

The Freedom Index

A Congressional Scorecard Based on the U.S. Constitution

Our third look at the 115th Congress shows how every member of the House and Senate voted on key issues such as the \$1.3 trillion omnibus spending bill, warrantless surveillance, raw milk (House), and illegal immigration (Senate).

House Vote Descriptions

21 Warrantless Surveillance. During consideration of the bill (S. 139) reauthorizing the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA), Representative Justin Amash (R-Mich.) introduced an amendment to end NSA collection of communications data that is neither to nor from an approved foreign target, but rather communications “about” a foreign target entirely between American citizens. It would prohibit the FBI and intelligence agencies from searching the NSA database for information on U.S. citizens without first obtaining a warrant, except in certain circumstances. The amendment would also end “reverse targeting,” in which an American citizen communicating with a foreign target is also subject to surveillance.

The House rejected Amash’s amendment on January 11, 2018 by a vote of 183 to 233 (Roll Call 14). We have assigned pluses to the yeas because this amendment



Hear all, see all: The NSA Data Center in Bluffdale, Utah, stores on its supercomputers massive amounts of information secretly collected from e-mails and phone calls.

is an attempt to limit NSA surveillance of U.S. citizens. Warrantless surveillance of U.S. citizens is unconstitutional, and NSA surveillance certainly falls under this category. Amash’s amendment would require the FBI to obtain a warrant, rather than merely FISA Court approval, in order to access the NSA’s database.

22 Warrantless Surveillance. This bill (S. 139) would reauthorize for six years, through 2023, the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA), which governs electronic surveillance of foreign terrorism suspects. The bill would require the development of procedures for searching the NSA database that would protect

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 36 percent, and the average Senate

score is 46 percent. Three representatives and one senator scored 100 percent. We encourage readers to examine how their own congressmen voted on each of the 10 key measures. We also encourage readers to commend legislators for their constitutional votes and to urge improvement where needed.

This is our third index for the 115th Congress. Our first index (votes 1-10) for the current Congress appeared in our August 7, 2017 issue, and our second index (votes 11-20) appeared in our February 19, 2018 issue. An online version of the “Freedom Index” is also available (click on “Freedom Index” at TheNewAmerican.com). ■

the Fourth Amendment-guaranteed rights of U.S. citizens, while allowing the FBI to access information with an order from the secret FISA Court, in certain cases.

The House passed S. 139 on January 11, 2018 by a vote of 256 to 164 (Roll Call 16). We have assigned pluses to the nays because FISA, while supposedly put in place to gather intelligence on foreign targets, has been used to spy on U.S. citizens. While the bill does provide provisions to, ostensibly, protect the privacy of U.S. citizens, given the track record of intelligence agencies, it is unlikely that they would actually follow these rules. The FISA Court gives a green light to just about any surveillance request that comes its way, and FISA-approved NSA warrantless surveillance of American citizens has become common knowledge.

23 World Bank. The World Bank Accountability Act (H.R. 3326) would authorize \$3.29 billion in U.S. contributions to the World Bank's International Development Association, which discharges concessional loans known as "credits" and economic grants to the world's poorest and most underdeveloped countries.

The House passed H.R. 3326 on January 17, 2018 by a vote of 237 to 184 (Roll Call 24). We have assigned pluses to the nays because authorizing such funds to the WTO's IDA is foreign aid, which is a form of international welfare and completely unconstitutional, and most World Bank "aid" further enriches plutocrats in Third World countries, at the expense of the poor.

24 School Violence. The STOP School Violence Act of 2018 (H.R. 4909) would authorize \$75 million a year through fiscal year 2028 for the Justice Department's Secure Our Schools grant program. SOS is a grant program of the Justice Department's Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, which has been instrumental in laying the foundations for nationalizing local police by providing federal "assistance" in the form of funds, equipment, training, and development of guidelines to local law-enforcement agencies.

In a podcast interview with *Conservative Review*, Representative Thomas Massie (R-Ky.) said the "STOP School Violence Act was bad enough for nationalizing defense of our schools," but he further revealed,

"There is money in that bill that is going to go to gun control groups. It literally says in there you can give it to the 501-C3s, and then it also says in there it can't go to train anybody on gun safety. It's got to go for all the liberal sort of agendas."

The House passed H.R. 4909 on March 14, 2018 by a vote of 407 to 10 (Roll Call 106). We have assigned pluses to the nays because school safety is not a proper function of the federal government, and no action the federal government has ever taken would actually make schools safe. School safety should be addressed at the local level. Furthermore, the nationalizing of local police and school security, as well as any other gun-control measures contained in the bill, are all strictly unconstitutional.

25 Omnibus Appropriations. This bill (H.R. 1625) would provide \$1.3 trillion in discretionary appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018 for federal government operations and services. This represents an overall increase in discretionary spending of 12 percent over the 2017 level. The big winner was the Department of Defense, with an increase of 10 percent over last year's appropriations. Democrat nego-

tiators on this bill successfully fought off many Republican riders, such as a rider that would have permitted the Trump administration to withdraw the Waters of the United States (WOTUS) rule. Pro-life Republicans were saddened to learn that the omnibus bill continues the more than \$500 million in taxpayer dollars Planned Parenthood receives each year.

The House passed the omnibus spending bill on March 22, 2018 by a vote of 256 to 167 (Roll Call 127). We have assigned pluses to the nays because with this omnibus bill, members of Congress are failing to address their fiscally and constitutionally irresponsible budgeting and appropriating process that is currently yielding annual federal deficits measured in the hundreds of billions of dollars, as well as minimizing their accountability to the voters by combining all discretionary federal spending for fiscal 2018 into one gigantic "take it or leave it" bill.

26 Agricultural Crop Subsidies. During consideration of the farm bill (H.R. 2), Representative Tom McClintock (R-Calif.) introduced an amendment that would have phased out agricultural crop subsidies by fiscal year 2030.



AP Images

Pay now or pay later: Crop subsidies may reduce prices at grocery stores — but they inflate the tax bill. An attempt to phase out the subsidies was overwhelmingly defeated in the House.

