
The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights Voting Record

115th Congress
February 2018



Table of Contents

1	Introduction
4	House Vote Summaries
11	Senate Vote Summaries
17	Scores

Introduction

Throughout our nation's history, we have experienced times of great upheaval. We have witnessed political divisions that have threatened to tear apart the bonds that keep us together as a country. And we have seen times when our basic understanding of how our government should work, and the rights that we have fought so hard to establish, have come under attack.

2017 was one of those years. The inauguration of Donald Trump as the 45th President of the United States, and the swearing-in of a Congress controlled by the same political party and that supported him on key matters of policy, left the civil and human rights community fearing tremendous setbacks.

In a number of areas, those fears have become reality. President Trump, through words and deeds, has threatened the fundamental right to vote, the independence of the judiciary, and the foundational right of people and the press to express their opinions. He has also threatened the rights of LGBTQ individuals, Muslim people, and immigrants to participate in society and to work. After a pro-Confederate rally in Charlottesville, Va., turned deadly in August, Trump gave comfort to white supremacists by blaming "many sides" for the violence, creating even more fears about his vision for the country. Members of Congress were not united in their response.

2017 was also a year of unprecedented citizen action and engagement. This activism caused cracks to appear in the narrow Republican congressional majority, especially in the Senate, and prevented many radical policy changes from ever reaching the president's desk. After years of campaigning on a promise to repeal and replace the Affordable Care Act of 2010, the majority in Congress found itself in disarray over exactly how to

do it, and the effort fell short by one vote in the Senate following widespread public protests. Partisan efforts to dismantle civil rights and consumer policies enacted in the wake of the 2008 financial crisis also fell short, for the most part. And Trump's campaign promise to build a wall stretching across the U.S.-Mexico border, and to "make Mexico pay for it," has yet to be even considered in Congress.

The year began with intense fights in Congress over the confirmation of many of Trump's nominees, both to the Supreme Court and to his own administration. After a year of blocking Merrick Garland, President Obama's highly qualified and well-respected moderate nominee to the Supreme Court, Senate Republicans quickly confirmed Neil Gorsuch, an ideological appellate judge. To do so, they changed Senate rules because Gorsuch could not garner the 60 votes needed to overcome a filibuster. And while some administrative appointees became quickly mired in controversy and were never confirmed, most notably businessman Andrew Puzder as Labor Secretary, most of Trump's cabinet-level appointments proceeded to confirmation in the face of serious opposition that could do little to stop them. To the civil and human rights community, the confirmations of Senator Jeff Sessions as Attorney General and Betsy DeVos as Secretary of Education were two of the most troubling confirmations, given their hostility to civil and human rights.

The Republican Congress tried to roll back the progress made in recent years in a number of areas such as health care, the environment, education, labor, consumer protection, and immigrant rights. Congress was able to utilize fast-track procedures under the Congressional Review Act in an unprecedented manner to overturn

regulations issued under the Obama administration. Some of these rules – discussed in the voting records – protected consumers from forced arbitration clauses, required federal contractors to disclose fair pay and workplace safety violations, ensured fair funding of family planning services, and improved state accountability under the Every Student Succeeds Act. But when congressional Republicans tried to move several punitive anti-immigrant measures, for example, they could not garner enough support to clear the 60-vote hurdle that is usually required in the Senate for legislation to be enacted.

Where Congress could not act on immigration, however, Trump in many cases did. Earlier in the year, he had announced many new administrative policies that targeted immigrants, including sweeping new enforcement powers, as well as a ban on travelers from Muslim-majority countries. But he had signaled that he would not undo Obama’s policy to protect Dreamers, young undocumented immigrants who had been brought to the United States as children. In early September, he reversed course, and U.S. Attorney General Jeff Sessions announced an end to the policy, igniting a flurry of efforts to enact legislation to provide Dreamers with the legal status that would allow them to move forward with their lives. While virtually all Democrats and many Republicans supported some kind of legislation aimed at helping Dreamers, Trump and the Republican leadership refused to address Dreamers unless they, in Trump’s words, “get something for it,” including border wall funding. The year ended with no legislation to protect Dreamers being passed despite broad bipartisan support.

Faced with difficult contests to retain seats in special elections, and with many Republicans announcing their retirements, the pressure grew on the Republican-led Congress to enact at least one piece of major legislation that it could point to as an accomplishment in a session that otherwise had gotten little done. In December, the congressional leadership jammed through a sweeping bill that lowered tax rates for corporations and wealthier Americans, but which also blew up the deficit and raised significant questions about fairness. The year concluded with yet another continuing resolution that failed to protect Dreamers, to provide needed disaster relief to Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands, or to extend the Children’s Health Insurance Program.

As the 115th Congress begins its second session, there are many important civil and human rights issues demanding Congress’ attention. A key priority for The Leadership Conference will be for Congress to enact

legislation to put Dreamers and Temporary Protected Status recipients on the path towards citizenship. Another top priority will involve crucial preparations for the 2020 Census, an historically bipartisan issue. The U.S. Constitution vests Congress with overseeing the census, and with so much riding on a fair and accurate count, the nation’s leaders must come together, despite the heated political climate, and ensure that this constitutional requirement is done well. The Leadership Conference credits the grassroots #MeToo movement for prompting Congress to work to reform its own procedures for addressing workplace harassment. We will work to ensure that these internal reforms are effective, but more needs to be done to protect workers outside of the legislative branch from harassment and discrimination. And we will continue to seek bipartisan support for long-overdue criminal justice reform, voting rights, and infrastructure legislation.

We will also work with Congress to hold the line in other areas that may come under attack, including the independence of the federal judiciary, affordable housing policies, and safety nets that are vital to low-income working people, older people, children, and people with disabilities. Congress remains sharply divided on both political and policy grounds, and Republicans now have one less vote in the Senate than it did through most of 2017 – so it is in everyone’s interest for Congress to put country over party and work together on the vital issues facing all of our communities.

About The Leadership Conference

The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights is a coalition charged by its diverse membership of more than 200 national organizations to promote and protect the civil and human rights of all persons in the United States. Through advocacy and outreach to targeted constituencies, The Leadership Conference works toward the goal of a more open and just society – an America as good as its ideals. Founded in 1950, The Leadership Conference works to effect meaningful legislation, policies, and executive branch appointments, and to ensure the proper enforcement of civil rights laws to unite us as a nation true to its promise of equal justice, equal opportunity, and mutual respect.

Reading The Leadership Conference Voting Record

The Leadership Conference Voting Record reflects the recorded votes taken by every senator and representative on the legislative priorities of The Leadership Conference and its coalition members. The Leadership Conference has taken a sample of bills considered dur-

ing the first session of the 115th Congress to create the “Voting Record.” These votes reflect how members of Congress have aligned with The Leadership Conference priority areas from the beginning of the 115th Congress through the end of December 2017.

Based on these votes, each member of Congress earns a percentage rating for support of The Leadership Conference priorities. This rating does not indicate the full extent of a legislator’s support for or opposition to The Leadership Conference positions and represents neither endorsement nor condemnation of any member of Congress.

A vote in accordance with The Leadership Conference’s position is a “+” vote; a vote contrary to The Leadership Conference’s position is a “-” vote. An “x” indicates a yea or nay vote was not cast. An “i” indicates the member of Congress did not take a vote because he/she was not in office for the full term. The “Voting Record” reflects only roll call votes that were officially recorded on the floor of the U.S. Senate and U.S. House of Representatives.

In the Senate during the 115h Congress:

- Sen. Jeff Sessions, R. Ala., resigned in February 2017 and was replaced by Sen. Luther Strange, R. Ala., who was appointed to fill the position in February 2017.
- Sen. Luther Strange, R. Ala., retired in January 2018 and was replaced by Sen. Doug Jones, D. Ala., who won a special election for the seat in December 2017.

In the House during the 115h Congress:

- Rep. Mike Pompeo, R. Kan., resigned in January 2017 and was replaced by Rep. Ron Estes, R. Kan., who won a special election for the seat in April 2017.
- Rep. Xavier Becerra, D. Calif., resigned in January 2017 and was replaced by Rep. Jimmy Gomez, D. Calif., who won a special election for the seat in June 2017.
- Rep. Tom Price, R. Ga., resigned in February 2017 and was replaced by Rep. Karen Handel, R. Ga., who won a special election for the seat in June 2017.
- Rep. Mick Mulvaney, R. S.C., resigned in February 2017 and was replaced by Rep. Ralph Norman, R. S.C., who won a special election for the seat in May 2017.
- Rep. Ryan Zinke, R. Mont., resigned in March 2017 and was replaced by Rep. Greg Gianforte, R. Mont.,

who won a special election for the seat in May 2017.

- Rep. Jason Chaffetz, R, Utah, resigned in June 2017 and was replaced by Rep. John Curtis, R, Utah, who won a special election for the seat in November 2017.
- Rep. Tim Murphy, R. Pa., resigned in October 2017 and his seat is currently vacant.
- Rep. Trent Franks, R. Ariz., resigned in December 2017 and his seat is currently vacant.
- Rep. John Conyers, D. Mich., resigned in December 2017 and his seat is currently vacant.
- Rep. Pat Tiberi, R. Ohio, resigned in January 2018 and his seat is currently vacant.

There are no votes of the District of Columbia (D.C.) delegate in “The Leadership Conference Voting Record.” Though District of Columbia (D.C.) residents pay federal income tax and serve in the military, D.C.’s only voice in Congress is a non-voting delegate, who serves in the House of Representatives but is not permitted to vote on the floor of Congress.

In 2017, 181 House members and 45 Senators supported our positions on 90 percent or more of the votes in “The Leadership Conference Voting Record.”

For more information, please contact The Leadership Conference Policy Department at 202.466.3311.

House Vote Summaries

BUDGET AND APPROPRIATIONS

Fiscal 2017 Budget Resolution (S.Con.Res.3)

S.Con.Res.3 was the budget resolution that included reconciliation instructions intended to be used to repeal the Affordable Care Act (ACA). Reconciliation is a special legislative process that is not subject to a filibuster in the Senate.

