

The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights Voting Record

113th Congress
October 2014



Table of Contents

2	Introduction
5	Senate Vote Summaries
13	House Vote Summaries
20	Scores

Introduction

The 113th Congress presented an extraordinarily challenging environment for the advancement of civil and human rights. Much like the 112th Congress (2011-12), the U.S. House of Representatives and Senate were sharply divided between themselves and with President Obama on a broad range of important policy issues, making it difficult to get much accomplished. Even routine business—such as keeping government doors open, raising the debt ceiling, and confirming highly qualified judicial and executive branch nominees—fell victim to obstruction, brinkmanship, and political posturing. On more complex issues like jobs, housing, immigration and voting rights, the obstacles were even greater. As a result, the 113th Congress was one of the least productive on record—and one of the least popular—as Congress’ approval rating plummeted to an all-time low of 9 percent (most recently inching back up to 14 percent) and Obama’s approval ratings sank to their lowest point as well.

The 113th Congress had, interestingly enough, started out with some encouraging developments. On January 1, 2013, nearly the last day of the 112th Congress, the House and Senate had reached an agreement that averted what had become known as the “fiscal cliff”: the expiration of Bush-era tax cuts, the beginning of deep spending cuts under the budget “sequester” enacted in 2011, the expiration of emergency unemployment compensation benefits, and several other tax and policy changes that were set to go into effect that day. Both the House and Senate managed to approve the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act, sending it to Obama for his signature. And in the opening months of 2013, bipartisan teams in both the House and Senate sat down to discuss how to move forward on the issue of

immigration reform, something that both parties had acknowledged—after the strong showing by Latino voters in 2012—they had an interest in doing.

At the same time, in other areas, it quickly became clear that little had changed. The fiscal cliff agreement may have settled some tax issues, but it did nothing to address the now-routine fights over the government’s ability to borrow money. The House voted on multiple bills to repeal Obama’s signature legislation from his first term, the Affordable Care Act, even though it was clear that he would veto any such effort. Indeed, much of the House agenda quickly centered on Tea Party-driven efforts to shrink government, eliminate regulations, and roll back the laws enacted during Obama’s first term. In a new low, the House even voted to drastically cut spending on food stamps, rather than raise taxes or find savings that did not target poor people. Meanwhile, in the Senate, most Republicans continued their efforts to block or delay the confirmation of even the most highly qualified Obama nominees to the federal bench and executive branch.

In April 2013, the bipartisan group of senators working on immigration reform delivered a pleasant surprise: an 844-page bill that addressed a sweeping range of complicated immigration policy issues. It proposed a “roadmap” to legalization, and eventually citizenship, for millions of unauthorized immigrants who have been living and working in the United States. It made sweeping changes to the system used by legal immigrants to come to the country. It made improvements to detention practices, including the greater use of alternatives to simply locking up immigrants during deportation cases. And it delved into issues surrounding low-wage immigrant workers, an issue that had ultimately doomed

the last attempt at immigration reform in 2007. The bill was cleared by the Senate Judiciary Committee in May, and passed the Senate in late June. While immigration and civil rights advocates were disappointed by many of the compromises made in the bill—particularly the late addition of a “surge” in border enforcement resources—most were pleased that the Senate was able to reach a consensus, and agreed that the bill should move forward in the process.

Progress on the issue of immigration quickly came to a stop, however, when the bill reached the House. Negotiators in the House were unable to agree on a comprehensive package, and several members of the group ultimately abandoned the effort. Many House Republicans did not fully trust their own party leadership, which had previously voiced support for a “comprehensive” approach to immigration reform, so they opposed bringing up any bill whatsoever—even legislation on their own terms. When House Speaker John Boehner, R. Ohio, circulated an outline for a comprehensive bill in early 2014, it was scuttled a week later. And when House Majority Leader Eric Cantor, R. Va., another supporter of reform, surprisingly lost a primary election in June, it confirmed what many advocates had feared for months: the push for comprehensive reform was over.

Meanwhile, despite the bipartisan consensus in the Senate on immigration reform, differences remained as sharp as ever on the issue of judicial and executive branch appointments. In July 2013, frustrated that a minority of senators was blocking up-or-down votes on many nominees, Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, D. Nev., proposed changing the Senate rules. Senate Republicans relented on a number of nominations, including those of Richard Cordray to head the new Consumer Financial Protection Bureau and Tom Perez as Secretary of Labor. The truce was short-lived, however, and after Republicans filibustered several nominees to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, Reid finally went forward in late November 2013 with the rules change he had promised. Since the rules change, the number of Senate confirmations has drastically improved, with one noteworthy exception: Debo Adebile, Obama’s choice to run the Civil Rights Division at the Department of Justice, whose nomination is discussed in our Senate voting record.