House Vote Scores ✓

	Votes: 21-30	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	1-30
ALABAMA												
1 Byrne (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	53%
2 Roby (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	50%
3 Rogers, M. (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	57%
4 Aderholt (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	50%
5 Brooks, M. (R)	70%	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	74%
6 Palmer (R)	50%	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	62%
7 Sewell (D)	11%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	?	14%
ALASKA												
AL Young, Don (R)	40%	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	57%
ARIZONA												
1 O'Halleran (D)	20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	17%
2 McCally (R)	40%	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	53%
3 Grijalva (D)	40%	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	28%
4 Gosar (R)	80%	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	77%
5 Biggs (R)	90%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	87%
6 Schweikert (R)	70%	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	70%
7 Gallego (D)	44%	+	+	+	-	+	?	-	-	-	-	29%
8 Lesko (R)	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	100%
9 Sinema (D)	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	22%
ARKANSAS												
1 Crawford (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	53%
2 Hill (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	53%
3 Womack (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	53%
4 Westerman (R)	40%	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	60%
CALIFORNIA												
1 LaMalfa (R)	40%	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	57%
2 Huffman (D)	44%	?	+	+	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	24%
3 Garamendi (D)	10%	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%
4 McClintock (R)	90%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	77%
5 Thompson, M. (D)	20%	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	13%
6 Matsui (D)	40%	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	20%
7 Bera (D)	10%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13%
8 Cook (R)	40%	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	57%
9 McNerney (D)	38%	?	?	+	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	21%
10 Denham (R)	40%	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	53%
11 DeSaulnier (D)	25%	?	?	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	14%
12 Pelosi (D)	10%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%
13 Lee, B. (D)	50%	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	27%
14 Speier (D)	57%	+	+	+	-	+	-	?	?	?	-	24%
15 Swalwell (D)	20%	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	13%
16 Costa (D)	20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	24%
17 Khanna (D)	40%	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	23%
18 Eshoo (D)	30%	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17%
19 Lofgren (D)	50%	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	30%
20 Panetta (D)	20%	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	17%
21 Valadao (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	50%
22 Nunes (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	51%
23 McCarthy (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	53%
24 Carbajal (D)	14%	?	?	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	?	15%
25 Knight (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	53%
26 Brownley (D)	10%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13%
27 Chu (D)	40%	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	23%
28 Schiff (D)	20%	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	13%
29 Cárdenas (D)	44%	?	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	28%
30 Sherman (D)	20%	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13%
31 Aguilar (D)	20%	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	17%

	Votes: 21-30	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	1-30
32 Napolitano (D)	40%	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	25%
33 Lieu (D)	71%	+	+	+	?	+	-	?	?	+	-	38%
34 Gomez (D)	40%	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	39%
35 Torres (D)	20%	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	20%
36 Ruiz (D)	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13%
37 Bass (D)	44%	+	+	+	?	+	-	-	-	-	-	27%
38 Sánchez (D)	40%	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	23%
39 Royce (R)	40%	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	57%
40 Roybal-Allard (D)	40%	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	21%
41 Takano (D)	40%	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	24%
42 Calvert (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	53%
43 Waters, Maxine (D)	30%	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17%
44 Barragán (D)	40%	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	27%
45 Walters, Mimi (R)	22%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	?	52%
46 Correa (D)	40%	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	30%
47 Lowenthal (D)	40%	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	20%
48 Rohrabacher (R)	80%	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	69%
49 Issa (R)	60%	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	60%
50 Hunter (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	59%
51 Vargas (D)	44%	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	?	28%
52 Peters, S. (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7%
53 Davis, S. (D)	30%	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20%
COLORADO												
1 DeGette (D)	40%	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	25%
2 Polis (D)	67%	+	+	-	-	+	?	?	?	+	?	27%
3 Tipton (R)	40%	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	60%
4 Buck (R)	57%	-	+	-	-	+	?	?	?	+	+	67%
5 Lamborn (R)	50%	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	63%
6 Coffman (R)	50%	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	63%
7 Perlmutter (D)	30%	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	17%
CONNECTICUT												
1 Larson, J. (D)	40%	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	24%
2 Courtney (D)	30%	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20%
3 DeLauro (D)	30%	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17%
4 Himes (D)	10%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%
5 Esty (D)	20%	-	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17%
DELAWARE												
AL Blunt Rochester (D)	10%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13%
FLORIDA												
1 Gaetz (R)	70%	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	77%
2 Dunn (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	52%
3 Yoho (R)	70%	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	73%
4 Rutherford (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	50%
5 Lawson (D)	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	11%
6 DeSantis (R)	60%	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	64%
7 Murphy (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%
8 Posey (R)	70%	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	68%
9 Soto (D)	40%	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	23%
10 Demings (D)	10%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13%
11 Webster (R)	70%	+	+	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	74%
12 Bilirakis (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	54%
13 Crist (D)	20%	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	18%
14 Castor (D)	10%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%
15 Ross (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	50%
16 Buchanan (R)	20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	46%
17 Rooney, T. (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	52%
18 Mast (R)	40%	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	50%

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 House rejected McClintock's amendment on May 17, 2018 by a vote of 34 to 380 (Roll Call 194). We have assigned pluses to the yeas because no warrant for the appropriation of crop subsidies is found in the Constitution, and subsidies disrupt the free market economy.

27 Raw Milk. During consideration of the farm bill (H.R. 2), Representative Thomas Massie (R-Ky.) introduced an amendment to prohibit federal interference in the interstate transportation of unpasteurized milk and milk products between states that allow for the distribution of such products for direct human consumption.

The House rejected Massie's amendment on May 18, 2018 by a vote of 79 to 331 (Roll Call 201). We have assigned pluses to the yeas because the U.S. Constitution does not give the federal government any authority over what foods a person chooses to consume. In other words, it is illegal for the federal government to make raw milk illegal. While the federal government does have authority to "regulate Commerce ... among the several States," there is no reason for federal interference in a scenario such as this, where a product is legally sold in each of the states in question. Massie's amendment would have limited federal overreach and should have been supported.

28 Waters of the United States. During consideration of the farm bill (H.R. 2), Representative Jim Banks (R-Ind.) introduced an amendment to repeal the Environmental Protection Agency's 2015 "Waters of the United States" rule. On the floor of the House, Banks called this rule "the poster child of government overreach during the Obama administration," noting that it gives "unelected bureaucrats at the EPA the power to broadly interpret what is a navigable waterway" under the Clean Water Act — so broadly that "even a puddle in a farm's drainage ditch could be subjected to Federal regulation."

