The Freedom Index

A Congressional Scorecard Based on the U.S. Constitution

Our second look at the 112th Congress shows how every Representative and Senator voted on key issues such as the debt deal, the South Korea trade deal, Libya (House only), and indefinite detention (Senate only).

House Vote Descriptions

11 Libya. During consideration of the Defense appropriations bill, Rep. Dennis Kucinich (D-Ohio) introduced an amendment to prohibit the use of funds in the bill to carry out military actions against Libya unless Congress declares war against Libya.

The House rejected the Kucinich amendment on July 8, 2011 by a vote of 169 to 251 (Roll Call 530). We have assigned pluses to the yeas because under Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution only Congress has the power "to declare war."

The Founding Fathers assigned this power to Congress because they did not want a single man deciding when to go to war. Yet President Obama usurped this congressional war-making authority by initiating offensive military actions against Libya without even asking advice from Congress, much less requesting the required declaration of war.

12 Incandescent Light Bulbs. Incandescent light bulbs ranging from 40 to 100 watts will be phased out during 2012-2014 in accordance with the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (Public Law 110-140). The first size to be phased out in 2012 will be the 100-watt incandescent light bulb. The energy efficiency standards in PL 110-140 that will effectively ban the ubiquitous incandescent light bulb will leave the environmentally questionable (due to mercury content) compact fluorescent light bulbs as the only economical light bulb in the marketplace. However, this ban on incandescent light bulbs led to the introduction of H.R. 2417, a bill that would repeal the relevant sections of PL 110-140 so that the familiar incandescent light bulbs would continue to be available for purchase in the United States.

AP Images

Not seeing the light: Despite the fact that no country has ever become more competitive and prosperous by reducing its energy consumption and that only government regulations prevent an almost unending supply of energy, Congress is mandating a ban of incandescent light bulbs.

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), our second for the current Congress, is 48 percent. The average Senate score is 40 percent. Six Representatives and no Senators earned 100 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. To contact your own Representative and Senators about key issues, go to JBS.org, click on "Act Now," then click on "Fed. Legis. Action Alerts." ■

This copyrighted article originally appeared in the January 9, 2012 issue of The New American. *Call 1-800-727-TRUE to order copies of this reprint!*

The House rejected H.R. 2417 on July 12, 2011 by a vote of 233 to 193 (Roll Call 563). The bill was brought to a vote under suspension of the rules, which required a two-thirds majority of those present and voting (284 in this case) for passage. We have assigned pluses to the yeas because the federal government has no constitutional authority to establish energy efficiency standards that would prevent the production, distribution, and consumer purchase of a previously perfectly acceptable and universally used product, such as the incandescent light bulb.

13 Debt Deal. This legislation (S. 365) provided for an immediate $400 billion increase in the national debt limit, while allowing the President to raise the ceiling an additional $500 billion unless Congress passes a resolution of disapproval (see House vote #14).

This legislation also established a process for reducing future cumulative deficit projections by up to $2.4 trillion for fiscal years 2012 through 2021, including the establishment of a supercommittee tasked with recommending cuts totaling up to $1.5 trillion for the 10-year period. If the supercommittee were to fail in recommending at least $1.2 trillion in cuts (and, as we know, the supercommittee failed to recommend any cuts), then the legislation would trigger automatic cuts totaling up to $1.2 trillion over 10 years.

The debt-raising/deficit-cutting package created the appearance that Congress was doing something to rein in out-of-control spending. But in reality, the total national debt would still increase even if the entire dollar amount of cuts called for in the legislation were identified and enacted, since the cuts are not cuts in the absolute sense but cuts in future budget projections. The national debt would continue to go up, but not as fast as before, for the simple reason that cutting (say) $1.2 trillion over 10 years will not offset projected annual $1 trillion-plus deficits.

The House passed S. 365 on August 1, 2011 by a vote of 269 to 161 (Roll Call 690). We have assigned pluses to the nays because the debt deal allows both the national debt and spending to continue their upward trajectories. Moreover, the budget process established by the legislation is clearly unconstitutional since no Congress can bind the actions of future Congresses via the so-called automatic cuts.

Proposing penalties: The National Labor Relations Board, composed mainly of people beholden to unions, told Boeing that it couldn't build a plant in a right-to-work state. If such a ruling is accepted as legal, unions could pay off Congressmen to penalize even states for not kowtowing to unions.

14 Debt Limit Disapproval. Under the debt deal passed by Congress in August (see House vote #13), the debt ceiling was raised by $400 billion, and the President can raise the ceiling by an additional $500 billion unless a resolution of disapproval is enacted. President Obama decided to raise the national debt the full $900 billion, and legislation was introduced (House Joint Resolution 77) to block the $500 billion increase.

The House passed the resolution of disapproval on September 14, 2011 by a vote of 232 to 186 (Roll Call 706). We have assigned pluses to the yeas because piling on more and more debt is devastating to the economy, and the bulk of the federal government's spending spree is for unconstitutional programs.

15 National Labor Relations Board. Earlier this year Boeing, a longtime airplane manufacturer in the state of Washington, opened a production facility in South Carolina for its new 787 Dreamliner airplane. Although this development had been publicly announced in 2009, early this year the machinists union charged that Boeing's decision was unfair and asked the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) to take action against Boeing. The NLRB complied by issuing a formal complaint as described in its press release of April 20, 2011: "National Labor Relations Board issues complaint against Boeing Company for unlawfully transferring work to a non-union facility."

Representative Tim Scott (R-S.C.) responded to the NLRB complaint by introducing H.R. 2587, the Protecting Jobs From Government Interference Act, "To prohibit the National Labor Relations Board from ordering any employer to close, relocate, or transfer employment under any circumstance."

The House passed H.R. 2587 on September 15, 2011 by a vote of 238 to 186 (Roll Call 711). We have assigned pluses to the yeas because the federal government has no constitutional authority to order a company to reinstate production or make certain investments at a given location, or to block a company's decision to relocate production.