The rules change only added to an unusually tense atmosphere in Congress that had existed since late September 2013, when the House and Senate—faced with the beginning of a new fiscal year and the looming debt ceiling—engaged in a standoff over government spend-

ing and the implementation of the Affordable Care Act. The Senate passed several “clean” bills to fund the government, but in each case, the House tacked on language to repeal or delay the health care law, even though such language was a nonstarter for the Senate and Obama. As a result of the standoff, many government agencies closed their doors on October 1, 2013, for the first time since early 1996, and remained closed for the next two weeks until Congress was finally able to reach an agreement.

Despite a fragile economic recovery and continued high unemployment—especially for African Americans, Latinos, and young people—Congress has still not taken up any meaningful effort to create jobs or deal with the continued fallout from the housing crisis. In an unexpected moment of bipartisan agreement, the House and Senate did manage in late 2013 to agree to a budget plan to undo some of the harmful spending cuts imposed by the sequester in the 2011 budget agreement, and to reduce—but not eliminate—the number of standoffs over spending and tax policies in the coming year.

But in countless other areas of legislation, standoffs in Congress were routine throughout 2014. Perhaps most egregiously, Congress failed to move a bipartisan compromise bill introduced in January 2014 to restore critical voting rights protections to the landmark Voting Rights Act, which were gutted in June 2013 by the Supreme Court in its *Shelby County v. Holder* decision. The bill was introduced in January 2014 in the House and Senate by Senator Patrick Leahy, D. Vt., and Representative James Sensenbrenner, R. Wis., but the only action that the bill saw was a lone hearing in the Senate on the one-year anniversary of the *Shelby* decision in June 2014.

Congress clearly had much work to do in the 113th Congress. But as it heads home to face the voters, a total of 181 bills were signed into law, putting it in a tie—with the 112th Congress before it—for the least productive ever.

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 positions 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 during the 113th 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 113th Congress through December 2013.

Based on these votes, each member of Congress earns a percentage rating for support of The Leadership Conference priorities. **This rating cannot 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 or U.S. House of Representatives.

In the House during the 113th Congress:

- Representative Jo Ann Emerson, R. Mo., resigned in January 2013 and was replaced by Representative Jason T. Smith, R. Mo., who won a special election for the seat in June 2013.
- Representative Robin Kelly, D. Ill., won a special election in April 2013 to succeed Representative Jesse Jackson, Jr., D. Ill.
- Representative Mark Sanford, R. S.C., won a special election in May 2013 to succeed Representative Tim Scott, R. S.C.
- Representative Ed Markey, D. Mass., resigned in July 2013 and was replaced by Representative Katherine Clark, D. Mass., who won a special election for the seat in December 2013.
- Representative Jo Bonner, R. Ala., resigned in August 2013 and was replaced by Representative Bradley Byrne, R. Ala., who won a special election for the seat in December 2013.

- Representative Rodney Alexander, R. La., resigned in September 2013 and was replaced by Representative Vance McAllister, R. La., who won a special election for the seat in November 2013.
- Representative Bill Young, R. Fla., passed away in October 2013 and was replaced by Representative David Jolly, R. Fla., who won a special election for the seat in March 2014.
- Representative Mel Watt, D. N.C., resigned in December 2013 upon confirmation to be the director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency and his seat is currently vacant.
- Representative Trey Radel, R. Fla., resigned in January 2014 and was replaced by Representative Curt Clawson, R. Fla., who won a special election for the seat in June 2014.
- Representative Rob Andrews, D. N.J., resigned in February 2014 and his seat is currently vacant.

In the Senate during the 113th Congress:

- Senator John Kerry, D. Mass., resigned in January 2013 upon confirmation to be the U.S. Secretary of State. Senator Mo Cowan, D. Mass., was appointed in January 2013, but declined to run for the remainder of the 113th Congress. Senator Ed Markey, D. Mass., won a special election for the seat in July 2013.
- Senator Frank Lautenberg, D. N.J., passed away in June 2013 and was replaced by Senator Jeffrey Chiesa, R. N.J., who was appointed in June 2013. Senator Chiesa declined to run for the remainder of the 113th Congress and Senator Cory Booker, D. N.J., won a special election for the seat in October 2013.
- Senator Max Baucus, D. Mont., resigned in February 2014 upon confirmation to be the U.S. Ambassador to China and was replaced by Senator John Walsh, D. Mont., who was appointed in February 2014.

The votes of the District of Columbia (D.C.) delegate do not appear in “The Leadership Conference Voting Record” because although District residents must pay federal taxes, they are not given voting representation in Congress.