The House adopted Banks' amendment on May 18, 2018 by a vote of 238 to 173 (Roll Call 203). We have assigned pluses to the yeas because both federal water regulations and the EPA are unconstitutional, and if the rule were allowed to stand, activities such as farming and real



AP Images

What's wrong with raw milk? Federal intervention against its sale suggests there's plenty wrong, but proponents say it's healthier than pasteurized milk. Shouldn't consumers be able to decide which milk to buy?

estate development would be greatly hampered, since farmers and developers would be subject to increased unconstitutional permit requirements and fines concerning their treatment of almost any body of water, no matter how small.

29 Experimental Drugs. This bill (S. 204) would allow patients with life-threatening diseases or conditions who are not participating in clinical trials to seek access to experimental and investigational drugs directly from a drug manufacturer, without approval by the Food and Drug Administration. It would require that in order for the patient to be eligible, the patient must first try all approved treatment options and be unable to participate in a clinical trial. Only drugs that have completed phase 1 clinical trials, that have not been approved or licensed for any use, and that are currently under an active FDA application or are undergoing clinical trials would be eligible for use under the bill's provisions.

The House passed S. 204 on May 22, 2018 by a vote of 250 to 169 (Roll Call 214). We have assigned pluses to the yeas because the federal government, under the Constitution, has not been given authority over what medical procedures U.S. citizens choose to engage in. If a person wants to try an "unapproved" treatment, he should be

able to do so with no interference from the government. In fact, since the Constitution gives the federal government no authority whatsoever over any aspect of healthcare, the FDA should not even exist. Any law that lessens government overreach into the personal medical decisions of citizens is a step in the right direction.

30 Appropriations Cuts. This bill (H.R. 3) would cut nearly \$15 billion from previously approved, unspent spending, including \$7 billion from the Children's Health Insurance Program and \$4.3 billion from the Department of Energy's Advanced Technology Vehicles Manufacturing Loan Program.

The House passed H.R. 3 on June 7, 2018 by a vote of 210 to 206 (Roll Call 243). We have assigned pluses to the yeas not only because the spending falls outside the scope of constitutionally authorized federal powers, but also because the federal government needs to start reining in ballooning federal spending (and debt) somewhere in order to avert fiscal disaster. The cuts in this bill comprise only a fraction of one percent of total federal spending, and according to the Congressional Budget Office, most of the funding targeted by the bill would not be spent anyway. Yet modest cuts are better than none at all. ■

	Votes: 21-30	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	1-30
19 Rooney, F. (R)	50%	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	66%
20 Hastings (D)	30%	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17%
21 Frankel (D)	10%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13%
22 Deutch (D)	20%	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15%
23 Wasserman Schultz (D)	10%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11%
24 Wilson, F. (D)	14%	?	?	+	?	-	-	-	-	-	-	12%
25 Diaz-Balart (R)	20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	46%
26 Curbelo (R)	25%	-	-	-	-	+	-	?	?	+	-	38%
27 Ros-Lehtinen (R)	33%	-	-	-	?	+	-	-	+	+	-	46%

GEORGIA

1 Carter, E.L. (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	53%
2 Bishop, S. (D)	30%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	36%
3 Ferguson (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	57%
4 Johnson, H. (D)	50%	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	30%
5 Lewis, John (D)	33%	+	+	?	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	21%
6 Handel (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	47%
7 Woodall (R)	50%	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	60%
8 Scott, A. (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	53%
9 Collins, D. (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	53%
10 Hice (R)	60%	+	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	70%
11 Loudermilk (R)	80%	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	72%
12 Allen (R)	40%	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	57%
13 Scott, D. (D)	30%	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	17%
14 Graves, T. (R)	40%	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	57%

HAWAII

1 Hanabusa (D)	13%	?	?	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7%
2 Gabbard (D)	50%	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	34%

IDAHO

1 Labrador (R)	86%	+	+	+	-	+	?	?	?	+	+	77%
2 Simpson (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	52%

ILLINOIS

1 Rush (D)	38%	?	+	+	?	+	-	-	-	-	-	33%
2 Kelly, R. (D)	30%	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17%
3 Lipinski (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17%
4 Gutiérrez (D)	40%	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	28%
5 Quigley (D)	10%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%
6 Roskam (R)	20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	55%
7 Davis, D. (D)	38%	+	+	+	?	?	-	-	-	-	-	19%
8 Krishnamoorthi (D)	20%	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17%
9 Schakowsky (D)	40%	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	23%
10 Schneider (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	?	?	-	-	11%
11 Foster (D)	20%	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13%
12 Bost (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	53%
13 Davis, R. (R)	40%	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	57%
14 Hultgren (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	53%
15 Shimkus (R)	22%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	?	52%
16 Kinzinger (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	50%
17 Bustos (D)	20%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	17%
18 LaHood (R)	40%	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	60%

INDIANA

1 Visclosky (D)	20%	-	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13%
2 Walorski (R)	20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	50%
3 Banks (R)	50%	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	63%
4 Rokita (R)	50%	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	60%
5 Brooks, S. (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	50%
6 Messer (R)	40%	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	59%
7 Carson (D)	22%	+	-	-	?	-	-	-	-	+	-	14%
8 Bucshon (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	50%
9 Hollingsworth (R)	40%	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	62%

IOWA

1 Blum (R)	60%	+	+	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	67%
2 Loebsack (D)	10%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%

	Votes: 21-30	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	1-30
3 Young, David (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	57%
4 King, S. (R)	40%	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	60%

KANSAS

1 Marshall (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	57%
2 Jenkins, L. (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	52%
3 Yoder (R)	38%	+	+	-	-	-	-	?	?	+	-	57%
4 Estes (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	48%

KENTUCKY

1 Comer (R)	60%	+	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	63%
2 Guthrie (R)	40%	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	57%
3 Yarmuth (D)	40%	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	20%
4 Massie (R)	90%	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	97%
5 Rogers, H. (R)	17%	-	-	-	-	-	?	?	?	?	+	50%
6 Barr (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	53%

LOUISIANA

1 Scalise (R)	57%	?	?	?	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	65%
2 Richmond (D)	30%	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	23%
3 Higgins, C. (R)	44%	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	?	+	61%
4 Johnson, M. (R)	60%	+	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	67%
5 Abraham (R)	40%	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	60%
6 Graves, G. (R)	70%	+	+	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	70%