16 Cross-state Air-pollution Rules. During consideration of legislation (H.R. 2401) regarding the regulatory impact of EPA regulations, Rep. Ed Whitfield (R-Ky.) proposed an amendment that would delay cross-state air-pollution rules until at least 2015. The amendment would

House Vote Scores

	Votes:	11-20	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	1-20
ALABAMA													
1	Bonner (R)	70%	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	70%
2	Roby (R)	70%	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	70%
3	Rogers, Mike D. (R)	60%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	70%
4	Aderholt (R)	70%	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	75%
5	Brooks (R)	90%	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	90%
6	Bachus, S. (R)	60%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	70%
7	Sewell (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15%
ALASKA													
AL	Young, D. (R)	56%	+	+	-	+	-	?	-	+	-	+	76%
ARIZONA													
1	Gosar (R)	70%	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	75%
2	Franks, T. (R)	80%	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	79%
3	Quayle (R)	80%	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	79%
4	Pastor (D)	30%	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	30%
5	Schweikert (R)	90%	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	90%
6	Flake (R)	90%	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	89%
7	Grijalva (D)	40%	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	30%
8	Giffords (D)		?	?	-	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	
ARKANSAS													
1	Crawford (R)	60%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	70%
2	Griffin (R)	60%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	70%
3	Womack (R)	60%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	65%
4	Ross, M. (D)	30%	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	-	45%
CALIFORNIA													
1	Thompson, M. (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%
2	Herger (R)	70%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	75%
3	Lungren (R)	60%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	65%
4	McClintock (R)	90%	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	95%
5	Matsui (D)	10%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%
6	Woolsey (D)	40%	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	30%
7	Miller, George (D)	20%	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	11%
8	Pelosi (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%
9	Lee (D)	40%	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	30%
10	Garamendi (D)	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	11%
11	McNerney (D)	20%	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	20%
12	Speier (D)	11%	-	-	-	-	-	?	+	-	-	-	17%
13	Stark (D)	40%	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	30%
14	Eshoo (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%
15	Honda (D)	30%	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	20%
16	Lofgren (D)	20%	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	16%
17	Farr (D)	20%	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	20%
18	Cardoza (D)	33%	?	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	26%
19	Denham (R)	70%	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	75%
20	Costa (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15%
21	Nunes (R)	70%	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	75%
22	McCarthy, K. (R)	60%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	70%
23	Capps (D)	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	10%
24	Gallegly (R)	60%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	70%
25	McKeon (R)	60%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	68%
26	Dreier (R)	50%	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	+	60%
27	Sherman (D)	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	15%
28	Berman (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%
29	Schiff (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%
30	Waxman (D)	22%	-	-	+	-	?	-	+	-	-	-	16%
31	Becerra (D)	10%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11%
32	Chu (D)	20%	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	15%
33	Bass, K. (D)	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	10%
34	Roybal-Allard (D)	20%	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	20%
35	Waters (D)	44%	+	-	+	-	-	?	+	-	+	-	32%
36	Hahn (D)	25%			+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	25%
37	Richardson (D)	30%	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	30%
38	Napolitano (D)	33%	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	?	-	26%
39	Sanchez, Linda (D)	20%	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	16%
40	Royce (R)	70%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	80%
41	Lewis, Jerry (R)	60%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	68%
42	Miller, Gary (R)	60%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	70%
43	Baca (D)	11%	-	-	?	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	17%
44	Calvert (R)	60%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	70%
45	Bono Mack (R)	60%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	63%
46	Rohrabacher (R)	70%	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	80%
47	Sanchez, Loretta (D)	10%	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11%
48	Campbell (R)	67%	?	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	84%
49	Issa (R)	70%	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	70%
50	Bilbray (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	+	50%
51	Filner (D)	22%	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	?	-	11%
52	Hunter (R)	80%	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	80%
53	Davis, S. (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%
COLORADO													
1	DeGette (D)	10%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%
2	Polis (D)	11%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	?	+	-	11%
3	Tipton (R)	90%	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	85%
4	Gardner (R)	78%	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	?	+	79%
5	Lamborn (R)	80%	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	80%
6	Coffman (R)	80%	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	75%
7	Perlmutter (D)	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	25%
CONNECTICUT													
1	Larson, J. (D)	20%	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20%
2	Courtney (D)	11%	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	?	-	16%
3	DeLauro (D)	20%	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	15%
4	Himes (D)	10%	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15%
5	Murphy, C. (D)	20%	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	15%
DELAWARE													
AL	Carney (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%
FLORIDA													
1	Miller, J. (R)	80%	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	84%
2	Southerland (R)	90%	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	90%
3	Brown, C. (D)	25%	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	?	?	-	11%
4	Crenshaw (R)	60%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	65%
5	Nugent (R)	80%	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	85%
6	Stearns (R)	90%	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	90%
7	Mica (R)	70%	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	75%
8	Webster (R)	67%	+	+	-	+	?	+	-	+	-	+	79%
9	Bilirakis (R)	70%	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	72%
10	Young, C.W. (R)	56%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	?	72%
11	Castor (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	?	11%
12	Ross, D. (R)	90%	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	90%
13	Buchanan (R)	60%	+	+	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	+	79%
14	Mack (R)	90%	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	95%
15	Posey (R)	90%	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	95%
16	Rooney (R)	60%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	75%
17	Wilson, F. (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	?	?	-	-	6%
18	Ros-Lehtinen (R)	60%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	65%
19	Deutch (D)	13%	-	?	-	?	-	-	+	-	-	-	6%

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.

Why aren't they cut? Agricultural subsidies are supposed help the family farmer, but according to Environmental Working Group, "74 percent of taxpayer-funded payments [go] to the largest and wealthiest 10 percent" of farmers and "five crops ... account for 90 percent of all farm subsidies."

delay by at least two years sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxide emissions standards for power plants and allow the companies at least five years to comply after the rules are issued.

The House passed Whitfield's amendment on September 23, 2011 by a vote of 234 to 188 (Roll Call 737). We have assigned pluses to the yeas because the new EPA cross-state pollution rules will further damage the economy and also because the federal government has no constitutional authority to regulate power plant emissions.