The Leadership Conference opposed S.Con.Res.3. The ACA has reduced the number of people without insurance to historic lows. Repealing the ACA would leave all people in the United States, particularly people of color and underserved populations, significantly worse off than under current law. The ACA is a critical source of health coverage for America's traditionally underserved communities. This includes individuals and families living in poverty, people of color, women, immigrants, LGBTQ individuals, individuals with disabilities, seniors, and individuals with limited English proficiency.

The House agreed to S.Con.Res.3 (227-198). A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 58 (1/13/17).

Fiscal 2018 Minibus Appropriations (H.R. 3219)

On the last day of a multi-day debate over FY 2018 government spending, the House moved to adopt a new rule for floor consideration of the bill. The rule would dictate which amendments to the bill could be brought up that day – which is common – but it also, upon approval, would automatically amend the bill to add \$1.6 billion to be used on border wall construction.

The Leadership Conference opposed the rule. Spending \$1.6 billion on border fencing would be wasteful, unnecessary, raise humanitarian and environmental

concerns, and would ultimately make it more difficult to fix our broken immigration system. At a time when border apprehensions have hit historic lows over the past two decades, new wall construction would put immigrant lives at greater risk, increase the risk of human trafficking, and disrupt the lives of border communities. At the same time, it would divert finite resources away from disaster relief, Coast Guard funding, and other programs that do promote national security. Moreover, by depriving members of a separate up-or-down vote on this troubling provision, the self-executing language in this rule amounted to an undemocratic end run around the lawmaking process.

The House passed H.R. 3219 (230-196). A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 427 (7/27/17).

Fiscal 2018 Omnibus Appropriations Legislative Vehicle – DC Reproductive Health Law (H.R. 3354)

H.R. 3354, sponsored by Rep. Palmer, R. Ala., would prohibit any appropriated funds from being used to implement the District of Columbia's Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Act, which protects District residents from discrimination with regard to their reproductive choices.

The Leadership Conference opposed H.R. 3354. The bill would infringe on the home rule and autonomy of the District of Columbia by overruling its elected representatives, who are charged with adopting their own laws and policies to meet the needs of the residents of the District of Columbia without the interference of the federal government.

The House passed H.R. 3354 (214-194). A vote against

it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 518 (9/14/2017).

Fiscal 2018 Budget Resolution (H.Con.Res.71)

H.Con.Res.71 proposed cuts in mandatory programs, including Medicare and Medicaid, and proposed reducing non-defense spending by \$1.3 trillion over 10 years accompanied by an almost \$1 trillion increase in defense spending. It also included reconciliation instructions intended to reimagine the tax code. Reconciliation is a special legislative process that is not subject to a filibuster in the Senate.

The Leadership Conference opposed H.Con.Res.71. The budget would have gutted Medicare, Medicaid, and the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), with dramatic, unspecified cuts in education, veterans' pensions, and other necessities. The Leadership Conference has opposed any funding proposal that does not maintain parity between defense and non-defense discretionary (NDD) spending. NDD programs provide vital funding for public programs that include education, housing supports, infrastructure investments, environmental protection, workforce training, and children's programs, all of which are integral to Americans' quality of life and well-being.

The House agreed to H.Con.Res.71 (219-206). A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 557 (10/5/17).

CLASS ACTION LAWSUITS

Class-Action Lawsuit Restrictions Bill (H.R. 985)

H.R. 985, sponsored by Rep. Bob Goodlatte, R. Va., would prohibit federal courts from certifying proposed classes of individuals for a class-action lawsuit unless each member of the class has suffered the same type and degree of injury.

The Leadership Conference opposed H.R. 985. The legislation would make it more difficult for civil rights plaintiffs, and other litigants, to bring class-action lawsuits. The Leadership Conference believes that class actions are critical for the enforcement of laws prohibiting discrimination in employment, housing, education, and access to public areas and services. The bill would undermine the enforcement of this nation's civil rights laws and upend decades of settled class-action law.

The House passed H.R. 985 (220-201). A vote against the bill was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 148 (3/9/17).

CRIMINAL JUSTICE

Death Sentence Aggravating Factor Expansion (H.R. 115)

The Thin Blue Line Act (H.R. 115), introduced by Rep. Vern Buchanan, R. Fla., would require courts and juries to consider if a defendant killed or attempted to kill a state law enforcement officer, local law enforcement officer, or first responder as an aggravating factor when determining whether to impose the death sentence on a defendant.

The Leadership Conference opposed H.R. 115. The bill would do nothing to actually ensure officer safety or prevent officer deaths in the line of duty. Federal and state laws already establish the killing of a police officer as a crime requiring the highest level of punishment. Instead of serving a public safety benefit, this legislation would ultimately exacerbate existing tension between law enforcement and the communities they serve, especially African Americans, and would amount to significant congressional overreach.

The House passed H.R. 115 (271-143). A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 265 (5/18/17).

Probation Officer Arrest Authority (H.R. 1039)

The Probation Officer Protection Act of 2017 (POPA), introduced by Rep. David Reichert, R. Wash., would authorize probation officers, during the course of their official duties, to arrest an individual without a warrant if there is probable cause that the individual has assaulted or impeded the officer. It would require the Administrative Office of the United States Courts to issue rules and regulations governing probation officers' use of expanded arrest authority.

The Leadership Conference opposed H.R. 1039. This bill would broadly authorize federal probation officers to arrest – without a warrant – any third party on the scene who the officer claims is “interfering” with their work. Not only would this prompt serious Fourth Amendment concerns, but it would deter people from agreeing to host probationers, thus inhibiting successful reentry for probationers. Furthermore, extending law enforcement-like powers to anyone not trained as a law enforcement officer would be dangerous, as federal probation officers receive far less training than law enforcement personnel. Moreover, given the racial disparities that exist in the U.S. criminal justice system, POPA would likely have a disproportionate impact on people of color and exacerbate mass incarceration.

The House passed H.R. 1039 (222-177). A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 268 (5/19/17).

EDUCATION

Overturing ESSA Accountability Regulation (H.J.Res.57)

This joint resolution, sponsored by Rep. Todd Rokita, R. Ind., nullified the Department of Education's regulation finalized on November 28, 2016 clarifying states' obligations under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), specifically with regard to state accountability systems. This action was taken under the authority of the Congressional Review Act. The regulation provided additional definition and clarity to requirements in the law that states identify, and provide support for improvement to, schools that are not serving their children well.

The Leadership Conference opposed H.J.Res.57. The Leadership Conference believes robust state accountability systems are critical to ensure that schools are appropriately identified and provided supports so that low-income children, children of color, children with disabilities, and English learners receive a high-quality education that prepares them for college, careers, and life. The Leadership Conference also supports clarifying regulations that define terms, provide examples of compliance, and provide additional detail and context so that laws can be complied with and enforced.

The House passed H.J.Res.57 (234-190). A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 84 (2/7/17).

EMPLOYMENT RIGHTS

Repeal of the Fair Pay and Safe Workplaces Executive Order regulations (H.J.Res.37)

H.J.Res.37, sponsored by Rep. Virginia Foxx, R. N.C., nullified a Defense Department, General Services Administration, and NASA rule that required companies bidding for federal contracts of more than \$500,000 to disclose whether they have been found to have violated federal fair pay and safe workplace regulations and equivalent state laws in the previous three years. This action was taken under the authority of the Congressional Review Act.

The Leadership Conference opposed H.J.Res.37. The Leadership Conference believes that the fair pay regulations that H.J.Res.37 sought to repeal represented a much-needed step forward in ensuring that the federal contractor community is providing safe and fair workplaces for employees by encouraging compliance with federal labor and civil rights laws, including those laws prohibiting sexual harassment and prohibiting the use of mandatory arbitration of certain disputes, including in cases of sexual harassment.

The House passed H.J.Res.37 (236-187). A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 76 (2/2/17).

Working Families Flexibility Act (H.R. 1180)

H.R.1180, sponsored by Rep. Martha Roby, R. Ala., would amend the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) to allow private sector employers to provide non-exempt employees compensatory time instead of overtime pay.

The Leadership Conference opposed H.R. 1180. The bill would result in more overtime hours and less money for working people without any guarantee of time off when they need it. The Leadership Conference believes employees deserve fair wages, paid time off, and more flexible schedules to support their families and meet both workplace and family needs. While H.R. 1180 purports to offer private sector employees a choice between extra time and extra pay, instead it relieves employers of the longstanding requirement of the FLSA of paying time and a half wages for hours worked more than the 40-hour week in exchange for a promise of future paid leave. H.R. 1180 would have a particularly pernicious effect on people of color and women, who make up a disproportionate share of the low-wage workforce eligible for overtime.

The House passed H.R. 1180 (229-197). A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 244 (5/2/17).

Joint Employer Definition (H.R. 3441)

H.R. 3441, sponsored by Rep. Bradley Byrne, R. Ala., would amend the Fair Labor Standards Act and the National Labor Relations Act to redefine a joint employer as an entity with actual, direct, and immediate control over employees, including substantial control over terms of employment, supervision of employees, and individual work schedules.

The Leadership Conference opposed H.R. 3441. Redefining and narrowing the definition of joint employer would prevent workers from holding more than one employer jointly accountable for wage theft, equal pay violations, or other unfair labor practices even when employers jointly exercise and share control over terms of employment and working conditions. Despite claims that the bill is intended to assist small businesses, it would result in insulating corporations who might use unscrupulous contractors that engage in wage theft or unfair pay practices from any liability leaving workers vulnerable to unfair and illegal labor practices.

The House passed H.R. 3441 (242-181). A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 614 (11/7/17).

FINANCIAL REFORM

Restructuring of Dodd-Frank Financial Regulations (H.R. 10)

The Financial CHOICE Act is a comprehensive bill that repeals or weakens many of the financial services industry reforms that were enacted in the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act of 2010, a law that addresses the widespread regulatory failures that led to the 2008 financial crisis and subsequent recession.