MAINE

1 Pingree (D)	44%	+	+	+	-	?	-	+	-	-	-	21%
2 Poliquin (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	45%

MARYLAND

1 Harris, A. (R)	80%	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	77%
2 Ruppberger (D)	10%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13%
3 Sarbanes (D)	30%	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17%
4 Brown, A. (D)	14%	-	-	+	-	-	?	?	?	-	-	12%
5 Hoyer (D)	20%	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	13%
6 Delaney (D)	10%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%
7 Cummings (D)	0%	?	?	?	?	?	-	-	-	-	-	11%
8 Raskin (D)	40%	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	20%

MASSACHUSETTS

1 Neal (D)	30%	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17%
2 McGovern (D)	40%	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	23%
3 Tsongas (D)	43%	+	+	+	?	-	-	?	?	-	-	20%
4 Kennedy, Joseph P. (D)	40%	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	21%
5 Clark, K. (D)	40%	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	24%
6 Moulton (D)	20%	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17%
7 Capuano (D)	40%	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	27%
8 Lynch (D)	40%	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	24%
9 Keating (D)	20%	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17%

MICHIGAN

1 Bergman (R)	40%	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	57%
2 Huizenga (R)	40%	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	57%
3 Amash (R)	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	90%
4 Moolenaar (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	53%
5 Kildee (D)	30%	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17%
6 Upton (R)	20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	41%
7 Walberg (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	53%
8 Bishop, M. (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	53%
9 Levin (D)	30%	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17%
10 Mitchell (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	53%
11 Trott (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	46%
12 Dingell (D)	30%	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17%
13 Conyers (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17%
14 Lawrence (D)	30%	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	21%

MINNESOTA

1 Walz (D)		+	+	+	-	?	?	?	?	?	?	25%
2 Lewis, Jason (R)	60%	+	+	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	67%

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)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	53%
4 McCollum (D)	30%	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17%
5 Ellison (D)	40%	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	27%
6 Emmer (R)	60%	+	+	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	67%
7 Peterson (D)	30%	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	50%
8 Nolan (D)	38%	?	?	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	21%
MISSISSIPPI												
1 Kelly, T. (R)	50%	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	63%
2 Thompson, B. (D)	30%	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17%
3 Harper (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	53%
4 Palazzo (R)	22%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	?	52%
MISSOURI												
1 Clay (D)	43%	+	+	+	-	-	?	?	?	-	-	19%
2 Wagner (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	57%
3 Luetkemeyer (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	53%
4 Hartzler (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	53%
5 Cleaver (D)	33%	+	+	+	-	-	-	?	-	-	-	17%
6 Graves, S. (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	55%
7 Long (R)	44%	-	-	?	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	65%
8 Smith, J. (R)	56%	-	-	-	?	+	-	+	+	+	+	66%
MONTANA												
AL Gianforte (R)	50%	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	58%
NEBRASKA												
1 Fortenberry (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	53%
2 Bacon (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	53%
3 Smith, Adrian (R)	40%	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	57%
NEVADA												
1 Titus (D)	40%	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	21%
2 Amodei (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	46%
3 Rosen (D)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%
4 Kihuen (D)	40%	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	24%
NEW HAMPSHIRE												
1 Shea-Porter (D)	30%	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20%
2 Kuster (D)	20%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	17%
NEW JERSEY												
1 Norcross (D)	25%	-	-	+	-	+	-	?	?	-	-	18%
2 LoBiondo (R)	40%	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	47%
3 MacArthur (R)	20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	43%
4 Smith, C. (R)	20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	40%
5 Gottheimer (D)	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	17%
6 Pallone (D)	40%	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	20%
7 Lance (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	50%
8 Sires (D)	10%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13%
9 Pascarella (D)	22%	?	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17%
10 Payne (D)	30%	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15%
11 Frelinghuysen (R)	33%	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	?	+	48%
12 Watson Coleman (D)	50%	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	27%
NEW MEXICO												
1 Lujan Grisham (D)	30%	+	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	21%
2 Pearce (R)	56%	+	+	-	-	+	-	-	+	?	+	66%
3 Luján, B.R. (D)	40%	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	20%
NEW YORK												
1 Zeldin (R)	60%	+	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	62%
2 King, P. (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	46%
3 Suozzi (D)	10%	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	17%
4 Rice, K. (D)	11%	-	-	+	?	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%
5 Meeks (D)	20%	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17%
6 Meng (D)	30%	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20%
7 Velázquez (D)	40%	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	23%
8 Jeffries (D)	30%	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17%
9 Clarke, Y. (D)	40%	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	27%

	Votes: 21-30	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	1-30
10 Nadler (D)	30%	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17%
11 Donovan (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	48%
12 Maloney, C. (D)	40%	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	21%
13 Espaillat (D)	40%	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	23%
14 Crowley (D)	40%	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	20%
15 Serrano (D)	40%	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	20%
16 Engel (D)	40%	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	24%
17 Lowey (D)	10%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%
18 Maloney, S.P. (D)	20%	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	17%
19 Faso (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	43%
20 Tonko (D)	30%	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17%
21 Stefanik (R)	20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	43%
22 Tenney (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	53%
23 Reed, T. (R)	40%	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	57%
24 Katko (R)	22%	-	-	-	?	-	-	-	+	+	-	55%
25 Slaughter (D)	67%	+	-	+	?	-	-	-	-	-	-	20%
26 Higgins, B. (D)	10%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13%
27 Collins, C. (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	48%
NORTH CAROLINA												
1 Butterfield (D)	30%	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	21%
2 Holding (R)	40%	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	60%
3 Jones (R)	89%	+	+	+	+	?	-	+	+	+	+	89%
4 Price (D)	30%	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17%
5 Foxx (R)	40%	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	60%
6 Walker (R)	40%	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	59%
7 Rouzer (R)	40%	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	60%
8 Hudson (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	57%
9 Pittenger (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	55%
10 McHenry (R)	50%	?	?	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	57%
11 Meadows (R)	78%	+	+	+	-	+	?	+	+	+	+	72%
12 Adams (D)	13%	?	?	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11%
13 Budd (R)	80%	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	73%
NORTH DAKOTA												
AL Cramer (R)	44%	-	-	-	-	?	-	+	+	+	+	54%
OHIO												
1 Chabot (R)	40%	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	60%
2 Wenstrup (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	57%
3 Beatty (D)	33%	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	?	21%
4 Jordan (R)	90%	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	79%
5 Latta (R)	40%	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	60%
6 Johnson, B. (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	53%
7 Gibbs (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	57%
8 Davidson (R)	70%	+	+	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	70%
9 Kaptur (D)	20%	-	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13%
10 Turner (R)	20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	53%
11 Fudge (D)	30%	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17%
12 Tiberi (R)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	65%
13 Ryan, T. (D)	30%	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17%
14 Joyce (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	57%
15 Stivers (R)	22%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	?	+	54%
16 Renacci (R)	40%	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	61%
OKLAHOMA												
1 Bridenstine (R)	0%	-	-	-	-	?	-	-	-	-	-	53%
2 Mullin (R)	50%	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	63%
3 Lucas (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	50%
4 Cole (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	50%
5 Russell (R)	40%	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	60%
OREGON												
1 Bonamici (D)	30%	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17%
2 Walden (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	53%
3 Blumenauer (D)	50%	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	28%
4 DeFazio (D)	30%	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	21%
5 Schrader (D)	30%	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	21%