17 South Korea Trade Agreement. On a single day — October 12, 2011 — both the House and Senate approved three separate trade agreements with South Korea, Colombia, and Panama. These measures are three more in a series of "free-trade agreements" intended to transfer the power to regulate trade (and eventually other powers too) to super-national arrangements via a step-by-step process. NAFTA is a prime example of such an arrangement. So is the developing continental government now known as the European Union, which is an outgrowth of a free-trade arrangement once called the Common Market. In fact, the Common Market-EU trajectory to regional governance served as a model for the formation of NAFTA.

The South Korea agreement, to quote *Congressional Quarterly*, is "considered the most economically important trade deal since the 1994 North American Free Trade Agreement." For this reason, the "Freedom Index" editors selected this vote over the other two (Colombia and Panama) for inclusion in this index.

The House passed H.R. 3080, the measure to implement the South Korea trade agreement, on October 12, 2011 by a vote of 278 to 151 (Roll Call 783). We have assigned pluses to the nays because agreements such as this one are intended to transfer trade (and other) powers to super-national arrangements binding the United States, despite the fact that under the Constitution only Congress has the power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations."

18 Abortion Funding. H.R. 358 would prohibit any federal funding to be used to purchase health insurance plans covering abortion. It would also require that any insurance companies offering plans via the ObamaCare-created state exchanges that include abortion coverage offer identical plans minus the abortion coverage.

The House passed H.R. 358 on October 13, 2011 by a vote of 251 to 172 (Roll Call 789). 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.

19 Agriculture-Commerce-Justice-Science-Transportation-HUD Appropriations. This so-called "minibus" bill (H.R. 2112) combined into a single package three of the regular appropriations bills — Agriculture, Commerce-Justice-Science, and Transportation-Housing and Urban Development (HUD) — for fiscal 2012. Just the "discretionary" spending in the minibus for the three-bill package totaled $128.1 billion. In addition, there is the spending that the government deems "mandatory." In the case of the Agriculture bill that was incorporated into the minibus, for instance, the appropriations include $116.8 billion in mandatory spending in addition to $19.8 billion in discretionary spending. The so-called mandatory spending in the Agriculture bill includes nearly $99 billion for food and nutrition programs.

The House passed the final version of this bill (known as a conference report) on November 17, 2011 by a vote of 298 to 121 (Roll Call 857). We have assigned pluses to the nays because Congress has no constitutional authority to fund many of the programs in the bill, including the farm programs, food programs, and housing (under HUD).

20 Congressional Approval of Major Regulations. This legislation (H.R. 10) is entitled the "Regulations From the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act" and is also known as the REINS Act. It would prohibit the executive branch from putting into effect major rules — rules having an economic impact of at least $100 million per year — until those rules are approved by Congress. The intent of the bill is to *rein in* the executive from usurping legislative powers via executive fiat.

The House passed the REINS Act on December 7, 2011 by a vote of 241 to 184 (Roll Call 901). We have assigned pluses to the yeas because all legislative powers in the Constitution are vested in Congress, not the executive branch. Mandatory rules issued by the executive branch may not be called laws, but they have the same effect as laws, and what they are called does not change the reality. ■

	Votes:	11-20	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	1-20
20	Wasserman Schultz (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%
21	Diaz-Balart (R)	56%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	?	68%
22	West, A. (R)	70%	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	85%
23	Hastings, A. (D)	30%	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	25%
24	Adams (R)	80%	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	85%
25	Rivera (R)	60%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	70%
GEORGIA													
1	Kingston (R)	80%	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	85%
2	Bishop, S. (D)	38%	-	?	-	-	-	+	+	+	?	-	33%
3	Westmoreland, L. (R)	90%	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	90%
4	Johnson, H. (D)	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	10%
5	Lewis, John (D)	38%	+	-	+	?	?	-	+	-	-	-	28%
6	Price, T. (R)	80%	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	85%
7	Woodall (R)	70%	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	80%
8	Scott, A. (R)	90%	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	90%
9	Graves, T. (R)	90%	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	95%
10	Broun (R)	90%	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	95%
11	Gingrey (R)	70%	-	+	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	75%
12	Barrow (D)	40%	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	35%
13	Scott, D. (D)	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	10%
HAWAII													
1	Hanabusa (D)	10%	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15%
2	Hirono (D)	20%	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	16%
IDAHO													
1	Labrador (R)	90%	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	95%
2	Simpson (R)	60%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	70%
ILLINOIS													
1	Rush (D)	30%	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	21%
2	Jackson, J. (D)	30%	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	21%
3	Lipinski (D)	20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	20%
4	Gutierrez (D)	20%	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	20%
5	Quigley (D)	10%	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15%
6	Roskam (R)	67%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	?	+	74%
7	Davis, D. (D)	10%	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15%
8	Walsh (R)	89%	+	+	+	?	+	+	-	+	+	+	89%
9	Schakowsky (D)	30%	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	20%
10	Dold (R)	50%	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	-	+	55%
11	Kinzinger (R)	70%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	70%
12	Costello (D)	50%	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	50%
13	Biggert (R)	44%	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	-	?	+	53%
14	Hultgren (R)	90%	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	85%
15	Johnson, Timothy (R)	90%	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	95%
16	Manzullo (R)	78%	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	?	+	89%
17	Schilling (R)	70%	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	75%
18	Schock (R)	60%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	68%
19	Shimkus (R)	67%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	?	+	68%
INDIANA													
1	Visclosky (D)	20%	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	25%
2	Donnelly (D)	20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	30%
3	Stutzman (R)	90%	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	90%
4	Rokita (R)	80%	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	85%
5	Burton (R)	80%	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	85%
6	Pence (R)	70%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	68%
7	Carson (D)	20%	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	15%
8	Bucshon (R)	70%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	75%
9	Young, T. (R)	70%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	70%
IOWA													
1	Braley (D)	30%	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	30%
2	Loebsack (D)	20%	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	20%
3	Boswell (D)	20%	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	25%
4	Latham (R)	70%	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	75%
5	King, S. (R)	80%	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	80%