The Leadership Conference can count on 183 House members and 55 senators to support its priorities on 90 percent or more of the votes in “The Leadership Conference Voting Record.”

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

Senate Vote Summaries

Budget and Appropriations

Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Resolution (S. Con. Res. 8)

In March, the Senate considered S. Con. Res. 8, the Fiscal Year 2014 budget proposal offered by Senator Patty Murray, D. Wash. S. Con. Res. 8 established general spending and tax policies for the next 10 years.

The Leadership Conference supported the Murray budget. It represented a sound and responsible approach to spending and tax policy in the coming decade, and aimed to protect the vulnerable while at the same time encouraging job creation and addressing infrastructure needs. While we were disappointed that the Murray budget would not undo the arbitrary sequester cuts to non-defense discretionary spending for the rest of FY2013, it would move forward with a far more sensible approach by proposing \$1.85 trillion in savings, evenly split between revenue increases and spending cuts. Increased revenues are vital to addressing our budgetary issues, and the Murray budget wisely recognizes this. At the same time, the Murray budget's carefully targeted spending cuts would prevent the reckless across-the-board cuts in education, child nutrition, environmental protection, housing, and many more vital services that were scheduled to take place under the sequester, or which would be even more severe under the House's budget proposal. Deficit reduction must not come from forcing low- and middle-income Americans to bear the burden, yet again, of cutting programs they depend upon.

The Senate adopted S. Con. Res. 8 (50-49). A vote in favor was counted as a + vote. Roll Call No. 92 (3/23/2013).

Fiscal 2014 Continuing Appropriations (H J Res 59)

During the debate between the House and Senate over

FY 2014 government funding, just prior to the October 2013 government shutdown, the Senate moved to table (reject) the House version of the bill, which would have adopted the Senate funding levels, but which also included language that would delay the individual mandate under the Affordable Care Act.

The Leadership Conference supported the motion to reject the House version of the bill. We supported the "clean" Senate bill even though we had serious misgivings about the funding levels it would provide. Both the House and Senate versions of H.J. Res. 59 would maintain devastating federal spending cuts (the "sequester") that jeopardize the communities we represent and the economy as a whole. It would continue federal spending at an annualized rate of \$986.3 billion. The damage caused by the sequester was already widespread at that point: children had lost access to Head Start and other vital educational programs while class sizes had grown; health care programs and food inspection services had been cut back; law enforcement and public safety programs were being starved of vital resources; and badly needed upgrades to our transportation infrastructure had been put off. The Congressional Budget Office estimated that the overall economic drag caused by the sequester would cost 1.6 million jobs by the end of FY 2014. Unfortunately, we had no choice but to support the Senate bill, because it did not include the House's reckless effort to gut the Affordable Care Act, an effort that was guaranteed to result in the shutdown of the federal government.

The Senate agreed to the motion (54-46). A vote in favor was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 210 (9/30/2013).

Education

Student Loan Interest Rate Extension (S. 953)

The Student Loan Affordability Act (S. 953) was introduced by Senator Jack Reed, D. R.I. The bill would amend the Higher Education Act to extend the 3.4 percent interest rate on the undergraduate Federal Direct Stafford Loan Program until June 30, 2015. The bill paid for the lower interest rates by closing loopholes for tax-deferred accounts, the oil industry, and non-U.S. companies.

The Leadership Conference supported S. 953 because it would keep college costs down and avoid increasing the financial burden on low- and moderate-income students who must borrow in order to pay for tuition and other expenses. Maintaining the 3.4 percent interest rate is essential to making college affordable for low-income students, students of color, women, nontraditional students, single parents and veterans, who often experience significant economic barriers to college access and completion.

The Senate did not invoke cloture (51-46). A vote for cloture was counted as a + vote. Record Vote Number 143 (6/6/13).

Employment Rights

Employment Non-Discrimination Act (S. 815)

First introduced in 1994, and modeled after Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Employment Non-Discrimination Act (ENDA) would prohibit most employers from discriminating against employees or job applicants on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity. It was brought up on the Senate floor for a vote in November 2011.

The Leadership Conference supported the passage of ENDA. The bill embodies and builds upon a key principle of the civil and human rights movement: employees should be judged solely on their ability to do a job, and not on the basis of irrelevant personal characteristics. Yet throughout much of the country, lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender workers lack adequate protections from employment discrimination, even though the public overwhelmingly believes they are entitled to fair treatment in the workplace. In addition, most Fortune 500 companies already prohibit discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation, and a majority of them prohibit discrimination on the basis of gender identity as well; they understand that such policies are good for both their workers and their businesses as well.

The Senate passed S. 815 (64-32). A vote in favor was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 232 (11/7/2013).