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
PENNSYLVANIA												
1 Brady, R. (D)	30%	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17%
2 Evans (D)	30%	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17%
3 Kelly, M. (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	52%
4 Perry (R)	90%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	80%
5 Thompson, G. (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	53%
6 Costello (R)	20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	48%
7 Meehan (R)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	52%
8 Fitzpatrick (R)	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	33%
9 Shuster (R)	22%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	?	52%
10 Marino (R)	40%	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	56%
11 Barletta (R)	40%	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	57%
12 Rothfus (R)	50%	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	63%
13 Boyle (D)	43%	+	-	+	-	+	?	?	?	-	-	22%
14 Doyle (D)	30%	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17%
15 Dent (R)	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	44%
16 Smucker (R)	50%	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	60%
17 Cartwright (D)	10%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%
18 Lamb (D)	20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	20%
RHODE ISLAND												
1 Cicilline (D)	30%	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17%
2 Langevin (D)	10%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%
SOUTH CAROLINA												
1 Sanford (R)	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	77%
2 Wilson, J. (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	53%
3 Duncan, Jeff (R)	70%	+	+	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	70%
4 Gowdy (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	53%
5 Norman (R)	70%	+	+	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	68%
6 Clyburn (D)	20%	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	14%
7 Rice, T. (R)	50%	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	57%
SOUTH DAKOTA												
AL Noem (R)	50%	-	-	?	-	+	-	+	+	+	?	64%
TENNESSEE												
1 Roe (R)	40%	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	60%
2 Duncan, John (R)	90%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	87%
3 Fleischmann (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	53%
4 DesJarlais (R)	50%	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	63%
5 Cooper (D)	30%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	20%
6 Black, D. (R)	56%	-	+	-	-	+	-	+	+	?	+	64%
7 Blackburn, M. (R)	67%	-	+	-	-	+	?	+	+	+	+	69%
8 Kustoff (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	53%
9 Cohen (D)	40%	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	20%
TEXAS												
1 Gohmert (R)	86%	+	+	+	-	+	?	?	?	+	+	74%
2 Poe (R)	78%	+	+	?	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	75%
3 Johnson, S. (R)	40%	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	63%
4 Ratcliffe (R)	40%	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	60%
5 Hensarling (R)	40%	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	57%
6 Barton (R)	60%	+	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	64%
7 Culberson (R)	40%	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	57%
8 Brady, K. (R)	33%	-	-	?	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	55%
9 Green, A. (D)	30%	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20%
10 McCaul (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	53%
11 Conaway (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	53%
12 Granger (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	54%
13 Thornberry (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	53%
14 Weber (R)	60%	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	67%
15 Gonzalez (D)	40%	+	+	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	33%
16 O'Rourke (D)	40%	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	27%
17 Flores (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	53%
18 Jackson Lee (D)	40%	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	23%
19 Arrington (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	60%

	Votes: 21-30	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	1-30
20 Castro (D)	30%	-	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	23%
21 Smith, L. (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	55%
22 Olson (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	55%
23 Hurd (R)	20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	53%
24 Marchant (R)	40%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	60%
25 Williams (R)	50%	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	63%
26 Burgess (R)	50%	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	60%
27 Farenthold (R)	60%	+	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	68%
28 Cuellar (D)	20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	40%
29 Green, G. (D)	30%	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	27%
30 Johnson, E.B. (D)	30%	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15%
31 Carter, J. (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	50%
32 Sessions (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	53%
33 Veasey (D)	50%	+	-	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	27%
34 Vela (D)	44%	+	+	?	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	38%
35 Doggett (D)	40%	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	20%
36 Babin (R)	50%	?	?	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	64%
UTAH												
1 Bishop, R. (R)	60%	-	+	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	67%
2 Stewart (R)	40%	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	57%
3 Curtis (R)	50%	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	55%
4 Love (R)	40%	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	60%
VERMONT												
AL Welch (D)	40%	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	24%
VIRGINIA												
1 Wittman (R)	50%	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	63%
2 Taylor (R)	40%	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	55%
3 Scott, R. (D)	30%	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17%
4 McEachin (D)	10%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10%
5 Garrett (R)	80%	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	79%
6 Goodlatte (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	57%
7 Brat (R)	70%	+	+	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	73%
8 Beyer (D)	33%	+	+	+	-	-	?	-	-	-	-	18%
9 Griffith (R)	70%	+	+	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	73%
10 Comstock (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	57%
11 Connolly (D)	30%	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20%
WASHINGTON												
1 DelBene (D)	30%	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20%
2 Larsen, R. (D)	30%	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17%
3 Herrera Beutler (R)	70%	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	67%
4 Newhouse (R)	40%	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	63%
5 McMorris Rodgers (R)	40%	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	57%
6 Kilmer (D)	20%	-	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17%
7 Jayapal (D)	40%	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	23%
8 Reichert (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	45%
9 Smith, Adam (D)	40%	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	23%
10 Heck (D)	20%	-	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13%
WEST VIRGINIA												
1 McKinley (R)	20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	50%
2 Mooney (R)	80%	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	70%
3 Jenkins, E. (R)	40%	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	57%
WISCONSIN												
1 Ryan, P. (R)		-	-	?	?	-	?	?	?	?	?	
2 Pocan (D)	40%	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	25%
3 Kind (D)	29%	?	?	?	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	22%
4 Moore (D)	40%	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	21%
5 Sensenbrenner (R)	80%	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	73%
6 Grothman (R)	50%	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	63%
7 Duffy (R)	40%	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	60%
8 Gallagher (R)	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	57%
WYOMING												
AL Cheney (R)	40%	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	60%

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.