	Votes:	11-20	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	1-20
KANSAS													
1	Huelskamp (R)	80%	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	89%
2	Jenkins (R)	80%	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	80%
3	Yoder (R)	80%	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	80%
4	Pompeo (R)	80%	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	79%
KENTUCKY													
1	Whitfield (R)	67%	?	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	74%
2	Guthrie (R)	60%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	74%
3	Yarmuth (D)	25%	-	-	+	?	-	?	+	-	-	-	22%
4	Davis, G. (R)	80%	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	80%
5	Rogers, H. (R)	60%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	68%
6	Chandler (D)	10%	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	20%
LOUISIANA													
1	Scalise (R)	67%	-	+	+	+	+	?	-	+	-	+	74%
2	Richmond (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	?	-	5%
3	Landry, J. (R)	90%	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	90%
4	Fleming (R)	80%	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	85%
5	Alexander, R. (R)	60%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	65%
6	Cassidy (R)	70%	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	75%
7	Boustany (R)	80%	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	79%
MAINE													
1	Pingree (D)	30%	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	30%
2	Michaud (D)	20%	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	20%
MARYLAND													
1	Harris (R)	90%	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	95%
2	Ruppersberger (D)	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	10%
3	Sarbanes (D)	20%	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	15%
4	Edwards (D)	20%	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	15%
5	Hoyer (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%
6	Bartlett (R)	70%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	85%
7	Cummings (D)	20%	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	15%
8	Van Hollen (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%
MASSACHUSETTS													
1	Olver (D)	20%	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	12%
2	Neal (D)	10%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11%
3	McGovern (D)	30%	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	25%
4	Frank, B. (D)	20%	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	20%
5	Tsongas (D)	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	5%
6	Tierney (D)	30%	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	25%
7	Markey (D)	20%	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	20%
8	Capuano (D)	38%	+	-	+	?	?	-	+	-	-	-	28%
9	Lynch (D)	11%	?	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	16%
10	Keating (D)	20%	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	20%
MICHIGAN													
1	Benishek (R)	70%	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	80%
2	Huizenga (R)	80%	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	85%
3	Amash (R)	90%	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	94%
4	Camp (R)	67%	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	?	-	+	79%
5	Kildee (D)	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	10%
6	Upton (R)	70%	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	80%
7	Walberg (R)	80%	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	85%
8	Rogers, Mike (R)	60%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	70%
9	Peters (D)	20%	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	16%
10	Miller, C. (R)	80%	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	85%
11	McCotter (R)	70%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	79%
12	Levin, S. (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%
13	Clarke (D)	30%	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	25%
14	Conyers (D)	40%	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	26%
15	Dingell (D)	11%	-	-	-	-	-	?	+	-	-	-	6%
MINNESOTA													
1	Walz (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15%
2	Kline, J. (R)	60%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	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.

	Votes:	11-20	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	1-20
3	Paulsen (R)	70%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	80%
4	McCollum (D)	20%	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	16%
5	Ellison (D)	30%	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	20%
6	Bachmann (R)		+	+	+	?	?	?	-	?	?	?	86%
7	Peterson (D)	50%	+	+	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	+	50%
8	Cravaack (R)	70%	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	75%
MISSISSIPPI													
1	Nunnelee (R)	60%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	65%
2	Thompson, B. (D)	30%	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	25%
3	Harper (R)	60%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	70%
4	Palazzo (R)	60%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	70%
MISSOURI													
1	Clay (D)	20%	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	20%
2	Akin (R)	90%	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	95%
3	Carnahan (D)	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	15%
4	Hartzler (R)	70%	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	75%
5	Cleaver (D)	30%	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	25%
6	Graves, S. (R)	67%	?	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	74%
7	Long (R)	60%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	74%
8	Emerson (R)	70%	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	75%
9	Luetkemeyer (R)	60%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	70%
MONTANA													
AL	Rehberg (R)	70%	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	80%
NEBRASKA													
1	Fortenberry (R)	60%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	63%
2	Terry (R)	80%	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	85%
3	Smith, Adrian (R)	60%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	70%
NEVADA													
1	Berkley (D)	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	15%
2	Amodei (R)	83%					+	+	-	+	+	+	83%
3	Heck (R)	70%	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	70%
NEW HAMPSHIRE													
1	Guinta (R)	80%	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	85%
2	Bass, C. (R)	50%	+	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	-	+	58%
NEW JERSEY													
1	Andrews (D)	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	11%
2	LoBiondo (R)	70%	+	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	-	+	75%
3	Runyan (R)	50%	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	-	+	65%
4	Smith, C. (R)	70%	+	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	-	+	70%
5	Garrett (R)	80%	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	85%
6	Pallone (D)	20%	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	15%
7	Lance (R)	50%	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	-	+	60%
8	Pascrell (D)	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	5%
9	Rothman (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%
10	Payne (D)	22%	?	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	21%
11	Frelinghuysen (R)	50%	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	-	+	56%
12	Holt (D)	20%	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	20%
13	Sires (D)	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	11%
NEW MEXICO													
1	Heinrich (D)	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	15%
2	Pearce (R)	90%	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	90%
3	Lujan (D)	30%	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	25%
NEW YORK													
1	Bishop, T. (D)	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	15%
2	Israel (D)	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	10%
3	King, P. (R)	60%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	65%
4	McCarthy, C. (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%
5	Ackerman (D)	10%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%
6	Meeks, G. (D)	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	11%
7	Crowley (D)	11%	?	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11%
8	Nadler (D)	43%	+	-	+	?	?	-	+	-	-	?	31%
9	Turner, B. (R)	67%					+	+	-	+	-	+	67%
10	Towns (D)	33%	-	-	+	?	-	-	+	-	+	-	26%
11	Clarke (D)	40%	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	30%
12	Velazquez (D)	40%	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	35%
13	Grimm (R)	44%	-	+	-	?	-	+	-	+	-	+	58%
14	Maloney (D)	20%	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20%
15	Rangel (D)	10%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15%
16	Serrano (D)	30%	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	25%
17	Engel (D)	20%	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	20%
18	Lowey (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%
19	Hayworth (R)	50%	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	-	+	60%
20	Gibson, C. (R)	50%	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	+	65%
21	Tonko (D)	20%	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	20%
22	Hinchey (D)	17%	?	?	?	-	-	-	+	-	-	?	19%
23	Owens (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11%
24	Hanna (R)	50%	+	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	53%
25	Buerkle (R)	80%	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	80%
26	Hochul (D)	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	9%
27	Higgins (D)	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	10%
28	Slaughter (D)	25%	+	-	+	-	-	-	?	?	-	-	22%
29	Reed, T. (R)	70%	+	-	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	75%
NORTH CAROLINA													
1	Butterfield (D)	20%	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	15%
2	Ellmers (R)	80%	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	80%
3	Jones (R)	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	100%
4	Price, D. (D)	10%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15%
5	Foxx (R)	90%	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	85%
6	Coble (R)	80%	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	85%
7	McIntyre (D)	60%	-	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	+	65%
8	Kissell (D)	30%	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	20%
9	Myrick (R)	78%	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	88%
10	McHenry (R)	90%	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	90%
11	Shuler (D)	33%	-	-	-	-	+	?	+	+	-	-	28%
12	Watt (D)	20%	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	15%
13	Miller, B. (D)	20%	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	10%
NORTH DAKOTA													
AL	Berg (R)	70%	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	75%
OHIO													
1	Chabot (R)	80%	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	80%
2	Schmidt (R)	80%	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	85%
3	Turner (R)	70%	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	70%
4	Jordan (R)	90%	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	83%
5	Latta (R)	60%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	70%
6	Johnson, B. (R)	60%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	70%
7	Austria (R)	70%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	70%
8	Boehner (R)		?	?	-	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	
9	Kaptur (D)	30%	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	21%
10	Kucinich (D)	40%	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	30%
11	Fudge (D)	30%	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	21%
12	Tiberi (R)	60%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	65%
13	Sutton (D)	20%	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	15%
14	LaTourette (R)	60%	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	60%
15	Stivers (R)	60%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	65%
16	Renacci (R)	60%	+	+	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	+	65%
17	Ryan, T. (D)	30%	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	20%
18	Gibbs, B. (R)	70%	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	75%
OKLAHOMA													
1	Sullivan (R)	80%	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	84%
2	Boren (D)	50%	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	+	60%
3	Lucas (R)	60%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	70%
4	Cole (R)	60%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	70%
5	Lankford (R)	80%	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	80%