Minimum Wage Fairness Act (S.2223)

The Minimum Wage Fairness Act (S. 2223), introduced by Sen. Tom Harkin, D. Iowa, would help working families make ends meet, sustain consumer spending, and spur economic recovery. The bill would raise the federal minimum wage from \$7.25 to \$10.10 by 2016, in three increments of 95 cents each. Further, the bill would adjust the minimum wage each year to keep pace with the rising cost of living. Finally, the bill would also raise the minimum wage for tipped workers, which has been frozen at a meager \$2.13 per hour for more than 20 years.

The Leadership Conference supported S. 2223, because the bill would make a significant difference in the lives of millions of low-wage workers and their families and help grow our economy. The bill would have helped provide America's lowest paid workers with an urgently needed raise while boosting the consumer spending that fuels the economy. The bill is also a common sense reform that is a key part of the nation's economic recovery and is needed more than ever to address the shift toward low-wage jobs for working families.

The Senate did not invoke cloture (54-42). A vote for cloture was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 117 (4/30/2014).

Paycheck Fairness Act (S. 2199)

The Paycheck Fairness Act (S. 2199), would amend and strengthen the Equal Pay Act of 1963. The bill would ensure that women can have the same remedies from sex-based pay discrimination as individuals who are discriminated against based on race or national origin. The bill would prohibit employer retaliation against employees who disclose or discuss their salaries and improve wage data collection. It would also make clear that individuals may compare themselves to similarly situated employees to determine whether wage discrimination exists, even if those employees do not work in the same physical location.

The Leadership Conference supported the bill, which would be an important step toward achieving gender equality in the workplace and assisting the many working families that depend on women's earnings to make ends meet.

The Senate did not invoke cloture (52-40). A vote for cloture was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 262 (9/15/2014).

Unemployment Benefits Extension (H.R. 3979)

In April, the Senate passed the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Extension Act of 2014 (H.R. 3979),

which would provide for the retroactive restoration of the federal emergency unemployment insurance program (UI) and extend unemployment benefits through May 31, 2014. The bill would provide much-needed economic support for millions of Americans still struggling to find their footing after years of recession and job losses. Retroactive restoration of the UI program would alleviate hardship for the most vulnerable job seekers while fostering economic growth for all.

The UI expired in December 2013, putting millions of vulnerable workers and families at risk. The Leadership Conference believes UI is a crucial source of protection for unemployed jobseekers, keeping millions out of poverty, and spurring economic growth. In addition to providing an urgent safety net, UI provides a boost to the economy because the money is usually quickly spent by the long-term unemployed.

After Senate passage of H.R. 3979, the House failed to vote on H.R. 3979 as amended and passed by the Senate. While The Leadership Conference applauded the Senate's passage of the UI extension, it is disappointed with Congress' failure to retroactively reinstate unemployment insurance benefits.

The Senate passed the bill (59-38). A vote for the bill was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 101 (4/7/2014).

Gender Equality

Violence Against Women Act Reauthorization (S. 47)

An earlier version of S. 47, the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) Reauthorization, was adopted by the Senate in 2012 by a bipartisan vote of 68-31, but no action was taken by the House of Representatives. S. 47 was re-introduced with bipartisan support to reauthorize VAWA, which expired in 2011, to protect women from domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault and stalking. This bipartisan version of VAWA expanded protections for some of the most vulnerable communities.

The Leadership Conference supported S.47 and urged the House to take up this legislation. Research shows that domestic and dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking disproportionately affects minorities and Native American women, underscoring the importance of strengthening protections for these communities. The bill includes new protections for Native American women, who experience a very high rate of gender-based violence and for the first time includes specific protections for LGBT survivors of domestic violence. The bill, as amended, would also extend protections and assistance programs to trafficking victims through 2017.

The Senate passed the bill (78-22). A vote in favor was counted as a + vote. Roll Call No. 19 (2/12/2013).

Immigration

Comprehensive Immigration Reform (S. 744)

Following months of bipartisan negotiations in early 2013 over the issue of immigration reform, a group of senators introduced S. 744, the Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act. It called for a number of badly needed changes to our

immigration policies. Most notably, it included a path to citizenship for millions of unauthorized immigrants who deserve a chance to stay in the United States and to become fully participating members of our society. Following several weeks of markup by the Senate Judiciary Committee, S. 744 was brought up for consideration on the Senate floor in June 2013.