How Can I Make a Difference?

GETTING STARTED IS AS EASY AS 1,2,3...

1

Sign up for JBS news and action alerts

- Stay informed with free content
- Visit www.JBS.org/e-newsletter to sign up now

2

Contact your elected representatives

- Local, state, and federal officials represent you
- Visit www.JBS.org/act-now for contact information

3


Join The John Birch Society

- National concerted action multiplies your impact
- Visit www.JBS.org/join to apply for membership today

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."



TRUTHFUL. CONSTITUTIONAL. FEARLESS.

The essential news source for
all freedom-loving Americans.

Based in Appleton, WI

New American

SUBSCRIBE TODAY!

www.TheNewAmerican.com


Senate Vote Descriptions

21 Warrantless Surveillance. This bill (S. 139) would reauthorize for six years, through 2023, the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA), which governs electronic surveillance of foreign terrorism suspects. The bill would require the development of procedures for searching the NSA database that would protect the Fourth Amendment-guaranteed rights of U.S. citizens, while allowing the FBI to access information with an order from the secret FISA Court, in certain cases.

The Senate passed S. 139 on January 18, 2018 by a vote of 65 to 34 (Roll Call 12). We have assigned pluses to the nays because FISA, while supposedly put in place to gather intelligence on foreign targets, has been used to spy on U.S. citizens. While the bill does provide provisions to, ostensibly, protect the privacy of U.S. citizens, given the track record of intelligence agencies, it is unlikely that they would actually follow these rules. The FISA Court gives a green light to just about any surveillance request that comes its way, and FISA-approved NSA warrantless surveillance of American citizens has become common knowledge.

22 Immigration (DACA). During consideration of the immigration bill (H.R. 2579), Senator Christopher Coons (D-Del.) introduced an amendment to provide “conditional permanent residence” (i.e., amnesty) to the unaccompanied minors who illegally entered the United States before turning 18 years old and have been recipients of President Obama’s unconstitutional Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program.

The Senate did not vote directly on Coons’ amendment, but on a motion to invoke cloture (and thus limit debate) so the amendment could come up for a vote. The motion to invoke cloture was rejected on February 15, 2018 by a vote of 52 to 47 (Roll Call 33; a three-fifths majority of the entire Senate is required to invoke cloture). We have assigned pluses to the nays because Obama’s executive action creating DACA was an unconstitutional usurpation of legislative power belonging to Congress, and because granting amnesty



Budget buster: “Shame shame. A pox on both Houses — and parties,” Senator Rand Paul tweeted regarding the \$1.3 trillion, 2,232-page omnibus spending bill lawmakers had “just hours to try to read” prior to voting.

to illegal immigrants will, as has been the case with past amnesties, encourage even more border jumping.

23 Immigration (Sanctuary Cities). During consideration of the immigration bill (H.R. 2579), Senator Pat Toomey (R-Penn.) introduced an amendment to prohibit the disbursement of federal development grants to cities, states, or other political subdivisions that harbor or provide sanctuary for illegal immigrants.

The Senate did not vote directly on Toomey’s amendment, but on a motion to invoke cloture (and thus limit debate) so the amendment could come up for a vote. The motion to invoke cloture was rejected on February 15, 2018 by a vote of 54 to 45 (Roll Call 34; a three-fifths majority of the entire Senate is required to invoke cloture). We have assigned pluses to the yeas because the flood of illegal immigrants into the United States has risen to the level of an invasion swamping our Republic, and political

entities that provide sanctuary to illegal aliens in contravention of federal immigration laws should not expect to do so while receiving federal aid.

24 U.S. Military Intervention in Yemen. This resolution (Senate Joint Res. 54), according to the text, would “direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities in the Republic of Yemen that have not been authorized by Congress.”

The Senate agreed to table (kill) a motion to discharge this resolution from the Foreign Relations Committee (so that it could be considered by the full Senate) on March 20, 2018 by vote of 55 to 44 (Roll Call 58). We have assigned pluses to the nays because only Congress is vested with the power to declare war. A foreign military intervention is an act of war, and Congress has not authorized any intervention or war in Yemen. Nor should Congress do so, since the civil war in Yemen does not threaten the United States.

Senate Vote Scores ✓

	Votes:	21-30	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	1-30
ALABAMA													
Shelby (R)	40%	-	+	+	-	-		+	-	-	+	-	50%
Jones (D)	30%	-	-	-	-	-		-	+	+	-	+	30%
ALASKA													
Murkowski (R)	40%	+	-	+	-	-		-	-	+	+	-	40%
Sullivan (R)	70%	+	+	+	-	+		+	-	-	+	+	57%
ARIZONA													
McCain (R)		?	?	?	?	?		?	?	?	?	?	35%
Flake (R)	70%	-	-	+	-	+		+	+	+	+	+	70%
ARKANSAS													
Boozman (R)	40%	-	+	+	-	-		+	-	-	+	-	47%
Cotton (R)	60%	-	+	+	-	+		+	-	-	+	+	60%
CALIFORNIA													
Feinstein (D)	40%	-	-	-	+	+		-	+	+	-	-	20%
Harris, K. (D)	50%	+	-	-	+	+		-	+	+	-	-	23%
COLORADO													
Bennet (D)	40%	+	-	-	+	-		-	+	+	-	-	20%
Gardner (R)	70%	+	-	+	-	+		+	-	+	+	+	57%
CONNECTICUT													
Blumenthal (D)	40%	+	-	-	+	-		-	+	+	-	-	20%
Murphy, C. (D)	40%	+	-	-	+	-		-	+	+	-	-	20%
DELAWARE													
Carper (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-		-	+	+	-	-	13%
Coons (D)	30%	+	-	-	-	-		-	+	+	-	-	17%
FLORIDA													
Nelson (D)	10%	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	+	-	-	3%
Rubio (R)	50%	-	+	+	-	-		+	-	-	+	+	55%
GEORGIA													
Isakson (R)	40%	-	+	+	-	-		+	-	-	+	-	48%
Perdue (R)	60%	-	+	+	-	+		+	-	-	+	+	57%
HAWAII													
Schatz (D)	40%	+	-	-	+	-		-	+	+	-	-	17%
Hirono (D)	40%	+	-	-	+	-		-	+	+	-	-	20%
IDAHO													
Crapo (R)	70%	-	+	+	-	+		+	-	+	+	+	67%
Risch (R)	70%	-	+	+	-	+		+	-	+	+	+	67%
ILLINOIS													
Durbin (D)	40%	+	-	-	+	-		-	+	+	-	-	21%
Duckworth (D)	25%	-	-	-	+	-		-	+	?	-	?	14%
INDIANA													
Donnelly (D)	20%	-	-	+	-	-		-	-	-	-	+	13%
Young, T. (R)	50%	-	+	+	-	-		+	-	-	+	+	53%
IOWA													
Grassley (R)	50%	-	+	+	-	+		+	-	-	+	-	53%
Ernst (R)	70%	-	+	+	-	+		+	-	+	+	+	60%
KANSAS													
Roberts (R)	40%	-	+	+	-	-		+	-	-	+	-	47%
Moran (R)	60%	-	+	+	+	-		+	-	+	+	-	57%
KENTUCKY													
McConnell (R)	40%	-	+	+	-	-		+	-	-	+	-	47%
Paul (R)	100%	+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	+	+	97%
LOUISIANA													
Cassidy (R)	70%	-	+	+	-	+		+	-	+	+	+	57%
Kennedy, John (R)	60%	-	+	+	-	+		-	-	+	+	+	60%