The Leadership Conference opposed H.R. 10. The bill would undermine the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB) and its policies, which have helped to put a stop to the deceptive, “anything goes” kind of lending that ran rampant in the years leading up to the 2008 housing crisis, including the widespread promotion of predatory subprime mortgage lending in communities of color. Ever since the CFPB opened its doors, it has worked tirelessly to advance the financial health of the communities we represent – not just carrying out the once-radical idea of “ability to repay” rules in lending policies, but also working to address racial discrimination in auto lending markups, sneaky credit card add-ons, and many other deceptive and abusive practices. The CFPB has worked to apply the law to bad actors, give clear guardrails to the good ones, and put billions of dollars back in the pockets of consumers who have been ripped off. At the same time, it has worked to promote consumer education and the growth of more inclusive financial technology. While we are always interested in fine-tuning CFPB policies to better promote safe, affordable, sustainable financial products for underserved communities, H.R. 10 would gut consumer protections en masse and repudiate the hard-learned lessons of the 2008 foreclosure crisis.

The House passed H.R. 10 (233-186). A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 299 (6/8/17).

Overturing the CFPB Arbitration Rule (H.J.Res. 111)

H.J. Res. 111 was a resolution overturning a new regulation by the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB) that placed limits on the ability of financial services companies to force consumers into arbitration, rather than court, to settle their disputes. This action was taken under the authority of the Congressional Review Act. Under the new rule, companies could still require consumers to arbitrate individual cases, but could not prevent them from joining together in class actions.

The Leadership Conference opposed H.J.Res. 111. H.J.Res. 111 would enable big banks, payday lenders,

and other financial companies to force victims of fraud, discrimination, or other unlawful conduct into a “kangaroo court” process, where their claims are decided by hired arbitration firms rather than by judges and juries, where the firms side with corporations in the overwhelming majority of cases, and where civil rights and consumer protection laws may not be applied in the right way. While arbitration can provide a useful alternative to litigation in some types of cases, many companies use it to rig the system in their favor by burying forced arbitration clauses in the fine print of take-it-or-leave-it contracts, preventing consumers from having any meaningful choice in the matter. The CFPB’s modest change would have reduced arbitration abuses by allowing consumers to consolidate their complaints in class action lawsuits.

The House passed H.J.Res. 111 (231-190). A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 412 (7/25/17).

Third Party Settlements (H.R. 732)

H.R. 732, the Stop Settlement Slush Funds Act of 2017, sponsored by Rep. Bob Goodlatte, R. Va., would prohibit federal agencies from entering into or enforcing any settlement agreements that involve payments other than to the federal government, direct restitution to victims, or to remedy harms directly and proximately caused by the defendant. While this legislation would apply to all settlements reached by the federal government, it was motivated largely by two settlements between the Department of Justice and a few of the nation’s largest banks stemming from conduct that led to the 2008 financial crisis, settlements that included contributions to HUD-approved housing counseling agencies and legal aid organizations.

The Leadership Conference opposed H.R. 732. There is no serious dispute over the effectiveness of housing counseling agencies and their record of success in helping homeowners to avoid foreclosure. Instead, the sponsors of H.R. 732 took issue with the process by which the settlements were reached, and with several of the specific groups that received funds for housing counseling work under the Bank of America and Citibank settlements. These objections are baffling, because the Department of Justice had no control over which of the more than 2,000 HUD-approved organizations received contributions from either of these banks. Both of these banks, to their credit, maintain strong relationships with a wide range of community-based organizations, and they had sole discretion to determine which organizations that provide housing counseling work they chose to support. Ultimately, the sponsors of H.R. 732 appeared

more troubled with whom the banks chose to support than with any broader legal or policy principle – an extraordinarily poor reason for limiting the ability of the Department of Justice to remedy corporate wrongdoing.

The House passed H.R. 732 (238-183). A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 580 (10/24/17).

HEALTH CARE

Family Planning Funding Disapproval (H.J.Res.43)

H.J.Res.43, sponsored by Rep. Diane Black, R. Tenn., nullified a Health and Human Services Department rule that prevented states from restricting Title X federal family planning funding to any qualified provider for any basis other than its ability to provide health services. This action was taken under the authority of the Congressional Review Act.

The Leadership Conference opposed H.J.Res.43. The Title X family planning program is a vital source of family planning and related preventive care for low-income, uninsured, and young people across the country. H.J.Res.43 would allow states to bar Planned Parenthood as a Title X provider. As women of color are among the major users of Title X health services, it is critical that access to these services, including those provided by Planned Parenthood, is unimpeded.

The House passed H.J. Res. 43 (230-188). A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 99 (2/16/17).

Health Care Marketplace Overhaul (H.R. 1628)

H.R. 1628 sought to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of 2010 (ACA), transform Medicaid into a block grant or per capita cap, and defund Planned Parenthood health centers.

The Leadership Conference opposed H.R. 1628. Repealing the ACA and restructuring the financing and coverage of Medicaid would leave all people in the United States, particularly people of color and underserved populations, significantly worse off than under current law. The ACA has reduced the number of people without insurance to historic lows, including a reduction of 39 percent of the lowest-income individuals. Medicaid is also critically important as it insures one of every five individuals in the United States and one of every three children. Further, the proposal to block all Medicaid patients from receiving care at Planned Parenthood health centers would have a disproportionate effect on poor families and people of color and could further jeopardize women's access to preventive health care.

The House passed H.R. 1628 (217-213). A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 256 (5/4/17).

Health Insurance Tax Credit Verification (H.R. 2581)

H.R. 2581 would amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of 2010 (ACA) and the proposed American Health Care Act – a bill that aimed to repeal many provisions of the ACA – to prohibit the advance payment of health insurance premium tax credits to any individual until any questions about their immigration or citizenship status have been fully resolved. It would also provide an exemption from the American Health Care Act's continuous coverage requirements for individuals who experience delays in coverage as a result of the verification process.

The Leadership Conference opposed H.R. 2581. It is based on a faulty premise about immigrants unlawfully obtaining subsidies under the ACA, and its enactment would endanger public health. While there were initially significant problems with the process used to verify eligibility for insurance premium tax credits, undocumented immigrants have always been highly unlikely to sign up for ACA coverage or the associated tax premium benefits, because doing so would draw unwanted attention to their lack of legal status. And while there have been significant improvements in the verification process, resulting in far fewer enrollees being disqualified for failure to establish citizenship or immigration status, many people – more often citizens than immigrants – still face delays in establishing their eligibility for insurance coverage under the ACA due to widespread errors in Social Security databases. Because the overwhelming majority of enrollees in ACA marketplaces rely on premium tax credits to help them pay for their insurance premiums, any delays in those benefits are highly likely to result in delays in coverage, with potentially serious consequences.

The House passed H.R. 2851 (238-184). A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 306 (6/13/17).

Fiscal 2018 Defense Authorization -- Gender Transition Treatment Prohibition (H.R. 2810)

During the floor debate over the National Defense Authorization Act, Rep. Vicky Hartzler, R. Mo., offered an amendment that would prohibit the Department of Defense from expending any funds to provide medical treatments related to gender transition.

The Leadership Conference opposed the amendment. An estimated 15,000 transgender people are currently serving in our military, yet this discriminatory and un-

constitutional amendment would deny them from getting health care services that the nation's leading medical institutions (including the American Medical Association) agree are medically appropriate and necessary. The need for the amendment was predicated on bizarre and unsubstantiated claims about the costs of medical care. After thorough study of the impact on costs and military readiness, in 2016 the Department of Defense ended policies that discriminated against transgender service-members. But this amendment – as well as President Trump's July 2017 announcement of a new ban, which is currently on hold in the courts – was driven by blatant hostility towards transgender people rather than by any objective assessment of our nation's military needs.

The House rejected the amendment (209-214). A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 369 (7/13/17).

IMMIGRATION

Immigration Law Enforcement Compliance (H.R. 3003)

H.R. 3003, the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act, would authorize the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to issue “detainers” that ask state and local law enforcement agencies to continue holding any individual who is accused of a criminal or motor vehicle law violation if there is probable cause to believe any such individual is an “inadmissible or deportable alien.” In order to pressure state and local law enforcement authorities to comply with these detainer requests issued by DHS, the bill would make states and cities ineligible for certain federal law enforcement grants if they do not satisfy the requests.

The Leadership Conference opposed H.R. 3003. The tragic 2015 killing of Kathryn Steinle in San Francisco sparked extensive debate over so-called “sanctuary cities,” yet the term incorrectly suggests that certain states and municipalities are refusing to work with federal immigration authorities. The truth is that state and local law enforcement agencies throughout the country already aid in the identification of individuals who are subject to immigration enforcement action through the sharing of fingerprints of those who are taken into custody. But they cannot detain an individual for immigration enforcement purposes, under the Fourth Amendment and pursuant to numerous court rulings, unless DHS obtains a judicial warrant. DHS has acknowledged the constitutional concerns surrounding the use of detainers, but rather than address these concerns, H.R. 3003 would leave state and municipal governments in an untenable position: either they must disregard their

constitutional responsibilities and erode the trust they have built between the police and the communities they serve, or face the loss of vital federal law enforcement funding that helps them fight crime in their jurisdictions. Congress should not force such an arbitrary and unwise choice on cities.

The House passed H.R. 3003 (228-195). A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 342 (6/29/17).

Criminal Alien Gang Member Removal Act (H.R. 3697)

H.R. 3697, the Criminal Gang Member Removal Act, sponsored by Rep. Barbara Comstock, R. Va., created new, sweeping grounds for barring entry to or deporting immigrants based on the mere suspicion of gang affiliation. It would subject people who have never committed a crime to deportation and shift the burden to individuals to prove they did not know they were affiliated with a gang that committed qualifying offenses.