The Leadership Conference supported S. 744. We took this position with some reluctance, because the Senate passed an amendment by Senators Bob Corker, R. Tenn., and John Hoeven, R. N.D., to the bill on the floor, which included a drastic expansion of border enforcement policies that were unnecessary, extraordinarily expensive, and raised significant concerns for the civil and human rights of people near the southern border. Overall, however, we felt that the bill would do more good than harm: the improvements to our immigration system made by S. 744 were simply too important to abandon at this point, even with the new border enforcement language. It would still put millions of hardworking, deserving immigrants on a road to citizenship that would enable people to fully share in the American dream. It would finally enact the DREAM Act, which has long enjoyed bipartisan support. It would provide drastically improved protections for agricultural guestworkers and other workers recruited from abroad. It would make significant reforms to immigration detention policies which, since 1996, have led to extensive constitutional and human rights abuses. While we were disappointed that S. 744 would repeal the diversity visa program, it included adequate numbers of visas for people from affected countries. In a number of other areas, including the reduction of family-based visa backlogs, promoting immigrant integration, removing arbitrary barriers to asylum, gathering data on the use of profiling, and many other policies, S. 744 would make important—while not ideal—improvements that have been many years in the making and that would go a long way in advancing the civil and human rights of immigrants and citizens alike.

The Senate passed S. 744 (68-32). A vote in favor was counted as a + vote. Roll Call No. 168 (6/27/2013).

Nominations

Nomination of Caitlin Halligan to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit

In January 2013, President Obama renominated Caitlin Halligan for a judgeship, after her nomination was filibustered in 2012. Due to another filibuster by opponents, the Senate was forced to vote on a motion to invoke cloture in early March, a procedure that required 60 votes to succeed. After the motion failed, Halligan's nomination was withdrawn on March 22, 2013.

The Leadership Conference supported the confirmation of Halligan. Her credentials were outstanding, including graduating with honors from Princeton University and Georgetown University Law Center. She had served as solicitor general of New York, representing the state in many cases before the U.S. Supreme Court. She had the enthusiastic bipartisan support of fellow lawyers, former judges, law enforcement officials, and others who cited her "brilliant legal mind, her collegiality and fair-mindedness, and her abiding respect for the rule of law."

The filibuster against Halligan marked the abandonment of a bipartisan agreement in the Senate, reached in 2005, to allow the filibuster of nominees only in "extraordinary circumstances." No one can claim in good faith that such a standard was met here. Most of the opposition to Halligan's confirmation stemmed from her representation of the state of New York in litigation against gun manufacturers. Opponents used this work to brand her as "hostile" to the Second Amendment, even though legal ethics guidelines have long made clear that an attorney's work on behalf of a client does not amount to an endorsement of the client's objectives. The filibuster of a judicial nominee based on her diligent representation of a client will, unfortunately, set a disastrous precedent for the judicial confirmation process in the future.

The Senate did not invoke cloture (51-41). A vote for it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 30 (3/6/13).

Nomination of Cornelia T.L. Pillard to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit

Attorney Cornelia T.L. Pillard was President Obama's second nomination to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit. The Senate Judiciary Committee held a hearing on Pillard's nomination in late July, and reported her nomination out of the committee in September. When her nomination reached the Senate floor, it was initially blocked by a filibuster.

The Leadership Conference supported the confirmation of Pillard. Her exceptional credentials included graduating with honors from Yale College and Harvard Law

School. She clerked for Judge Louis H. Pollack on the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania and served in the Office of the Solicitor General from 1994-98, and then as Deputy Assistant Attorney General in the Office of Legal Counsel at the Justice Department from 1998-2000. As an appellate litigator, she had argued dozens of cases and issued more than 25 briefs in the U.S. Supreme Court. After leaving the government, Pillard became a professor of law at Georgetown University Law Center, where she had taught for 15 years.

The filibuster of another well-qualified nominee to the D.C. Circuit illustrated the continued obstruction by Republicans of the president's nominees. Most of the opposition to her nomination was on the basis of an incorrect premise that the three remaining seats on the D.C. Circuit were unnecessary due to a "low caseload" per active judge—a notion that is contrary to the recommendations of the Judicial Conference and statistics reflecting the current caseload per active judge as reported by the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts. In light of the Senate's decision in December 2013 to eliminate the filibuster on most presidential appointees, however, Pillard was able to move forward to confirmation.

The Senate confirmed Cornelia T.L. Pillard (51-44). A vote in favor was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 256 (12/12/2013).

Nomination of Debo Adegbile to the Dept. of Justice Civil Rights Division

President Obama nominated Debo P. Adegbile to the position of Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights, Department of Justice on November 14, 2013. Due to a filibuster by opponents, the Senate was forced to vote on a motion to invoke cloture in early March 2014. The motion failed.