	Votes:	21-30	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	1-30
MAINE													
Collins (R)	40%	-	+	+	+	-		-	-	+	-	-	33%
King, A. (I)	30%	-	-	-	+	-		-	+	+	-	-	23%
MARYLAND													
Cardin (D)	40%	+	-	-	+	-		-	+	+	-	-	20%
Van Hollen (D)	40%	+	-	-	+	-		-	+	+	-	-	20%
MASSACHUSETTS													
Warren (D)	50%	+	-	-	+	+		-	+	+	-	-	23%
Markey (D)	50%	+	-	-	+	+		-	+	+	-	-	23%
MICHIGAN													
Stabenow (D)	40%	-	-	+	+	-		-	+	+	-	-	17%
Peters, G. (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-		-	+	+	-	-	20%
MINNESOTA													
Klobuchar (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-		-	+	+	-	-	17%
Smith (D)	40%	+	-	-	+	-		-	+	+	-	-	40%
MISSISSIPPI													
Wicker (R)	50%	-	+	+	-	-		+	-	-	+	+	50%
Hyde-Smith (R)	60%							+	-	-	+	+	60%
MISSOURI													
McCaskill (D)	60%	-	-	+	+	+		-	+	+	-	+	27%
Blunt (R)	50%	-	+	+	-	-		+	-	-	+	+	50%
MONTANA													
Tester (D)	40%	+	-	-	+	-		-	+	+	-	-	27%
Daines (R)	90%	+	+	+	+	+		+	-	+	+	+	73%
NEBRASKA													
Fischer (R)	70%	-	+	+	-	+		+	-	+	+	+	60%
Sasse (R)	60%	-	+	+	-	+		+	-	-	+	+	62%
NEVADA													
Heller (R)	70%	+	+	+	-	-		+	-	+	+	+	62%
Cortez Masto (D)	10%	-	-	-	-	-		-	+	-	-	-	7%
NEW HAMPSHIRE													
Shaheen (D)	25%	-	-	-	+	-		-	-	+	?	?	11%
Hassan (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-		-	+	+	-	-	13%
NEW JERSEY													
Menendez (D)	30%	+	-	-	-	-		-	+	+	-	-	15%
Booker (D)	50%	+	-	-	+	+		-	+	+	-	-	23%
NEW MEXICO													
Udall (D)	40%	+	-	-	+	-		-	+	+	-	-	20%
Heinrich (D)	40%	+	-	-	+	-		-	+	+	-	-	20%
NEW YORK													
Schumer (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-		-	+	+	-	-	17%
Gillibrand (D)	50%	+	-	-	+	+		-	+	+	-	-	23%
NORTH CAROLINA													
Burr (R)	33%	-	+	+	-	?		+	-	-	-	-	45%
Tillis (R)	50%	-	+	+	-	+		+	-	-	+	-	50%
NORTH DAKOTA													
Hoeven (R)	50%	-	+	+	-	-		+	-	+	+	-	50%
Heitkamp (D)	20%	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	+	-	+	20%
OHIO													
Brown, S. (D)	40%	+	-	-	+	-		-	+	+	-	-	20%
Portman (R)	40%	-	+	+	-	-		+	-	-	+	-	43%
OKLAHOMA													
Inhofe (R)	50%	-	+	+	-	-		+	-	-	+	+	53%
Lankford (R)	70%	-	+	+	-	+		+	-	+	+	+	67%

	Votes:	21-30	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	1-30
OREGON													
Wyden (D)	40%	+	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	20%
Merkley (D)	50%	+	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	-	23%
PENNSYLVANIA													
Casey (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	13%
Toomey (R)	56%	-	+	+	-	?	+	-	-	+	+	-	61%
RHODE ISLAND													
Reed, J. (D)	20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	10%
Whitehouse (D)	20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	10%
SOUTH CAROLINA													
Graham, L. (R)	30%	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	48%
Scott, T. (R)	50%	-	+	+	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	57%
SOUTH DAKOTA													
Thune (R)	40%	-	+	+	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	47%
Rounds (R)	40%	-	+	+	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	47%
TENNESSEE													
Alexander (R)	50%	-	+	+	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	47%
Corker (R)	56%	-	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	?	-	59%
TEXAS													
Cornyn (R)	40%	-	+	+	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	47%
Cruz (R)	70%	-	+	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	63%

	Votes:	21-30	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	1-30
UTAH													
Hatch (R)	50%	-	+	+	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	50%
Lee, M. (R)	90%	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	87%
VERMONT													
Leahy (D)	40%	+	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	20%
Sanders (I)	50%	+	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	-	31%
VIRGINIA													
Warner (D)	20%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	7%
Kaine (D)	30%	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	17%
WASHINGTON													
Murray (D)	40%	+	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	20%
Cantwell (D)	40%	+	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	20%
WEST VIRGINIA													
Manchin (D)	30%	-	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	20%
Capito (R)	50%	-	+	+	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	47%
WISCONSIN													
Johnson, R. (R)	60%	-	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	57%
Baldwin (D)	40%	+	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	20%
WYOMING													
Enzi (R)	70%	-	+	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	60%
Barrasso (R)	70%	-	+	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	60%

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 Omnibus Appropriations. This bill (H.R. 1625) would provide \$1.3 trillion in discretionary appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018 for federal government operations and services. This represents an overall increase in discretionary spending of 12 percent over the 2017 level. The big winner was the Department of Defense, with an increase of 10 percent over last year’s appropriations. (See House Vote 25 for more information.)