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:	11-20	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	1-20
OREGON													
1	Vacant												
2	Walden (R)	60%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	65%
3	Blumenauer (D)	10%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%
4	DeFazio (D)	30%	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	30%
5	Schrader (D)	10%	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	25%
PENNSYLVANIA													
1	Brady, R. (D)	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	10%
2	Fattah (D)	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	10%
3	Kelly (R)	60%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	70%
4	Altmire (D)	40%	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	35%
5	Thompson, G. (R)	60%	+	-	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	70%
6	Gerlach (R)	60%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	70%
7	Meehan (R)	50%	-	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	60%
8	Fitzpatrick (R)	60%	+	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	70%
9	Shuster (R)	60%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	70%
10	Marino (R)	50%	-	+	-	?	?	+	-	+	-	+	67%
11	Barletta (R)	50%	-	+	-	?	?	+	-	+	-	+	67%
12	Critz (D)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	40%
13	Schwartz (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%
14	Doyle (D)	20%	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	20%
15	Dent (R)	60%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	60%
16	Pitts (R)	70%	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	80%
17	Holden (D)	40%	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	-	35%
18	Murphy, T. (R)	70%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	75%
19	Platts (R)	60%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	70%
RHODE ISLAND													
1	Cicilline (D)	20%	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	25%
2	Langevin (D)	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	10%
SOUTH CAROLINA													
1	Scott, T. (R)	80%	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	85%
2	Wilson, J. (R)	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	90%
3	Duncan (R)	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	100%
4	Gowdy (R)	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	95%
5	Mulvaney (R)	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	95%
6	Clyburn (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%
SOUTH DAKOTA													
AL	Noem (R)	80%	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	80%
TENNESSEE													
1	Roe (R)	70%	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	85%
2	Duncan (R)	90%	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	95%
3	Fleischmann (R)	80%	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	80%
4	DesJarlais (R)	90%	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	85%
5	Cooper (D)	10%	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	10%
6	Black, D. (R)	60%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	70%
7	Blackburn, M. (R)	70%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	75%
8	Fincher (R)	80%	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	85%
9	Cohen (D)	20%	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	21%
TEXAS													
1	Gohmert (R)	90%	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	90%
2	Poe (R)	90%	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	90%
3	Johnson, S. (R)	70%	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	79%
4	Hall, R. (R)	80%	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	85%
5	Hensarling (R)	70%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	70%
6	Barton (R)	80%	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	80%
7	Culberson (R)	67%	?	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	74%
8	Brady, K. (R)	70%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	70%
9	Green, A. (D)	20%	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	25%
10	McCaul (R)	60%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	65%
11	Conaway (R)	60%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	70%
12	Granger (R)	60%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	68%
13	Thornberry (R)	60%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	70%
14	Paul, Ron (R)	100%	+	+	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	+	100%
15	Hinojosa (D)	20%	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	19%
16	Reyes (D)	33%	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	?	+	-	26%
17	Flores (R)	70%	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	75%
18	Jackson Lee (D)	11%	?	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	21%
19	Neugebauer (R)	90%	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	85%
20	Gonzalez (D)	11%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	?	-	-	21%
21	Smith, Lamar (R)	60%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	70%
22	Olson (R)	60%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	70%
23	Canseco (R)	70%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	75%
24	Marchant (R)	70%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	75%
25	Doggett (D)	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	10%
26	Burgess (R)	80%	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	84%
27	Farenthold (R)	80%	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	80%
28	Cuellar (D)	20%	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	25%
29	Green, G. (D)	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	16%
30	Johnson, E. (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%
31	Carter (R)	60%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	70%
32	Sessions, P. (R)	70%	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	75%
UTAH													
1	Bishop, R. (R)	89%	+	?	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	89%
2	Matheson (D)	50%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	40%
3	Chaffetz (R)	90%	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	95%
VERMONT													
AL	Welch (D)	20%	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	25%
VIRGINIA													
1	Wittman (R)	50%	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	-	+	65%
2	Rigell (R)	70%	+	-	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	80%
3	Scott, R. (D)	10%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15%
4	Forbes (R)	70%	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	75%
5	Hurt (R)	80%	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	80%
6	Goodlatte (R)	60%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	68%
7	Cantor (R)	60%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	65%
8	Moran, James (D)	10%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%
9	Griffith (R)	80%	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	85%
10	Wolf (R)	60%	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	-	+	70%
11	Connolly (D)	10%	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15%
WASHINGTON													
1	Inslee (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%
2	Larsen, R. (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%
3	Herrera Beutler (R)	80%	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	80%
4	Hastings, D. (R)	60%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	72%
5	McMorris Rodgers (R)	60%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	70%
6	Dicks (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%
7	McDermott (D)	10%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%
8	Reichert (R)	44%	-	-	-	+	+	?	-	+	-	+	47%
9	Smith, Adam (D)	10%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%
WEST VIRGINIA													
1	McKinley (R)	70%	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	80%
2	Capito (R)	70%	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	75%
3	Rahall (D)	40%	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	35%
WISCONSIN													
1	Ryan, P. (R)	70%	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	70%
2	Baldwin (D)	30%	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	25%
3	Kind (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%
4	Moore (D)	11%	-	-	?	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	11%
5	Sensenbrenner (R)	80%	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	85%
6	Petri (R)	70%	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	80%
7	Duffy (R)	80%	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	75%
8	Ribble (R)	78%	+	+	-	?	+	+	-	+	+	+	84%
WYOMING													
AL	Lummis (R)	80%	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	85%