The Leadership Conference supported the confirmation of Adegbile. Not only were his professional credentials outstanding, but his personal story exemplified the American Dream. A son of immigrants from Ireland and Nigeria, Adegbile grew up in poverty, living in the most notorious welfare hotel in New York City, to graduate from New York University Law School, before working at a large, prestigious corporate law firm. He then served for a decade in various leadership positions at the nation's first civil rights law firm, the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc. (LDF). At the time of the vote, Adegbile was Senior Counsel to the Committee on the Judiciary in the U.S. Senate. Mr. Adegbile twice defended the Voting Rights Act before the U.S. Supreme Court and was highly regarded for his leader-

ship, judgment, and integrity, as well as his knowledge of and commitment to civil rights.

The opposition to Adegbile was based purely on the fact that, while at LDF, he supervised staff engaged in defending the constitutional rights of a capital defendant, Mumia Abu-Jamal. Providing representation to death-sentenced prisoners or unpopular clients is part of the finest traditions of the legal profession, and opposing a nominee on this basis risks chilling the participation of many qualified candidates who may have similarly engaged in efforts to protect the constitutional rights of unpopular clients.

The Senate did not invoke cloture (47-52). A vote in favor was counted as a + vote. CQ Floor Vote 48 (3/5/2014).

Nomination of Judge Robert L. Wilkins to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit

Judge Robert Wilkins was President Obama's third nomination to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit. The Senate Judiciary Committee held a hearing on Wilkins' nomination on September 11, 2013, and reported his nomination out of the committee on October 31. Once again, at both the hearing and committee vote, much of the debate by opponents focused on incorrect arguments about the caseload of the D.C. Circuit and whether there was a need to fill the three remaining vacancies, rather than on the merits of the nominee. When his nomination reached the Senate floor, it was initially blocked by a filibuster.

The Leadership Conference supported the confirmation of Wilkins. Wilkins earned his law degree from Harvard Law School, where he served as the executive editor of the *Harvard Civil Rights-Civil Liberties Law Review*. After graduation, he clerked for the Honorable Earl B. Gilliam on the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of California. He then spent more than a decade at the Public Defender Service for the District of Columbia—one of the most competitive public defender offices in the nation—first as a staff attorney and later as special litigation chief. Wilkins was appointed to the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia in December 2010, and since that time had earned a reputation as a conscientious and fair-minded jurist who dutifully follows the law.

The filibuster of another well-qualified nominee to the D.C. Circuit was an example of the extreme obstruction of the president's nominees, and not based on the merits of their nomination. Opposition to his nomination was made purely on the basis of the incorrect premise that the three remaining seats on the D.C. Circuit were un-

necessary due to a "low caseload" per active judge—a notion that is contrary to the recommendations of the Judicial Conference and statistics reflecting the current caseload per active judge as reported by the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts. With the Senate's decision in December 2013 to eliminate the filibuster on most presidential appointees, however, Wilkins was able to move forward to confirmation.

The Senate confirmed Robert L. Wilkins (55-43). A vote in favor was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 7 (1/13/2014).

Confirmation of Patricia Millett to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit

On June 4, 2013, President Obama announced three nominations to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit. Attorney Patricia Millett was the first of these nominations. The Senate Judiciary Committee held a hearing on Millett's nomination in early July and reported her nomination out of the committee on August 1. At both the hearing and committee vote, much of the debate by opponents focused on arguments about the caseload of the D.C. Circuit and whether there was a need to fill the three remaining vacancies, rather than on the merits of the nominee. When her nomination reached the Senate floor, it was initially blocked by a filibuster.

The Leadership Conference supported the confirmation of Millett. Her credentials were outstanding, including graduating with honors from the University of Illinois and Harvard Law School. As an appellate litigator, she had argued 32 cases and issued dozens of briefs in the U.S. Supreme Court, 35 cases in the D.C. Circuit and eleven other circuit courts of appeal, and four cases in state appellate courts. She garnered the bipartisan support of colleagues in the legal community and she received a "Unanimously Well Qualified" rating from the American Bar Association, as well as the strong endorsement from seven former solicitor generals.

The filibuster of yet another well-qualified nominee to the D.C. Circuit illustrated the continued obstruction by Republicans of the president's nominees. Opposition to her nomination was made purely on the basis of the incorrect premise that the three remaining seats on the D.C. Circuit were unnecessary due to a "low caseload" per active judge—a notion that is contrary to the recommendations of the Judicial Conference and statistics reflecting the current caseload per active judge as reported by the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts. With the Senate's decision in December 2013 to eliminate the filibuster on most presidential appointees, however, Millett was able to move forward to confirmation.

The Senate confirmed Patricia Millett (56-38). A vote in favor was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 247 (12/10/2013).