The Senate passed the omnibus spending bill on March 23, 2018 by a vote of 65 to 32 (Roll Call 63). We have assigned pluses to the nays because with this omnibus bill, members of Congress are failing to address their fiscally and constitutionally irresponsible budgeting and appropriating process that is currently yielding annual federal deficits measured in the hundreds of billions of dollars, as well as minimizing their accountability to the voters by combining all discretionary federal spending for fiscal 2018 into one gigantic “take it or leave it” bill.

26 Net Neutrality. This bill (Senate Joint Resolution 52) would nullify and disapprove of the new Federal Communications Commission (FCC) rule that seeks to deregulate the Internet. In 2015, as a result of fears that providers would

“throttle” customers’ Internet connections and charge higher rates for certain times and/or services, the Obama-era FCC imposed common-carrier mandates on broadband Internet service providers, essentially regulating the Internet as a public utility. The Trump FCC under Chairman Ajit Pai overturned this rule, allowing the Internet to be more or less unregulated — as it had been before the rule.

The Senate passed Senate Joint Resolution 52 on May 16, 2018 by a vote of 52 to 47 (Roll Call 97). We have assigned pluses to the nays because regulation of the Internet is not a proper function of the federal government under the Constitution. The new FCC rule under Commissioner Pai was more of a hands-off approach to the Internet, allowing service providers to set their own rules. This is the correct approach, as any provider “throttling” service or overcharging customers will lose business to more competitive providers in a free market setting. Government, in scenarios such as these, will nearly always cause more problems than it claims to attempt to solve. Case in point: Regulations are not always applied equally, as under the Obama FCC rule some sites were forced to “play fair,” while some of the big guys, such as Netflix and Google, could still set their own rules.

27 Haspel Nomination. In March 2018, President Trump nominated Gina Haspel to be director of the Central Intelligence Agency. Senator Rand Paul (R-Ky.), who opposed Haspel’s nomination, explained why in a *Politico Magazine* article: “Haspel ran a secret [CIA ‘black site’] center in Thailand where prisoners were tortured”; “Haspel participated in and helped develop the program that our own government has labeled torture”; and “she helped destroy the very evidence of this program.” Regarding the latter, Haspel ordered the destruction of videos documenting the torture.

The Senate confirmed Trump’s nomination of Haspel on May 17, 2018 by a vote of 54 to 45 (Roll Call 101). We have assigned pluses to the nays because of Haspel’s complicity in the use of torture, including waterboarding, a violation of U.S. law as well as the U.S. Constitution’s Eighth Amendment prohibition against “cruel and unusual punishments.”

28 Indefinite Detention. During consideration of the National Defense Authorization Act (H.R. 5515), Senator Mike Lee (R-Utah) introduced the Due Process Guarantee Act amendment to uphold the right to due process for U.S. citizens and permanent residents on

American soil. “This amendment ... simply says that if you are a U.S. citizen or a lawful permanent resident, you may not be indefinitely detained on U.S. soil without trial, without charge, without access to a jury or to counsel,” Lee said on the Senate floor. His amendment would negate language in the fiscal year 2012 NDAA that purportedly authorizes the U.S. military to indefinitely detain American citizens accused of being terrorists, without habeas corpus and without being tried and found guilty in a court of law.

The Senate rejected a motion to table (kill) Lee’s amendment on June 13, 2018 by a vote of 30 to 68 (Roll Call 122). We have assigned pluses to the nays because the war on terror must not be allowed to destroy constitutionally guaranteed legal protections.

29 Appropriations Cuts. This bill (H.R. 3) would cut nearly \$15 billion from previously approved, unspent funding, including \$7 billion from the Children’s Health Insurance Program and \$4.3 billion from the Department of

Energy’s Advanced Technology Vehicles Manufacturing Loan Program.

The Senate rejected a motion to discharge H.R. 3 from the Senate Budget Committee (so that it could be considered by the full Senate) on June 20, 2018 by a vote of 48 to 50 (Roll Call 134). We have assigned pluses to the yeas not only because the spending falls outside the scope of constitutionally authorized federal powers, but also because the federal government needs to start reining in ballooning federal spending (and debt) somewhere in order to avert fiscal disaster. The cuts in this bill comprise only a fraction of one percent of total federal spending, and according to the Congressional Budget Office, most of the unspent funding targeted by the bill would not be spent anyway. Yet modest cuts are better than none at all.

30 Waters of the United States. During consideration of a minibus appropriations bill (H.R. 5895), Senator Mike Lee (R-Utah) introduced an amendment to repeal the EPA’s 2015 “Waters

of the United States” rule, which allows federal bureaucrats to broadly interpret the meaning of “navigable waters” under the Clean Water Act. This rule, Lee opined on the Senate floor, “effectively dramatically expanded the jurisdiction of the Federal Government over land in the United States, in some instances saying that if a plot of land is wet some of the time, some of the year, during any particular year, you can be subject to massive fines totaling millions of dollars if you do anything on that land, subject to the arbitrary determinations of Federal bureaucrats.”

The Senate tabled (killed) Lee’s amendment on June 21, 2018 by a vote of 62 to 34 (Roll Call 138). We have assigned pluses to the nays because both federal water regulations and the EPA are unconstitutional, and if the rule were allowed to stand, activities such as farming and real estate development would be greatly hampered, since farmers and developers would be subject to increased unconstitutional permit requirements and fines concerning their treatment of almost any body of water, no matter how small. ■

Freedom Index

Voting Records 1999-2018

HOW DID YOUR CONGRESSMAN DO?



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.

A perfect resource for the online activist!