The Leadership Conference opposed H.R. 3697. The bill would expand the use of mandatory, no-bond detention to people facing removal under the bill, even if they have not been convicted of any criminal offenses. Deportations based on suspected gang membership or affiliation would likely rely on flawed gang databases, which are rife with inconsistent definitions, improper documentation procedures, and inadequate safeguards. Furthermore, creating a new ground of deportability for suspected gang members is also unnecessary, because the government already has enough tools and resources to deport such individuals. In addition, DHS has long prioritized its resources to target suspected gang members for deportation. H.R. 3697 would disproportionately harm younger immigrants, indiscriminately barring these immigrants from asylum, withholding of removal, or other forms of humanitarian relief.

The House passed H.R. 3697 (233-175). A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 517 (9/14/17).

REGULATORY REFORM

Congressional Approval of Federal Agency Rules (H.R. 26)

H.R. 26, the Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny (REINS) Act, would require Congress to approve any “major rule” issued by a federal agency before it could take effect. It would apply to any regulation with an annual economic impact of \$100 million or more; one that would significantly harm employment, investment, or U.S. economic competitiveness; or one that would cause a major increase in costs or prices for

consumers or industries. It would create an expedited process for the House and Senate to consider resolutions of approval. On the House floor, it was amended so it would not apply if an agency's repeal of a rule, i.e. a deregulatory action, otherwise met the definition of a "major rule."

The Leadership Conference opposed H.R. 26. Congress has always had the authority to override, clarify, or rewrite the details of administrative actions, but has neither time nor the expertise to micromanage every nuance of regulatory details before they can be allowed to take effect. It would be bad enough if the REINS Act applied equally to all 'major' regulatory actions, but the House adopted an amendment that made its true motives clear: it would exempt deregulatory actions from congressional approval, no matter how costly or harmful they are to the health, safety, or finances of Americans. At the same time, the House rejected commonsense amendments to ensure that the executive branch could still act on issues like clean water, automotive safety, the protection of infants, and disease prevention without being subjected to congressional gridlock. In short, H.R. 26 amounted to a radical anti-government proposal that would quickly enrich our nation's most powerful interests while forcing efforts to protect the health and safety of ordinary Americans to clear new hurdles.

The House passed H.R. 26 (237-187). A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 23 (1/5/17).

TAX

Tax Overhaul – Passage (H.R. 1)

H.R. 1, sponsored by Rep. Kevin Brady, R. Texas, was the House tax proposal. The bill would provide large tax cuts for millionaires, billionaires, and wealthy corporations at the expense of working families, including many people of color. In addition, the House plan sought to require a Social Security number (SSN) to file for the Child Tax Credit (CTC) so that children whose parents filed their taxes with an Individual Tax Identification Number (ITIN) would no longer be eligible for this anti-poverty tax credit. Finally, the proposal sought repeal of the Johnson amendment, which prohibits 501(c)(3) organizations from making statements related to political campaigns or endorsing political candidates.

The Leadership Conference opposed H.R. 1. It would add more than a trillion dollars to the deficit and lead to cuts to critical programs that sustain working families, including Medicaid, Social Security, Medicare, and education programs like Head Start. Additionally, the bill included language that would repeal the Johnson Amendment, which has long prohibited organizations

falling under section 501(c)(3) of the federal tax code from partisan politicking. The Leadership Conference believes that the Johnson Amendment serves as a valuable safeguard for the integrity of religious institutions and the political process; we opposed the repeal of the longstanding restriction. We also opposed the anti-immigrant provision of the bill that would take the CTC away from three million children.

The House passed H.R. 1 (227-205). A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 637 (11/6/17).

Tax Overhaul – Motion to Concur (H.R. 1)

H.R. 1, sponsored by Rep. Kevin Brady, R. Texas, was the Republican tax proposal. The bill would provide large tax cuts for millionaires, billionaires, and wealthy corporations at the expense of working families, including many people of color. In addition, the plan included a provision that would have taken the Child Tax Credit (CTC) away from millions of immigrant families, and it would also repeal the individual mandate of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of 2010 (ACA).

The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights opposed H.R. 1. The bill would add more than a trillion dollars to the deficit and lead to cuts to critical programs that sustain working families, including Medicaid, Social Security, Medicare, and education programs like Head Start. And it would repeal the individual mandate of the ACA, leaving 13 million low- and middle-income people uninsured, including five million individuals now receiving Medicaid, and raise premiums for millions of others. The Leadership Conference also opposed the anti-immigrant provision of this bill that would take the CTC away from three million children.

The House agreed to the motion (224-201). A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 699 (12/20/17).

Senate Vote Summaries

BUDGET AND APPROPRIATIONS

Fiscal 2017 Budget Resolution (S.Con.Res.3)

S.Con.Res.3 was the budget resolution that included reconciliation instructions intended to be used to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of 2010 (ACA). Reconciliation is a special legislative process that is not subject to a filibuster in the Senate.

The Leadership Conference opposed S.Con.Res.3. The ACA has reduced the number of people without insurance to historic lows. Repealing the ACA would leave all people in the United States, particularly people of color and underserved populations, significantly worse off than under current law. The ACA is a critical source of health coverage for America's traditionally underserved communities, which our coalition represents. This includes individuals and families living in poverty, people of color, women, immigrants, LGBTQ individuals, individuals with disabilities, seniors, and individuals with limited English proficiency.

The Senate agreed to S.Con.Res.3 (51-48). A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 26 (1/12/17).

Fiscal 2018 Budget Resolution (H.Con.Res.71)

H.Con. Res.71 was the budget resolution that included reconciliation instructions intended to reimagine the tax code. Reconciliation is a special legislative process that is not subject to a filibuster in the Senate.

The Leadership Conference opposed H.Con.Res. 71. The budget resolution would increase the deficit by \$1.5 trillion over the period of fiscal 2018 through fiscal 2027, likely leading to eventual cuts to programs that are critical to working families, including Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid.

The Senate agreed to H.Con.Res.71 (51-49). A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 245 (10/19/17).

EDUCATION

Overturing ESSA Accountability Regulation (H.J.Res.57)

This joint resolution, sponsored by Rep. Todd Rokita, R. Ind., nullified the Department of Education's regulation finalized on November 28, 2016 clarifying states' obligations under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), specifically with regard to state accountability systems. This action was taken under the authority of the Congressional Review Act. The regulation provided additional definition and clarity to requirements in the law that states identify, and provide support for improvement to, schools that are not serving their children well.

The Leadership Conference opposed H.J.Res.57. The Leadership Conference believes robust state accountability systems are critical to ensure that schools are appropriately identified and provided supports so that low-income children, children of color, children with disabilities, and English learners receive a high-quality education that prepares them for college, careers, and life. The Leadership Conference also supports clarifying regulations that define terms, provide examples of compliance, and provide additional detail and context so that laws can be complied with and enforced.

The Senate passed H.J.Res.57 (50-49). A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 84 (3/9/17).

EMPLOYMENT RIGHTS

Repeal of the Fair Pay and Safe Workplaces Executive Order regulations (H.J.Res.37)

H.J.Res.37, sponsored by Rep. Virginia Foxx, R. N.C., nullified a Defense Department, General Services Administration, and NASA rule that required companies bidding for federal contracts of more than \$500,000 to disclose whether they have been found to have violated federal fair pay and safe workplace regulations and equivalent state laws in the previous three years. This action was taken under the authority of the Congressional Review Act.

The Leadership Conference opposed H.J.Res.37. The Leadership Conference believes that the fair pay regulations represent a much-needed step forward in ensuring that the federal contractor community is providing safe and fair workplaces for employees by encouraging compliance with federal labor and civil rights laws, including those laws prohibiting sexual harassment and prohibiting the use of mandatory arbitration of certain disputes, including in cases of sexual harassment.

The Senate passed H.J.Res.37 (49-48). A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 81 (3/6/17)

FINANCIAL REFORM

Overtuning the CFPB Arbitration Rule (H.J.Res.111)

H.J.Res.111 was a resolution overturning a new regulation by the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB) that placed limits on the ability of financial services companies to force consumers into arbitration, rather than court, to settle their disputes. This action was taken under the authority of the Congressional Review Act. Under the new rule, companies could still require consumers to arbitrate individual cases, but could not prevent them from joining together in class actions.

The Leadership Conference opposed H.J.Res.111. H.J.Res.111 would enable big banks, payday lenders, and other financial companies to force victims of fraud, discrimination, or other unlawful conduct into a “kangaroo court” process, where their claims are decided by hired arbitration firms rather than by judges and juries, where the firms side with corporations in the overwhelming majority of cases, and where civil rights and consumer protection laws may not be applied in the right way. While arbitration can provide a useful alternative to litigation in some types of cases, many companies use it to rig the system in their favor by burying forced arbitration clauses in the fine print of take-it-or-leave-it contracts, preventing consumers from having any meaningful choice in the matter. The CFPB’s modest change would have reduced arbitration abuses by allowing consumers to consolidate their complaints in class action lawsuits.

The Senate passed H.J.Res.111 (50-50) with Vice President Pence breaking the tie. A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote. No. 249 (10/24/17).

HEALTH CARE

Family Planning Funding Disapproval (H.J.Res.43)

H.J.Res.43, sponsored by Rep. Diane Black, R. Tenn., nullified a Health and Human Services Department rule that prevented states from restricting Title X federal family planning funding to any qualified provider for any basis other than its ability to provide health services. This action was taken under the authority of the Congressional Review Act.

The Leadership Conference opposed H.J.Res.43. The Title X family planning program is a vital source of family planning and related preventive care for low-income, uninsured, and young people across the country. H.J.Res.43 would allow states to bar Planned Parenthood as a Title X provider. As women of color are among the major users of Title X health services, it is critical that access to these services, including those provided by Planned Parenthood, is unimpeded.

The Senate passed H.J.Res.43 (50-50) with Vice President Pence breaking the tie. A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 101 (3/30/17).

Motion to Proceed on Health Care Marketplace Overhaul (H.R. 1628)

The motion to proceed on H.R. 1628 by Senator Mitch McConnell, R. Ky., would make extensive changes to the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of 2010 (ACA) by effectively repealing the individual and employer mandates and by repealing most of the taxes that finance the system. H.R. 1628 would also make drastic cuts to Medicaid by transforming the structure from an entitlement program to a block grant or per capita cap with reduced funding.