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.

The Anti-Federalist Papers

A look at the clashes and compromises that gave birth to our form of government. (2003ed, 406pp, pb, $7.99) **BKAFP**

The Federalist Papers

A brilliant defense of the Constitution of the United States by Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, and John Jay. (1999ed, 606pp, pb, $6.99) **BKFP**

Colonial Origins of the American Constitution

"Local government in colonial America was the seedbed of American constitutionalism." So begins the introductory essay to this landmark collection of 80 documents created by American colonists that are the genesis of American fundamental law and constitutionalism. (1998, 396pp, pb, $14.95) **BKCOAC**

Miracle at Philadelphia

Rediscover the timeless story of the Constitutional Convention of 1787. (1986ed, 346pp, pb, $16.95) **BKMP**

View of the Constitution of the United States

Published in 1803 by a distinguished patriot and jurist, *View of the Constitution of the United States* represents the earliest extended commentary on the U.S. Constitution and Bill of Rights. Written from the perspective that the federal government is an agent of a sovereign people, Tucker's work continues to add to our understanding of the Founding Fathers' original intentions. (1999ed, 478pp, pb, $14.95) **BKVCUS**

Friends of the Constitution

This book consists of extended quotations from the essays, letters, and pamphlets by the "other" influential supporters of the proposed constitution: George Washington, Benjamin Rush, Noah Webster, and more. (1998ed, 523pp, pb, $17.95) **BKFC**

A More Perfect Union

This motion picture does an admirable job of dramatizing the events of the Constitutional Convention of 1787. (2006, 120min, cased DVD, $19.95) **DVDAMPU**

QUANTITY	TITLE	PRICE	TOTAL PRICE

SUBTOTAL	WI RESIDENTS ADD 5% SALES TAX	SHIPPING/HANDLING (SEE CHART BELOW)	TOTAL

For shipments outside the U.S., please call for rates.

Order Subtotal	Standard Shipping	Rush Shipping
$0-10.99	$4.95	$9.95
$11.00-19.99	$7.75	$12.75
$20.00-49.99	$9.95	$14.95
$50.00-99.99	$13.75	$18.75
$100.00-149.99	$15.95	$20.95
$150.00+	call	call

Standard: 4-14 business days. Rush: 3-7 business days, no P.O. Boxes, HI/AK add $10.00

ShopJBS.org | Official Store of The John Birch Society

Order Online: www.ShopJBS.org

Credit-card orders call toll-free now!

Mail completed form to:
ShopJBS • P.O. BOX 8040
APPLETON, WI 54912

1-800-342-6491

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Phone _____ E-mail _____

❑ Check ❑ VISA ❑ Discover
❑ Money Order ❑ MasterCard ❑ American Express

VISA/MC/Discover Three Digit V-Code — — —

American Express Four Digit V-Code — — — —

Make checks payable to: **ShopJBS**

_____ Exp. Date _____

Signature _____

RPFI0112

Senate Vote Descriptions

11 IMF Loans. During consideration of a bill on executive branch nominations (S. 679), Sen. Jim DeMint (R-S.C.) introduced an amendment to repeal the authority to provide certain loans to the International Monetary Fund, and to rescind up to $108 billion previously appropriated for the IMF. The IMF is an adjunct of the United Nations and grants foreign aid to qualifying countries.

The Senate rejected the DeMint amendment on June 29, 2011 by a vote of 44 to 55 (Roll Call 99). We have assigned pluses to the yeas because there is no authority in the U.S. Constitution for redistributing American wealth to other countries.

12 Debt Deal. This legislation (S. 365) increased the debt limit while creating a process for cutting future deficit projections. It is explained in more detail under House vote #13.

The Senate agreed to the House-passed version of the bill on August 2, 2011 by a vote of 74 to 26 (Roll Call 123). We have assigned pluses to the nays because the debt deal allows both the national debt and spending to continue their upward trajectories.