Nomination of Rep. Mel Watt as Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency

On May 1, 2013, President Obama nominated Representative Mel Watt, D. N.C., to be the director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency (FHFA). The FHFA is the agency that oversees the mortgage finance companies Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, which together guarantee nearly 80 percent of all mortgages nationwide, so it has a tremendous influence on our nation's housing policies. His nomination was initially filibustered when it was brought to the Senate floor in October. In December, however, the Senate voted to eliminate the ability of members to filibuster most presidential nominees, clearing the way for an up-or-down vote on his confirmation.

The Leadership Conference supported the confirmation of Mel Watt. Throughout his career, Watt has been a fierce advocate for struggling homeowners, he has the depth to grasp the problems that plague Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, and he has the skills to work with everyone involved to get the housing sector of our economy back on track. He was one of the first members of Congress to call for greater consumer protections in the subprime mortgage market—a proposal that was strongly opposed by the mortgage industry in the middle of the last decade, but which was eventually accepted as self-evident and included as a key feature of the Dodd-Frank financial regulation law in 2010. We believed it was time for a change in the leadership at the FHFA, which has failed to properly address the widespread home foreclosures that have plagued our economy since the 2007-08 financial crisis, and Watt was extraordinarily well-suited for the job.

The Senate confirmed Mel Watt (57-41). A vote in favor was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 252 (12/10/2013).

Nomination of Richard Cordray as Director of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau

In 2010, Congress enacted the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, which provided a badly needed overhaul of the financial services regulatory structure that had failed to prevent the financial crisis of 2007-08. A key part of this legislation was the creation of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB), which was charged with providing better enforcement of consumer protection laws, such as those governing mortgage lending. In 2011, President Obama nominated Richard Cordray, the former Attorney General of Ohio, to serve as its first director. That

year, however, a group of 44 Republicans signed a letter pledging to block any nominee to head the CFPB unless Congress agreed to changes to the agency structure that would badly weaken its ability to do its job. Faced with this obstruction, Obama used his recess appointment power to install Cordray as the temporary head of the CFPB, and after the 2012 election, nominated him once again. After Senate Republicans renewed their vow to block any nominee, and after Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, R. Nev., threatened to change the Senate rules to eliminate the filibuster of most nominees, the Senate finally agreed to allow an up-or-down vote on his confirmation in July of 2013.

The Leadership Conference supported the confirmation of Cordray. His qualifications were beyond any serious dispute. Moreover, during his time as a recess appointee, Cordray had earned widespread acclaim—from consumer advocates and financial service providers alike—for the way he had carried out his duties. The Leadership Conference adamantly opposed the effort to weaken the CFPB, as any concerns about the CFPB's independent nature had been thoroughly debunked during Cordray's tenure to date—and the threat by a minority of the Senate to block his (or any) confirmation, unless the agency itself was changed, would have set a disastrous precedent.

The Senate confirmed Richard Cordray (66-34). A vote in favor was counted as a + vote. Roll Call No. 174 (7/16/2013).

Nomination of Ronnie L. White to the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri

On November 7, 2013, Judge Ronnie L. White was nominated by President Obama to fill a vacancy on the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri. This was the third time White had been nominated to the court, having been previously nominated twice by President Bill Clinton. Both of White's previous nominations were filibustered by then-Senator John Ashcroft who led a vigorous smear campaign against White based on spurious claims about his record as a judge on death penalty cases. White's nomination was returned to Obama on January 3, 2014, and he was re-nominated on January 6, 2014. The Senate Judiciary Committee held a hearing on White's nomination on May 20, and reported his nomination out of committee on June 19. On July 17, the full Senate voted to confirm White.

The Leadership Conference supported the confirmation of White. His outstanding credentials earned him a "Unanimously Qualified" rating from the American Bar Association. He graduated from the University of

Missouri-Kansas City Law School in 1983, after which he began a long and successful career in public service. White worked as a public defender in St. Louis and served three terms in the Missouri House of Representatives. In addition, White served with distinction on the Missouri Court of Appeals and the state Supreme Court, gaining a reputation as a fair, intelligent jurist who commanded the respect of his fellow judges. His record made him an enormously qualified nominee with the ability to make objective decisions on the multifaceted and prominent cases that would come before the district court. His impeccable credentials and the support he garnered from people across the political spectrum made him an excellent choice for a federal judgeship on the U.S. District Court in the Eastern District of Missouri.

The Senate confirmed Ronnie L. White (53-44). A vote in favor was counted as a + vote. Roll Call No. 227 (7/16/2014).