The Leadership Conference opposed gutting the ACA; slashing federal funding and transforming Medicaid into a block grant or per capita cap; and eliminating the Medicaid expansion. The ACA and Medicaid are critical sources of health coverage for America’s traditionally underserved communities, including individuals and families living in poverty, people of color, women, immigrants, LGBTQ individuals, individuals with disabilities, seniors, and individuals with limited English proficiency.

Medicaid is also critically important as it insures one of every five individuals in the United States, including one of every three children, 10 million people with disabilities, and nearly two-thirds of people in nursing homes.

Medicaid coverage, including the Medicaid expansion, is particularly critical for underserved individuals and especially women and people of color, as they make up the majority of those working in jobs that lack health insurance and earn wages too low to purchase health insurance in the marketplace. The proposed defunding of Planned Parenthood would also negatively affect women of color and low-income women who rely on their services for preventive care as well as reproductive health care.

The Senate adopted the motion to proceed on H.R. 1628 (50-50) with Vice President Pence breaking the tie. A vote against the motion was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 167 (7/25/17).

Better Care Reconciliation Act Final Passage (H.R. 1628)

The motion to proceed on H.R. 1628 by Senator Mitch McConnell, R. Ky., would make extensive changes to the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of 2010 (ACA) by effectively repealing the individual and employer mandates and by repealing most of the taxes that finance the system. H.R. 1628 would also make drastic cuts to Medicaid by transforming the structure from an entitlement program to a block grant or per capita cap with reduced funding.

The Leadership Conference opposed gutting the ACA; slashing federal funding and transforming Medicaid into a block grant or per capita cap; and eliminating the Medicaid expansion. The ACA and Medicaid are critical sources of health coverage for America's traditionally underserved communities, including individuals and families living in poverty, people of color, women, immigrants, LGBTQ individuals, individuals with disabilities, seniors, and individuals with limited English proficiency.

Medicaid is also critically important as it insures one of every five individuals in the United States, including one of every three children, 10 million people with disabilities, and nearly two-thirds of people in nursing homes. Medicaid coverage, including the Medicaid expansion, is particularly critical for underserved individuals and especially women and people of color, as they make up the majority of those working in jobs that lack health insurance and earn wages too low to purchase health insurance in the marketplace. The proposed defunding of Planned Parenthood would also negatively affect women of color and low-income women who rely on their services for preventive care as well as reproductive health care.

The Senate rejected H.R. 1628 (49-51). A vote against

it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 179 (7/28/17).

NOMINATIONS

Nomination of Betsy DeVos – Confirmation

On November 23, 2016, President Trump nominated Betsy DeVos to serve as U.S. Secretary of Education. Because of bipartisan opposition to DeVos' confirmation, the vice president's vote was required to break a tie. This is the first time a vice president has broken a tie on a cabinet nominee.

The Leadership Conference opposed DeVos' confirmation because of her inability and unwillingness to advance public education and protect students from discrimination, as is the responsibility of the Secretary of Education. DeVos' previous record of support for anti-civil rights causes, her unwillingness to demonstrate support during her confirmation process, and her overall unfamiliarity with education and civil rights issues reinforced her unfitness for the position. A billionaire philanthropist, DeVos had never been a public school student, parent, educator, or administrator. She had long been associated with anti-civil rights causes, in particular those hostile to the rights of LGBTQ people.

The Senate confirmed Betsy DeVos with Vice President Pence breaking the tie (50-50). A vote against the confirmation was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 54 (2/7/17).

Nomination of Jefferson Beauregard Sessions III – Confirmation

On November 18, 2016, President Trump nominated Sen. Jeff Sessions, R. Ala., to be Attorney General of the United States.

The Leadership Conference opposed Sessions' confirmation because of his 30-year record of racial hostility, bias against immigrants, disregard for the rule of law, and hostility to the protection of civil rights. This included his support for voter suppression and association with white nationalist groups, as well as his opposition to hate crimes legislation, women's rights, criminal justice reform, and the rights of people with disabilities. The Attorney General is charged with enforcing our nation's laws without prejudice and with an eye toward justice. And, just as important, the Attorney General has to be seen by the public as a fair arbiter of justice. There was little in Sessions' record that demonstrated that he would meet such a standard.

The Senate confirmed the nomination (52-47). A vote against confirmation was counted as a + vote. Roll Call No. 59 (2/8/17).

Gorsuch Nomination – Ruling of the Chair

To facilitate the confirmation of Neil Gorsuch to the U.S. Supreme Court, the Republican-led Senate voted in April 2017 to change Senate procedure and allow Supreme Court nominees to obtain cloture with a simple majority vote rather than with a 60-vote supermajority.

In 2013, the then-Democratic controlled Senate changed the cloture rule from 60 votes to a simple majority, but this was limited to lower court judicial nominees and executive branch nominees. Senate Democrats maintained the 60-vote supermajority threshold for Supreme Court nominees in order to minimize the chance that extreme nominees could be confirmed to the highest and most important court in the country. The 60-vote threshold for Supreme Court nominees incentivized presidents to seek out consensus nominees to the Court.

In April 2017, after Senate Democrats successfully filibustered Gorsuch's nomination due to his extreme record, Senate Republicans changed the Senate procedure for Supreme Court nominees so that it now only takes a simple majority to invoke cloture. This procedural change allowed Gorsuch to proceed to a vote on the merits. An affirmative vote was a vote to sustain the chair's ruling that the November 21, 2013 rules change did not apply to Supreme Court nominations.

The Leadership Conference opposed the rule change not only because it allowed Gorsuch to be confirmed, but because we believe that it will allow other ideologically extreme Supreme Court nominees to be confirmed in the future.

The Senate rejected the ruling of the chair (48-52). A vote in favor of the ruling counted as a + vote. Roll Call No. 109 (4/6/17).

Nomination of Neil Gorsuch – Confirmation

On February 1, 2017, President Trump nominated Judge Neil Gorsuch to be an associate justice of the U.S. Supreme Court.

The Leadership Conference opposed Gorsuch's confirmation because his decade-long record on the federal bench, as well as his writings, speeches, and activities throughout his career, demonstrated that he was a conservative ideologue. As a judge and as a lawyer, Gorsuch had a record that was hostile to civil rights, discrimination claims, workers' rights, immigration, women's health, LGBT rights, police misconduct, students with disabilities, corporate bias, money in politics, environmental protection, the right to a fair trial, and voting rights. His frequent dissents and concurrences as a 10th Circuit judge showed he was out of the mainstream of

legal thought and unwilling to accept the constructs of binding precedent and stare decisis when they dictated results he disfavored.

The Senate confirmed the nomination (54-45). A vote against confirmation was counted as a + vote. Roll Call No. 111 (4/7/17).

Nomination of Alexander Acosta – Confirmation

On March 7, 2017, President Trump nominated Alexander Acosta to be U.S. Secretary of Labor.

The Leadership Conference urged a no vote on Acosta's confirmation. Fundamental to the Department of Labor's (DOL) mission is protecting the welfare, health, and safety of workers and insuring compliance with labor standards. While DOL is expected to serve as a voice and advocate for all working people, its role is particularly critical in ensuring that those most vulnerable, including migrant workers and other workers of color, are treated fairly. However, Acosta was evasive in his testimony, refusing to answer specific questions posed at the hearing about the fiduciary rule, silica standards, and pay equity for women. He also failed to address the need to increase the minimum wage, which is so critical for workers of color, women, and other low-wage workers.

The Senate voted to confirm Acosta to be Secretary of Labor (60-38). A vote against the confirmation was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 116 (4/27/17).

Nomination of John Bush – Confirmation

On May 8, 2017, President Trump nominated John Bush of Kentucky to be a judge on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

The Leadership Conference opposed Bush's confirmation because he had a record of extreme partisanship and did not appear to possess the temperament needed to serve as an impartial federal judge. Many of his writings were pseudonymous blog postings not previously associated with him before he disclosed these writings to the Senate Judiciary Committee. In various blog posts, Bush compared abortion to slavery, derided LGBT parents, argued for increased money in politics, and generally exhibited extreme partisanship. Beyond his blog, Bush demonstrated hostility to the rights of women, when he argued against their admission to VMI, and LGBT people, when he used a derogatory slur to describe them in a public speech. He also defended notorious Los Angeles Police Department officer Stacey Koon, who was convicted in 1993 of police brutality for the vicious beating of Rodney King.

The Senate confirmed the nomination (51-47). A vote against confirmation counted as a + vote. Roll Call No.

164 (7/20/17).

Nomination of Amy Barrett – Confirmation

On May 8, 2017, President Trump nominated Amy Barrett of Indiana to be a judge on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

The Leadership Conference opposed Barrett’s confirmation because her statements and writings revealed a strong bias against reproductive freedom and LGBT rights, expressing the view that abortion is “always immoral” and that marriage should only be between a man and a woman. In addition, her record demonstrated a dangerous lack of deference to longstanding precedent and judicial restraint.

The Senate confirmed the nomination (55-43). A vote against confirmation counted as a + vote. Roll Call No. 255 (10/31/17).

Nomination of Joan Larsen – Confirmation

On May 8, 2017, President Trump nominated Joan Larsen of Michigan to be a judge on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

The Leadership Conference opposed Larsen’s confirmation because as a justice on the Michigan Supreme Court and as an academic before that, she established a record that was antagonistic to civil and human rights. She demonstrated a restrictive view of LGBT rights, writing an article that criticized *Lawrence v. Texas*, and voting against hearing an appeal by a lesbian mother who sought parental visitation. Larsen also demonstrated extreme views on executive power, raising concerns that she would be a rubber stamp for President Trump’s executive actions. Larsen’s extreme ideology helps explain why she was one of the 21 individuals recommended by the far-right Federalist Society and Heritage Foundation and put forward by Trump during the presidential campaign as the pool of people he would consider in making Supreme Court nominations.

The Senate confirmed the nomination (60-38). A vote against confirmation counted as a + vote. Roll Call No. 257 (11/1/17).