13 Debt Limit Disapproval. Senate Joint Resolution 25 would disapprove of President Obama's intent to raise the national debt ceiling by an additional $500 billion on top of the immediate $400 billion increase under last August's budget deal (Senate vote #12 above). If the motion of disapproval were enacted, the additional $500 billion increase would not go into effect. S. J. Res. 25 is similar to H. J. Res. 77, described under House vote #14.

The Senate rejected a motion to proceed to the resolution of disapproval on September 8 by a vote of 45 to 52 (Roll Call 130). We have assigned pluses to the yeas because piling on more and more debt is devastating to the economy.

14 Trade Promotion Authority. During consideration of the trade-preferences bill, Sen. Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) introduced an amendment to reinstitute trade promotion authority through 2013 for the purpose of expediting approval of trade bills. The authority, which was called "fast track" when initially instituted, had expired in 2007. The fast-track procedure requires that Congress must not amend or filibuster trade agreements submitted to them by the President, and must either approve or disapprove of the agreements within 90 days of submission. Renewing trade promotion authority is considered crucial for picking up the pace for approving future free-trade agreements such as the South Korea trade agreement (House vote #17 and Senate vote #16).

The Senate rejected McConnell's amendment on September 20, 2011 by a vote of 45 to 55 (Roll Call 141). We have assigned pluses to the nays because trade promotion authority limits the ability of Congress to deliberate and legislate. Moreover, treaties should need a two-thirds majority vote in the Senate for approval.

AP Images

Disturbing disenfranchisement: Senator Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) cajoled President Obama to act on trade deals for Panama, Colombia, and South Korea, giving up U.S. power over trade, even though past free-trade deals, such as NAFTA, have harmed U.S. businesses and led to an outsourcing of jobs.

15 Jobs Program. The Obama-Democrat jobs bill (S. 1660) would provide $175 billion in spending for transportation infrastructure projects, extending long-term unemployment benefits, preventing lay-offs of teachers and first responders, and upgrading public schools and community colleges. It would also extend and expand the current employee payroll tax cut. But it would offset the costs of the bill by imposing a 5.6 percent surtax on household income above $1 million.

The Senate rejected a motion to invoke cloture (and thus end debate so the bill could come up for a vote) on October 11, 2011 by a vote of 50 to 49 (Roll Call 160; a three-fifths majority vote of the full Senate — 60 votes — was needed to invoke cloture). We have assigned pluses to the nays because the way to create jobs is not to provide them via government financing of certain sectors of the economy, but to reduce the government's burden on the economy.

16 South Korea Trade Agreement. The measure (H.R. 3080) to implement the South Korea trade agreement and the significance of this and similar bilateral and multinational agreements are explained under House vote #17.

The Senate passed H.R. 3080 on October 12, 2011 by a vote of 83 to 15 (Roll Call 161). We have assigned pluses to the nays because agreements such as this one are intended to transfer trade (and other) powers to super-national arrangements, despite the fact that under the Constitution only Congress has the power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations."

17 Net Neutrality. Senate Joint Resolution 6 would have nullified the "net neutrality" rules issued by the Federal Communications Commission in December 2010 and scheduled to become effective November 20, 2011. The new rules give the federal government more control over the Internet. "The FCC reversed its successful

Senate Vote Scores

Votes:	11-20	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	1-20
ALABAMA												
Shelby (R)	70%	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	75%
Sessions, J. (R)	67%	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	?	+	-	74%
ALASKA												
Murkowski (R)	50%	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	55%
Begich (D)	10%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	20%
ARIZONA												
McCain (R)	50%	+	-	+	-	+	-	?	?	+	-	61%
Kyl (R)	50%	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	60%
ARKANSAS												
Pryor (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15%
Boozman (R)	50%	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	55%
CALIFORNIA												
Feinstein (D)	20%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	20%
Boxer (D)	20%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	20%
COLORADO												
Udall, Mark (D)	20%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	25%
Bennet (D)	20%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	20%
CONNECTICUT												
Lieberman (I)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11%
Blumenthal (D)	20%	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	22%
DELAWARE												
Carper (D)	20%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	20%
Coons (D)	20%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	25%
FLORIDA												
Nelson, Bill (D)	20%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	25%
Rubio (R)	67%	+	+	?	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	76%
GEORGIA												
Chambliss (R)	70%	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	65%
Isakson (R)	60%	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	65%
HAWAII												
Inouye (D)	13%	-	-	-	+	-	-	?	?	-	-	11%
Akaka (D)	20%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	20%
IDAHO												
Crapo (R)	60%	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	65%
Risch (R)	60%	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	63%
ILLINOIS												
Durbin (D)	20%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	15%
Kirk (R)	50%	-	-	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	50%
INDIANA												
Lugar (R)	50%	-	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	55%
Coats (R)	70%	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	65%
IOWA												
Grassley (R)	70%	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	65%
Harkin (D)	40%	-	+	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	25%
KANSAS												
Roberts (R)	50%	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	56%
Moran, Jerry (R)	70%	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	+	70%
KENTUCKY												
McConnell (R)	50%	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	55%
Paul, Rand (R)	90%	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	95%
LOUISIANA												
Landrieu, M. (D)	10%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	20%
Vitter (R)	70%	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	70%

