTON</b>													
Murray (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4%
Cantwell (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3%
<b>WEST VIRGINIA</b>													
Rockefeller (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3%
Manchin (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	24%
<b>WISCONSIN</b>													
Johnson, R. (R)	60%	-	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	-	-	80%
Baldwin (D)	0%	-	?	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%
<b>WYOMING</b>													
Enzi (R)	60%	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	-	80%
Barrasso (R)	70%	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	-	-	83%

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 9, 11, and 12.

**25 Debt Limit Suspension.** This bill (S. 540), entitled the “Temporary Debt Limit Extension Act,” would suspend the national debt limit on federal debt through March 15, 2015 — the temporary aspect of the legislation. But the additional debt accumulated between enactment of this bill and March 15, 2015 would not be “temporary,” since on the following day the legislation would automatically re-establish the debt limit at a higher level, reflecting the additional debt.

The Senate passed S. 540 on February 12, 2014 by a vote of 55 to 43 (Roll Call 34). We have assigned pluses to the nays because the federal government should live within its means, suspending the debt limit is even worse than raising it, and most of the spending responsible for the ballooning national debt is unconstitutional. (The House passed this bill on February 11; see House vote #25.)

**26 Child Care.** This bill (S. 1086) would reauthorize the Child Care and Development Block Grant program through fiscal 2020 and would further institute new standards for education, health, and safety on child care providers that receive funds under this program. It would also expand the information required from states regarding how they will make use of

the funds, as well as require that the states develop plans that include guidelines for training and teaching children from the time they are born until they enroll in kindergarten. The CBO has estimated that implementing this bill would cost \$16.8 billion over the 2015-2020 period.

The Senate passed S. 1086 on March 13, 2014 by a vote of 96 to 2 (Roll Call 77). We have assigned pluses to the nays because childcare funding is an unconstitutional activity of the federal government. Just based on the brief description of S. 1086 in the above paragraph, it is clear that this bill would increase federal oversight of child care and impose national standards reminiscent of what the widely reviled Common Core State (read *National*) Standards are doing to K-12 education.

**27 Ukraine Aid.** The Senate version of this legislation — offered in the form of a substitute amendment to the House version, H.R. 4152 — would provide \$150 million for direct aid to Ukraine. It would also provide for loan guarantees (meaning that the U.S. taxpayers would be stuck holding the bag if the loans are not paid). And it would impose sanctions on Russian and ex-Ukrainian officials deemed responsible for the crisis in the Ukraine.

The Senate adopted the substitute amendment to H.R. 4152 on March 27, 2014 by a vote of 98 to 2 (Roll Call 88). We have assigned pluses to the nays because foreign aid is unconstitutional. The rationale for providing U.S. aid to Ukraine is that the country needs our assistance to resist Russian hegemony and build “democracy.” Yet the oligarchs wielding power in Ukraine are hardly “democrats,” and (because money is fungible) U.S. assistance could effectively be funneled to Russia in the form of Ukrainian energy and debt payments.

**28 Unemployment Benefits Extension.** This bill (H.R. 3979) was for the extension of unemployment benefits through May 31 of 2014. These extended benefits were to be paid for by adjustments to employers’ pension contributions and by extending U.S. Customs and Border Protection user fees through 2024.

The Senate passed H.R. 3979 on April 7, 2014 by a vote of 59 to 38 (Roll Call 101). We have assigned pluses to the nays because, by paying people unemployment benefits, the federal government is essentially subsidizing unemployment. That the federal government does this in the first place is bad enough,

but any extension of said benefits is even worse. At a time when government debt is nearly \$17 trillion, paying unemployment benefits is fiscally irresponsible. Furthermore, the U.S. Constitution nowhere authorizes the federal government to provide unemployment benefits to workers. This type of welfare should be handled on the state or local level, if handled by the government at all.

**29 Minimum Wage.** During consideration of the bill to increase the federal minimum wage from \$7.25 to \$10.10 (S. 2223), Sen. Harry Reid (D-Nev.) offered a motion to invoke cloture, and thus limit debate, so the bill could come up for a vote.

The Senate rejected Reid's motion to invoke cloture on April 30, 2014 by a vote of 54 to 42 (60 votes, three-fifths of the full Senate, are needed to invoke cloture; Roll Call 117). We have assigned pluses to the nays because any debate on the Senate floor that could prevent a federal minimum wage increase is a good thing. A federal minimum wage

is unconstitutional, since nowhere in the Constitution is the federal government authorized to dictate how much private businesses pay their employees for services performed as part of a private, voluntary contract. Furthermore, many studies have demonstrated that minimum wage increases always lead to more unemployment among the poor and unskilled workers, the very people whom the wage increase is ostensibly intended to help.

**30 Burwell Nomination.** On April 11, 2014, President Obama nominated Sylvia Mathews Burwell to succeed Kathleen Sebelius as secretary of Health and Human Services. One of the most remarkable things about Burwell's résumé is that she has served in so many high-level positions in government and the non-profit sector. For example, while serving for eight years in the Clinton administration, she rose to become deputy chief of staff to the president. During her decade serving in the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (2001-2011), she was executive vice presi-

dent, chief operating officer, and president of the Global Development Program. Of course, the Gates Foundation is a huge financial supporter of pro-abortion organizations, such as Planned Parenthood Federation of America and International Planned Parenthood Federation, and has funded the creation of the Common Core educational standards. She is also a member of the globalist-minded Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), serving on its Board of Directors from 2007 to 2013, and has been a member of the Trilateral Commission. With this network of establishment elite connections, Burwell is especially well suited to implement the unconstitutional, socialistic ObamaCare legislation.

The Senate confirmed the nomination on June 5, 2014 by a vote of 78 to 17 (Roll Call 175). We have assigned pluses to the nays because opposing the nomination of such a high-ranking establishment operative to be point person for implementing the unconstitutional ObamaCare law should be a no-brainer for Constitution-supporting senators. ■

# NOW ONLINE!



Look Online

## Freedom Index Voting Records 1999-2014:

The index you've used to track whether your congressman is voting according to the Constitution now features cumulative scores online, as well as scores for former congressmen, at [TheNewAmerican.com/freedomindex](http://TheNewAmerican.com/freedomindex). A perfect resource for the online activist!