Nomination of Allison Eid – Confirmation

On June 7, 2017, President Trump nominated Allison Eid of Colorado to be a judge on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

The Leadership Conference opposed Eid’s confirmation because as a member of the Colorado Supreme Court, Eid had a demonstrated record of conservative extremism. She consistently rejected civil rights and public interest claims, often in dissent. Eid’s record of ex-

treme legal views earned her a place on then-candidate Trump’s list of 21 potential Supreme Court nominees assembled in 2016 by the far-right Federalist Society and Heritage Foundation. Particular areas of concern included Eid’s rulings or dissents on voting rights, police misconduct, access to courts, religious discrimination, public school funding, property rights, and judicial independence.

The Senate confirmed the nomination (56-41). A vote against confirmation counted as a + vote. Roll Call No. 259 (11/2/17).

Nomination of Steven Bradbury – Confirmation

On June 6, 2017, President Trump nominated Steven Bradbury of Virginia to serve as General Counsel of the Department of Transportation.

The Leadership Conference opposed Bradbury’s confirmation. As acting head of the Department of Justice’s Office of Legal Counsel from 2005 to 2009, Bradbury wrote several legal memoranda that authorized waterboarding and other forms of torture and cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment. His memos broke with well-established domestic and international law regarding the treatment of prisoners, and they helped establish an official policy of torture and detainee abuse that caused incalculable damage to both the United States and the prisoners it has held. Confirming a nominee who had a central role in the violation of human rights was troubling enough in its own right, but his work also raised serious doubt moving forward about his ability to provide the kind of rigorous, independent legal analysis that is required of any top government lawyer.

The Senate confirmed the nomination (50-47). A vote against confirmation counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 272 (11/14/17).

Nomination of Gregory Katsas – Confirmation

On September 7, 2017, President Trump nominated Gregory Katsas of Virginia to be a judge on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

The Leadership Conference opposed Katsas’ confirmation because throughout his career, he advanced an agenda to restrict voting rights, LGBT rights, and women’s access to health care. He also worked to expand executive power at the expense of civil liberties. A longtime member of the Federalist Society and former law clerk to Supreme Court Justice Clarence Thomas, Katsas promoted his ultraconservative agenda in high level positions in both the Trump administration and Bush administration. As Deputy White House Counsel to President Trump, he was involved in or refused to

clarify his involvement in attacks on civil rights like the Pence-Kobach commission, the ban on trans people from serving in the military, and the nomination of extreme judges. He did not demonstrate the necessary independence and fair-mindedness necessary to serve in a lifetime appointment on the powerful D.C. Circuit.

The Senate confirmed the nomination (50-48). A vote against confirmation counted as a + vote. Roll Call No. 283 (11/28/17).

Nomination of Leonard Gras – Confirmation

On August 3, 2017, President Trump nominated Leonard Gras of Nebraska to be a judge on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

The Leadership Conference opposed Gras's confirmation both because of his Not Qualified rating from the nonpartisan American Bar Association and his record as a right-wing extremist who had worked throughout his career to restrict LGBT rights and reproductive freedom. The ABA specifically cited bias and lack of open-mindedness in the explanation of its rating. The ABA also noted Gras's reputation for having a rude and offensive demeanor.

The Senate confirmed the nomination (50-48). A vote against confirmation counted as a + vote. Roll Call No. 313 (12/12/17).

Nomination of Don Willett – Confirmation

On October 3, 2017, President Trump nominated Don Willett of Texas to be a judge on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

The Leadership Conference opposed Willett's confirmation because he advanced a right-wing agenda throughout his career, both on and off the bench. Willett's record of extreme legal views earned him a place on then-candidate Trump's list of 21 potential Supreme Court nominees assembled in 2016 by the far-right Federalist Society and Heritage Foundation. Willett lacked the impartiality and temperament necessary to serve as a federal judge. The Leadership Conference highlighted Willett's stated conservative bias, explicit antipathy to women's rights in the workplace, and public opposition to LGBT rights – even going so far as to ridicule LGBT people on Twitter. Willett also had a troubling record on voting rights and affirmative action.

The Senate confirmed the nomination (50-47). A vote against confirmation counted as a + vote. Roll Call No. 315 (12/13/17).

TAX

Tax Overhaul – Motion to Recede and Concur (H.R. 1)

H.R. 1 was the Republican tax proposal. The bill would provide large tax cuts for millionaires, billionaires, and wealthy corporations at the expense of working families, including people of color. In addition, the plan included a provision that would have taken the Child Tax Credit (CTC) away from millions of immigrant families, and it would also repeal the individual mandate of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of 2010 (ACA).

The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights opposed H.R. 1. It would add more than a trillion dollars to the deficit and lead to cuts to critical programs that sustain working families, including Medicaid, Social Security, Medicare, and education programs like Head Start. And it would repeal the individual mandate of the ACA, leaving 13 million low- and middle-income people uninsured, including five million individuals now receiving Medicaid, and raise premiums for millions of others. The Leadership Conference also opposed the anti-immigrant provision of this bill that would take the CTC away from three million children.

The Senate agreed to the motion (51-48). A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 323 (12/19/17).

KEY (c) = Civil Rights Score



ALABAMA

<i>Senate</i>	<i>House of Representatives</i>	
Shelby (R) (c) 0%	Aderholt (R)..... (c) 0%	Palmer (R) (c) 0%
Strange (R)..... (c) 0%	Brooks (R) (c) 0%	Roby (R) (c) 0%
	Byrne (R)..... (c) 0%	Rogers (R)..... (c) 4%
		Sewell (D) (c) 100%



ALASKA

<i>Senate</i>	<i>House of Representatives</i>
Murkowski (R) (c) 18%	Young (R) (c) 0%
Sullivan (R) (c) 0%	



ARIZONA

<i>Senate</i>	<i>House of Representatives</i>	
Flake (R) (c) 0%	Biggs (R) (c) 4%	Grijalva (D) (c) 100%
McCain (R) (c) 12%	Franks (R)..... (c) 0%	McSally (R)..... (c) 4%
	Gallego (D) (c) 100%	O’Halloran (D) (c) 83%
	Gosar (R)..... (c) 5%	Schweikert (R) (c) 4%
		Sinema (D) (c) 77%

KEY (c) = Civil Rights Score

ARKANSAS



<i>Senate</i>		<i>House of Representatives</i>	
Boozman (R)	(c) 0%	Crawford (R)	(c) 0%
Cotton (R).....	(c) 0%	Hill (R)	(c) 4%
		Westerman (R)	(c) 0%
		Womack (R)	(c) 0%

CALIFORNIA



<i>Senate</i>		<i>House of Representatives</i>	
Feinstein (D)	(c) 100%	Cook (R)	(c) 4%
Harris (D).....	(c) 100%	Correa (D)	(c) 78%
		Costa (D).....	(c) 84%
		Davis (D)	(c) 100%
		Denham (R).....	(c) 4%
		DeSaulnier (D).....	(c) 100%
		Eshoo (D)	(c) 96%
		Garamendi (D).....	(c) 91%
		Gomez (D).....	(c) 100%
		Huffman (D)	(c) 100%
		Hunter (R)	(c) 0%
		Issa (R).....	(c) 14%
		Khanna (D)	(c) 100%
		Knight (R)	(c) 4%
		LaMalfa (R)	(c) 0%
		Lee (D)	(c) 100%
		Lieu (D)	(c) 100%
		Lofgren (D).....	(c) 100%
		Lowenthal (D)	(c) 100%
		Matsui (D)	(c) 100%
		McCarthy (R).....	(c) 0%
		McClintock (R)	(c) 9%
		McNerney (D)	(c) 100%
		Napolitano (D)	(c) 100%
		Nunes (R).....	(c) 5%
		Panetta (D)	(c) 96%
		Pelosi (D).....	(c) 100%
		Peters (D).....	(c) 87%

KEY (c) = Civil Rights Score



CALIFORNIA, con't.

<i>House of Representatives, con't.</i>		
		Thompson (D) (c) 91%
Rohrabacher (R) (c) 13%	Schiff (D) (c) 100%	Torres (D) (c) 96%
Roybal-Allard (D) (c) 100%	Sherman (D)..... (c) 100%	Valadao (R) (c) 0%
Royce (R) (c) 0%	Speier (D)..... (c) 96%	Vargas (D) (c) 100%
Ruiz (D) (c) 91%	Swalwell (D)..... (c) 100%	Walters (R) (c) 0%
Sánchez, Linda (D) (c) 100%	Takano (D) (c) 100%	Waters (D) (c) 100%

COLORADO



<i>Senate</i>	<i>House of Representatives</i>	
Bennet (D) (c) 95%	Buck (R) (c) 4%	Lamborn (R) (c) 4%
Gardner (R) (c) 0%	Coffman (R)..... (c) 13%	Perlmutter (D) (c) 91%
	DeGette (D)..... (c) 100%	Polis (D)..... (c) 100%
		Tipton (R) (c) 4%

CONNECTICUT



<i>Senate</i>	<i>House of Representatives</i>	
Blumenthal (D)..... (c) 100%	Courtney (D) (c) 96%	Esty (D) (c) 100%
Murphy (D)..... (c) 100%	DeLauro (D) (c) 95%	Himes (D)..... (c) 100%
		Larson (D) (c) 100%

KEY (c) = Civil Rights Score



DELAWARE

<i>Senate</i>	<i>House of Representatives</i>
Carper (D) (c) 95%	Blunt Rochester (D) (c) 100%
Coons (D)..... (c) 100%	