Votes:	11-20	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	1-20
MAINE												
Snowe (R)	60%	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	60%
Collins (R)	60%	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	55%
MARYLAND												
Mikulski (D)	20%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	15%
Cardin (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	25%
MASSACHUSETTS												
Kerry (D)	20%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	21%
Brown, Scott (R)	20%	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	35%
MICHIGAN												
Levin, C. (D)	10%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%
Stabenow (D)	10%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%
MINNESOTA												
Klobuchar (D)	10%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%
Franken (D)	20%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	20%
MISSISSIPPI												
Cochran (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	45%
Wicker (R)	50%	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	50%
MISSOURI												
McCaskill (D)	20%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	15%
Blunt (R)	50%	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	50%
MONTANA												
Baucus, M. (D)	20%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	30%
Tester (D)	50%	+	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	45%
NEBRASKA												
Nelson, Ben (D)	50%	-	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	-	35%
Johanns (R)	50%	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	50%
NEVADA												
Reid, H. (D)	40%	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	25%
Heller (R)	70%	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	77%
NEW HAMPSHIRE												
Shaheen (D)	20%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	25%
Ayotte (R)	60%	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	-	65%
NEW JERSEY												
Lautenberg (D)	30%	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	30%
Menendez (D)	30%	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	33%
NEW MEXICO												
Bingaman (D)	20%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	25%
Udall, T. (D)	22%	?	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	26%
NEW YORK												
Schumer (D)	20%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	17%
Gillibrand (D)	30%	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	25%
NORTH CAROLINA												
Burr (R)	60%	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	65%
Hagan (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	30%
NORTH DAKOTA												
Conrad (D)	20%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	15%
Hoeven (R)	50%	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	50%
OHIO												
Brown, Sherrod (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	25%
Portman (R)	60%	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	60%
OKLAHOMA												
Inhofe (R)	70%	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	70%
Coburn (R)	75%	+	+	+	-	?	?	+	+	+	-	72%

Votes:	11-20	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	1-20
OREGON												
Wyden (D)	20%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	25%
Merkley (D)	40%	-	+	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	35%
PENNSYLVANIA												
Casey (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	20%
Toomey (R)	70%	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	75%
RHODE ISLAND												
Reed, J. (D)	20%	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	20%
Whitehouse (D)	20%	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	20%
SOUTH CAROLINA												
Graham (R)	70%	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	70%
DeMint (R)	70%	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	80%
SOUTH DAKOTA												
Johnson, Tim (D)	20%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	15%
Thune (R)	60%	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	60%
TENNESSEE												
Alexander, L. (R)	40%	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	50%
Corker (R)	50%	+	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	60%
TEXAS												
Hutchison (R)	50%	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	55%
Cornyn (R)	60%	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	65%

Votes:	11-20	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	1-20
UTAH												
Hatch (R)	70%	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	70%
Lee, M. (R)	80%	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	90%
VERMONT												
Leahy (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	25%
Sanders (I)	33%	-	+	-	+	-	?	-	-	-	+	26%
VIRGINIA												
Webb (D)	22%	-	-	?	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	21%
Warner (D)	20%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	21%
WASHINGTON												
Murray (D)	20%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	20%
Cantwell (D)	20%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	25%
WEST VIRGINIA												
Rockefeller (D)	33%	-	-	?	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	26%
Manchin (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	+	-	-	30%
WISCONSIN												
Kohl (D)	20%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	20%
Johnson, R. (R)	70%	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	75%
WYOMING												
Enzi (R)	60%	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	70%
Barrasso (R)	60%	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	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 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 and 11.

hands-off approach … by passing net neutrality rules where the FCC has essentially granted itself power over all forms of communication including the Internet," warned Sen. Kay Bailey Hutchison (R-Texas), who spearheaded S. J. Res. 6. She added that the "regulations on broadband providers" in the net neutrality rules "establish the FCC as the Internet's gatekeeper, a role for which government is not really suited when innovation could be stifled."

Senator Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) moved to proceed to the resolution, but the Senate rejected his resolution on November 10 by a vote of 46 to 52 — thereby thwarting the attempt to nullify the net neutrality rules (Roll Call 200). We have assigned pluses to the yeas because the federal government has no business serving as a gatekeeper for the Internet, and such a role could eventually threaten what has become an important public square for circulating ideas and information.

18 Cross-state Pollution. Senate Joint Resolution 27 would nullify the EPA's cross-state pollution rules targeting sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxide power plant emissions. The House had already passed related legislation that would delay implementation of the EPA rules but not actually eliminate them. (See House vote #16.)

Senator Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) moved to proceed to the resolution, but the Senate rejected his motion November 10 by a vote of 41 to 56 — thereby thwarting the attempt to stop the EPA cross-state pollution rules (Roll Call 201). We have assigned pluses to the yeas because these rules will further damage the economy and also because the federal government has no constitutional authority to regulate power plant emissions.

19 Agriculture-Commerce-Justice-Science-Transportation-HUD Appropriations. This so-called "minibus" bill (H.R. 2112) — which combined into a single package three of the regular appropriations bills for fiscal 2012 — is described in more detail under House vote #19.

The Senate passed the final version (conference report) of this legislation on November 17, 2011 by a vote of 70 to 30 (Roll Call 208). We have assigned pluses to the nays because Congress has no constitutional authority to fund many of the programs in the bill, including the farm programs, food programs, and housing (under HUD).

20 Indefinite Detention. Detainee-related language in the Defense authorization bill (S. 1867) was written in such a sweeping way that even the United States can be considered part of the battlefield in the global war against terror — and even American citizens accused of being terrorists can be apprehended by the U.S. military and detained indefinitely without habeas corpus and without even being tried and found guilty in a court of law. Several attempts were made to revise the language, including an amendment offered by Sen. Dianne Feinstein (D-Calif.) to prohibit U.S. citizens from being held indefinitely without being charged or given a trial.

The Senate rejected this amendment on December 1 by a vote of 45 to 55 (Roll Call 214). We have assigned pluses to the yeas because the War on Terror must not be allowed to destroy legal protections stretching back to the Magna Carta. ■

AP Images

What's good for the goose… For years the U.S. has held foreigners without trial. Congress now has authorized this power for Americans.

A Republic, If You Can Keep It

The John Birch Society

Appleton, WI 54912-8040 • (920) 749-3780 • JBS.org

"Less government, more responsibility, and — with God's help — a better world."

UNDERSTANDING TODAY'S WORLD

The New American

THAT FREEDOM SHALL NOT PERISH

CALL 1-800-727-TRUE TO SUBSCRIBE TODAY!
OR VISIT WWW.THENEWAMERICAN.COM AND CLICK ON SUBSCRIBE