FLORIDA

<i>Senate</i>		
Nelson (D)..... (c) 91%	Deutch (D)..... (c) 96%	Rooney, Tom (R) (c) 5%
Rubio (R) (c) 0%	Diaz-Balart (R) (c) 14%	Ros-Lehtinen (R) (c) 29%
	Dunn (R)..... (c) 0%	Ross (R) (c) 0%
	Frankel (D)..... (c) 100%	Rutherford (R) (c) 15%
<i>House of Representatives</i>	Gaetz (R) (c) 0%	Soto (D) (c) 96%
Bilirakis (R) (c) 0%	Hastings (D) (c) 100%	Wasserman Schultz (D) (c) 100%
Buchanan (R)..... (c) 0%	Lawson (D) (c) 90%	Webster (R) (c) 0%
Castor (D)..... (c) 96%	Mast (R) (c) 9%	Wilson (D)..... (c) 100%
Crist (D)..... (c) 90%	Murphy (D)..... (c) 83%	Yoho (R) (c) 10%
Curbelo (R)..... (c) 20%	Posey (R)..... (c) 5%	
DeSantis (R)..... (c) 0%	Rooney, Francis (R) (c) 0%	

KEY (c) = Civil Rights Score

GEORGIA



Senate		
Carter (R) (c) 10%	Lewis (D) (c) 100%	
Isakson (R) (c) 0%	Collins (R) (c) 0%	Loudermilk (R) (c) 5%
Perdue (R) (c) 0%	Ferguson (R) (c) 0%	Scott, A. (R) (c) 0%
	Graves (R) (c) 4%	Scott, D. (D) (c) 100%
House of Representatives		
Handel (R) (c) 0%	Woodall (R) (c) 0%	
Allen (R) (c) 0%	Hice (R) (c) 0%	
Bishop (D) (c) 95%	Johnson (D) (c) 96%	

HAWAII



Senate	House of Representatives
Hirono (D) (c) 100%	Gabbard (D) (c) 100%
Schatz (D) (c) 100%	Hanabusa (D) (c) 100%

IDAHO



Senate	House of Representatives
Crapo (R) (c) 0%	Labrador (R) (c) 5%
Risch (R) (c) 0%	Simpson (R) (c) 0%

KEY (c) = Civil Rights Score



ILLINOIS

Senate		
Duckworth (D)..... (c) 100%	Davis, D. (D)..... (c) 100%	LaHood (R)..... (c) 0%
Durbin (D) (c) 100%	Davis, R. (R) (c) 5%	Lipinski (D)..... (c) 78%
	Foster (D)..... (c) 100%	Quigley (D)..... (c) 96%
	Gutierrez (D) (c) 100%	Roskam (R) (c) 0%
	Hultgren (R) (c) 0%	Rush (D)..... (c) 100%
House of Representatives		
Bost (R)..... (c) 0%	Kelly (D) (c) 100%	Schakowsky (D) (c) 100%
Bustos (D)..... (c) 96%	Kinzinger (R)..... (c) 0%	Schneider (D) (c) 100%
	Krishnamoorthi (D)..... (c) 96%	Shimkus (R) (c) 0%



INDIANA

Senate	House of Representatives	
Donnelly (D)..... (c) 82%	Banks (R) (c) 4%	Hollingsworth (R) (c) 0%
Young (R) (c) 0%	Brooks (R) (c) 0%	Messer (R) (c) 4%
	Bucshon (R) (c) 0%	Rokita (R) (c) 4%
	Carson (D)..... (c) 100%	Visclosky (D) (c) 100%
		Walorski (R) (c) 0%

KEY (c) = Civil Rights Score

IOWA



<i>Senate</i>		<i>House of Representatives</i>	
Ernst (R)..... (c) 0%	Grassley (R) (c) 0%	Blum (R)..... (c) 4%	King (R) (c) 0%
		Loebsack (D)..... (c) 100%	Young (R) (c) 0%

KANSAS



<i>Senate</i>		<i>House of Representatives</i>	
Moran (R)..... (c) 0%	Roberts (R)..... (c) 0%	Estes (R) (c) 0%	Jenkins (R) (c) 9%
		Marshall (R)..... (c) 0%	Yoder (R) (c) 0%

KENTUCKY



<i>Senate</i>		<i>House of Representatives</i>	
McConnell* (R)..... (c) 0%	Paul (R) (c) 14%	Barr (R)..... (c) 0%	Comer (R) (c) 4%
		Guthrie (R) (c) 0%	Massie (R)..... (c) 30%
		Rogers (R)..... (c) 0%	Yarmuth (D)..... (c) 100%

KEY (c) = Civil Rights Score

LOUISIANA



<i>Senate</i>		<i>House of Representatives</i>	
Cassidy (R)..... (c) 0%	Kennedy (R) (c) 9%	Abraham (R)..... (c) 0%	Graves (R) (c) 0%
		Higgins (R) (c) 0%	
			Johnson (R)..... (c) 0%
			Richmond (D) (c) 100%
			Scalise (R) (c) 19%

MAINE



<i>Senate</i>		<i>House of Representatives</i>	
Collins (R)..... (c) 18%	King (I)..... (c) 95%	Pingree (D)..... (c) 100%	Poliquin (R)..... (c) 4%

MARYLAND



<i>Senate</i>		<i>House of Representatives</i>	
Cardin (D)..... (c) 100%	Van Hollen (D) (c) 100%	Brown (D) (c) 100%	Cummings (D)..... (c) 100%
		Delaney (D) (c) 96%	Harris (R) (c) 0%
			Hoyer (D) (c) 100%
			Raskin (D) (c) 100%
			Ruppersberger (D) (c) 96%
			Sarbanes (D) (c) 100%

KEY (c) = Civil Rights Score

MASSACHUSETTS



<i>Senate</i>		<i>House of Representatives</i>	
			Lynch (D)..... (c) 87%
Markey (D)..... (c) 100%		Capuano (D)..... (c) 100%	McGovern (D)..... (c) 100%
Warren (D)..... (c) 100%		Clark (D)..... (c) 100%	Moulton (D)..... (c) 100%
		Keating (D)..... (c) 96%	Neal (D)..... (c) 96%
		Kennedy (D)..... (c) 100%	Tsongas (D)..... (c) 100%

MICHIGAN



<i>Senate</i>			
		Bishop (R)..... (c) 0%	Moolenaar (R)..... (c) 0%
Peters (D)..... (c) 95%		Conyers (D)..... (c) 100%	Trott (R)..... (c) 5%
Stabenow (D)..... (c) 95%		Dingell (D)..... (c) 100%	Upton (R)..... (c) 0%
		Huizenga (R)..... (c) 5%	Walberg (R)..... (c) 0%
<i>House of Representatives</i>			
		Kildee (D)..... (c) 100%	
Amash (R)..... (c) 39%		Lawrence (D)..... (c) 100%	
Bergman (R)..... (c) 4%		Levin (D)..... (c) 100%	

KEY (c) = Civil Rights Score

MINNESOTA



<i>Senate</i>	<i>House of Representatives</i>	
		Nolan (D)..... (c) 100%
Franken (D) (c) 100%	Ellison (D)..... (c) 100%	Paulsen (R)..... (c) 0%
Klobuchar (D) (c) 100%	Emmer (R) (c) 0%	Peterson (D)..... (c) 55%
	Lewis (R)..... (c) 9%	Walz (D) (c) 100%
	McCollum (D)..... (c) 100%	

MISSISSIPPI



<i>Senate</i>	<i>House of Representatives</i>	
		Thompson (D) (c) 95%
Cochran (R) (c) 0%	Harper (R) (c) 0%	
Wicker (R) (c) 0%	Kelly (R)..... (c) 4%	
	Palazzo (R)..... (c) 0%	

MISSOURI



<i>Senate</i>	<i>House of Representatives</i>	
		Long (R) (c) 5%
Blunt (R)..... (c) 0%	Clay (D) (c) 100%	Luetkemeyer (R) (c) 0%
McCaskill (D)..... (c) 95%	Cleaver (D) (c) 100%	Smith (R)..... (c) 4%
	Graves (R) (c) 5%	Wagner (R)..... (c) 0%
	Hartzler (R)..... (c) 0%	

KEY (c) = Civil Rights Score

MONTANA



<i>Senate</i>		<i>House of Representatives</i>	
Daines (R)	(c) 0%	Gianforte (R)	(c) 0%
Tester (D)	(c) 95%		

NEBRASKA



<i>Senate</i>		<i>House of Representatives</i>	
Fischer (R)	(c) 0%	Bacon (R)	(c) 0%
Sasse (R)	(c) %	Fortenberry (R)	(c) 0%
		Smith (R)	(c) 0%

NEVADA



<i>Senate</i>		<i>House of Representatives</i>	
Cortez Masto (D)	(c) 95%	Amodei (R)	(c) 0%
Heller (R)	(c) 0%	Kihuen (D)	(c) 95%
		Rosen (D)	(c) 86%
		Titus (D)	(c) 100%

KEY (c) = Civil Rights Score

NEW HAMPSHIRE



<i>Senate</i>		<i>House of Representatives</i>	
Hassan (D)	(c) 100%	Kuster (D).....	(c) 100%
Shaheen (D)	(c) 100%	Shea-Porter (D)	(c) 100%

NEW JERSEY



<i>Senate</i>			
Booker (D).....	(c) 100%	Payne (D)	(c) 100%
Menendez (D)	(c) 94%	Lance (R).....	(c) 22%
		Sires (D).....	(c) 95%
		LoBiondo (R)	(c) 30%
		Smith (R).....	(c) 32%
		MacArthur (R)	(c) 13%
		Watson Coleman (D)	(c) 100%
<i>House of Representatives</i>			
Frelinghuysen (R)	(c) 9%	Norcross (D).....	(c) 96%
Gottheimer (D)	(c) 83%	Pallone (D)	(c) 100%
		Pascrell (D).....	(c) 91%

NEW MEXICO



<i>Senate</i>		<i>House of Representatives</i>	
Heinrich (D)	(c) 100%	Luján (D)	(c) 100%
Udall (D)	(c) 100%	Lujan Grisham (D)	(c) 100%
		Pearce (R)	(c) 4%

KEY (c) = Civil Rights Score

NEW YORK



Senate			Nadler (D)..... (c) 100%
Gillibrand (D) (c) 100%	Faso (R)..... (c) 22%	Reed (R)..... (c) 14%	
Schumer (D)..... (c) 100%	Higgins (D) (c) 91%	Rice (D) (c) 100%	
	Jeffries (D) (c) 100%	Serrano (D)..... (c) 100%	
House of Representatives			
	Katko (R) (c) 23%	Slaughter (D)..... (c) 100%	
Clarke (D) (c) 100%	King (R) (c) 17%	Stefanik (R) (c) 17%	
Collins (R)..... (c) 5%	Lowey (D) (c) 100%	Suozzi (D)..... (c) 95%	
Crowley (D) (c) 100%	Maloney, C. (D) (c) 100%	Tenney (R)..... (c) 4%	
Donovan (R) (c) 17%	Maloney, S. (D) (c) 91%	Tonko (D)..... (c) 100%	
Engel (D) (c) 100%	Meeks (D) (c) 100%	Velázquez (D) (c) 100%	
Españat (D)..... (c) 100%	Meng (D)..... (c) 95%	Zeldin (R)..... (c) 9%	

NORTH CAROLINA



Senate			
	Budd (R)..... (c) 0%	McHenry (R) (c) 0%	
Burr (R) (c) 0%	Butterfield (D) (c) 100%	Meadows (R) (c) 10%	
Tillis (R) (c) 0%	Foxx (R)..... (c) 0%	Pittenger (R)..... (c) 0%	
	Holding (R) (c) 0%	Price (D)..... (c) 100%	
House of Representatives			
	Hudson (R)..... (c) 0%	Rouzer (R) (c) 0%	
Adams (D)..... (c) 100%	Jones (R)..... (c) 45%	Walker (R) (c) 0%	

KEY (c) = Civil Rights Score

NORTH DAKOTA



<i>Senate</i>	<i>House of Representatives</i>
Heitkamp (D)..... (c) 82%	Cramer (R) (c) 0%
Hoeven (R)..... (c) 0%	

OHIO



<i>Senate</i>	<i>House of Representatives</i>	
Fudge (D) (c) 100%	Ryan (D)..... (c) 100%	
Brown (D) (c) 100%	Gibbs (R) (c) 0%	Stivers (R) (c) 0%
Portman (R)..... (c) 5%	Johnson (R)..... (c) 0%	Tiberi (R) (c) 5%
	Jordan (R) (c) 4%	Turner (R) (c) 4%
<i>House of Representatives</i>	Joyce (R) (c) 9%	Wenstrup (R)..... (c) 0%
Beatty (D)..... (c) 100%	Kaptur (D)..... (c) 91%	
Chabot (R)..... (c) 0%	Latta (R) (c) 0%	
Davidson (R) (c) 4%	Renacci (R)..... (c) 10%	

OKLAHOMA



<i>Senate</i>	<i>House of Representatives</i>	
Inhofe (R) (c) 0%	Bridenstine (R) (c) 6%	Mullin (R) (c) 0%
Lankford (R) (c) 0%	Cole (R) (c) 5%	Russell (R)..... (c) 5%
	Lucas (R)..... (c) 0%	

KEY (c) = Civil Rights Score

OREGON



<i>Senate</i>		<i>House of Representatives</i>	
Merkley (D)..... (c) 100%		Blumenauer (D)..... (c) 100%	Schrader (D)..... (c) 86%
Wyden (D)..... (c) 100%		Bonamici (D)..... (c) 100%	Walden (R)..... (c) 0%
		DeFazio (D)..... (c) 91%	

PENNSYLVANIA



<i>Senate</i>					
Casey (D)..... (c) 100%		Cartwright (D)..... (c) 87%		Meehan (R)..... (c) 26%	
Toomey (R)..... (c) 0%		Costello (R)..... (c) 18%		Murphy (R)..... (c) 6%	
		Dent (R)..... (c) 26%		Perry (R)..... (c) 4%	
		Doyle (D)..... (c) 100%		Rothfus (R)..... (c) 0%	
<i>House of Representatives</i>					
Barletta (R)..... (c) 5%		Evans (D)..... (c) 100%		Smucker (R)..... (c) 0%	
Boyle (D)..... (c) 96%		Fitzpatrick (R)..... (c) 26%		Shuster (R)..... (c) 4%	
Brady (D)..... (c) 100%		Kelly (R)..... (c) 0%		Thompson (R)..... (c) 0%	
		Marino (R)..... (c) 5%			

RHODE ISLAND



<i>Senate</i>		<i>House of Representatives</i>	
Reed (D)..... (c) 100%		Cicilline (D)..... (c) 100%	
Whitehouse (D)..... (c) 100%		Langevin (D)..... (c) 96%	

KEY (c) = Civil Rights Score

SOUTH CAROLINA



<i>Senate</i>		<i>House of Representatives</i>	
Graham (R)..... (c) 5%	Scott (R)..... (c) 0%	Clyburn (D)..... (c) 100%	Duncan (R)..... (c) 0%
		Gowdy (R)..... (c) 0%	Norman (R)..... (c) 0%
			Rice (R)..... (c) 0%
			Sanford (R)..... (c) 5%
			Wilson (R)..... (c) 0%

SOUTH DAKOTA



<i>Senate</i>		<i>House of Representatives</i>	
Rounds (R)..... (c) 0%	Thune (R)..... (c) 0%	Noem (R)..... (c) 0%	

TENNESSEE



<i>Senate</i>		<i>House of Representatives</i>	
Alexander (R)..... (c) 0%	Corker (R)..... (c) 0%	Black (R)..... (c) 0%	Blackburn (R)..... (c) 0%
		Cohen (D)..... (c) 100%	Cooper (D)..... (c) 91%
			DesJarlais (R)..... (c) 0%
			Duncan (R)..... (c) 9%
			Fleischmann (R)..... (c) 0%
			Kustoff (R)..... (c) 0%
			Roe (R)..... (c) 0%

KEY (c) = Civil Rights Score



TEXAS

Senate		
Culberson (R) (c) 0%	Marchant (R) (c) 0%	
Cornyn (R) (c) 0%	Doggett (D) (c) 100%	McCaul (R) (c) 0%
Cruz (R) (c) 0%	Farenthold (R) (c) 0%	O'Rourke (D) (c) 95%
	Flores (R) (c) 0%	Olson (R) (c) 0%
House of Representatives		
	Gohmert (R) (c) 0%	Poe (R) (c) 5%
Arrington (R) (c) %	Gonzalez (D) (c) 96%	Ratcliffe (R) (c) 0%
Babin (R) (c) 4%	Granger (R) (c) 5%	Sessions (R) (c) 0%
Barton (R) (c) 0%	Green, A. (D) (c) 100%	Smith (R) (c) 0%
Brady (R) (c) 0%	Green, G. (D) (c) 95%	Thornberry (R) (c) 0%
Burgess (R) (c) 0%	Hensarling (R) (c) 0%	Veasey (D) (c) 100%
Carter (R) (c) 0%	Hurd (R) (c) 9%	Vela (D) (c) 91%
Castro (D) (c) 100%	Jackson Lee (D) (c) 100%	Weber (R) (c) 0%
Conaway (R) (c) 0%	Johnson, S. (R) (c) 0%	Williams (R) (c) 0%
Cuellar (D) (c) 61%	Johnson, E. (D) (c) 100%	

UTAH



Senate	House of Representatives	
Love (R) (c) 0%		
Hatch (R) (c) 0%	Bishop (R) (c) 0%	Stewart (R) (c) 0%
Lee (R) (c) 0%	Chaffetz (R) (c) 0%	

KEY (c) = Civil Rights Score



VERMONT

<i>Senate</i>	<i>House of Representatives</i>
Leahy (D) (c) 100%	Welch (D) (c) 100%
Sanders (I)..... (c) 100%	



VIRGINIA

<i>Senate</i>	<i>House of Representatives</i>	
Kaine (D) (c) 95%	Beyer (D)..... (c) 100%	Goodlatte (R)..... (c) 0%
Warner (D) (c) 90%	Brat (R)..... (c) 4%	Griffith (R) (c) 5%
	Comstock (R) (c) 13%	McEachin (D) (c) 100%
	Connolly (D) (c) 100%	Scott (D)..... (c) 100%
	Garrett (R) (c) 5%	Taylor (R) (c) 0%
		Wittman (R) (c) 4%



WASHINGTON

<i>Senate</i>	<i>House of Representatives</i>	
Cantwell (D) (c) 100%	DelBene (D) (c) 100%	Larsen (D) (c) 100%
Murray (D)..... (c) 100%	Heck (D)..... (c) 96%	McMorris Rodgers (R) (c) 0%
	Herrera Beutler (R)..... (c) 4%	Newhouse (R) (c) 0%
	Jayapal (D) (c) 100%	Reichert (R) (c) 18%
	Kilmer (D)..... (c) 96%	Smith (D)..... (c) 100%

KEY (c) = Civil Rights Score

WEST VIRGINIA



<i>Senate</i>		<i>House of Representatives</i>	
Capito (R)	(c) 0%	Jenkins (R)	(c) 0%
Manchin (D)	(c) 68%	McKinley (R)	(c) 9%
		Mooney (R)	(c) 4%

WISCONSIN



<i>Senate</i>		<i>House of Representatives</i>	
Baldwin (D)	(c) 100%	Duffy (R)	(c) 0%
Johnson (R)	(c) 0%	Gallagher (R)	(c) 0%
		Grothman (R)	(c) 0%
		Kind (D)	(c) 91%
		Moore (D)	(c) 100%
		Pocan (D)	(c) 100%
		Ryan (R)	(c) 0%
		Sensenbrenner (R)	(c) 0%

WYOMING



<i>Senate</i>		<i>House of Representatives</i>	
Barrasso (R)	(c) 0%	Cheney (R)	(c) 0%
Enzi (R)	(c) 0%		



The Leadership
Conference

The nation's premier
civil & human rights coalition

The Leadership Conference on
Civil and Human Rights

1620 L Street, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC
20036

202.466.3311 voice
202.466.3435 fax
www.civilrights.org

Copyright © 2018 by
The Leadership Conference.
All Rights Reserved.