Nomination of Thomas E. Perez for U.S. Secretary of Labor

On March 18, 2013, President Obama nominated Thomas E. Perez, then-Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights at the Department of Justice (DOJ), to be Secretary of the Department of Labor. For several months, a group of Republican senators threatened to block his confirmation through the use of a filibuster, which requires 60 votes to overcome. However, after Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, R. Nev., threatened to change the Senate rules to eliminate the filibuster of most nominees, the Senate finally agreed to allow an up-or-down vote on his confirmation in July of 2013.

The Leadership Conference supported the confirmation of Perez. Throughout his career, he has been a leader on civil rights issues, and has a strong grounding in labor protections. As the head of the DOJ's Civil Rights Division, Perez stepped up enforcement of human trafficking laws and efforts to ensure that veterans can keep their civilian jobs while serving in the military. He was also a tireless champion of voting rights, disability rights, equal educational equity, and prosecuted some of the most heinous hate crimes in recent memory. He had also previously served as Maryland's Secretary of Labor, where he collaborated with businesses and employees to address critical workforce development needs and continue to build a world-class workforce. His long and outstanding career in public service made him eminently qualified to serve as Secretary of Labor.

The Senate confirmed Thomas E. Perez (54-46). A vote in favor was counted as a + vote. Roll Call No. 178 (7/18/2013).

Poverty and Welfare

Mobile Service Subsidies (S. Con. Res. 8)

During consideration of the budget resolution, (S. Con. Res. 8), the Fiscal Year 2014 budget proposal offered by Senator Patty Murray, D. Wash., Senator David Vitter, R. La., offered a nonbinding amendment that would end the Lifeline low-income subsidy for mobile phones, which is managed by the Federal Communications Commission. The Lifeline program supports low-income people's access to telephone service, whether they use wireless or traditional technology.

The Leadership Conference opposed the Vitter amendment. Lifeline support is critical for families in poverty, who spend every day balancing among a number of unmet needs. Today, more than ever before, access to telephone service, and in particular, mobile phone service, is essential for all people who seek to reach emergency services, earn a living, improve their education, receive health care, or engage in civic society. The increasing scarcity of public pay phones means that without a mobile phone, low-income people cannot always be responsive to their employers, their children, and their caregivers, or the eligibility requirements of federal benefit programs. The Lifeline program has been extremely successful at ensuring access to phone service for those who need it most. Because of Lifeline, struggling families can help escape the circumstances that made them eligible for the program in the first place.

The Vitter amendment failed (46-53). A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 84 (3/23/13).

Transportation

Fiscal 2014 Transportation-HUD Appropriations – Cloture (S. 1243)

Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, D. Nev., moved to invoke cloture on a bill that would provide \$54 billion in fiscal 2014 for the Transportation and Housing and Urban Development (T-HUD) departments. It would provide \$40.3 billion for highway programs, \$12.6 billion for the Federal Aviation Administration, and \$1.8 billion for rail infrastructure.

The Leadership Conference supported the Senate's T-HUD appropriations bill and believes that communities need affordable and accessible transportation systems and fair affordable housing to safely and efficiently access opportunity and grow their local economies.

The Senate's T-HUD appropriations bill reflected a thoughtful assessment of the needs of our nation's most vulnerable families by increasing tenant-based Section 8

rental assistance, and providing level or near-level Community Development Block Grant and HOME Investment Partnership funding for the nation's neighborhoods. The Senate bill funds the Fair Housing Initiatives Program at \$44.1 million dollars, providing much-needed support for addressing housing discrimination in markets across the nation. The bill also provided much needed investments in public transit and funding for our nation's transit systems, passenger rail, roads, and bridges, and creates jobs to boost the economy. The transit investments in the bill support projects that will provide new or expanded public transportation services at a time when demand for transit services is increasing.

The Senate did not invoke cloture (54-43). A vote for cloture was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 199 (8/1/2013).

Voting Rights

Voter Identification Requirement (S. Con. Res. 8)

During the consideration of the Senate Budget Resolution for F.Y. 2014, Senator David Vitter, R. La., offered an amendment that aimed to require the use of a government-issued photo identification to vote in federal elections.

The Leadership Conference opposed the Vitter amendment. Voter ID requirements represent one of the most serious threats in decades to our efforts to ensure the right of every eligible American to vote. They open the door to racial and ethnic discrimination at polling places; prevent many eligible voters across the country from participating in our democracy; and do nothing to combat genuine instances of voter fraud – including improper purges of voters, distributing false information about when and where to vote, stuffing ballot boxes, and tampering with registration forms. There is no evidence that the type of fraud that the Vitter amendment purports to address—voters who misrepresent their identity—is anything but an anomaly.

The Senate rejected the Vitter amendment (44-54). A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call No. 83 (3/23/2013).

House Vote Summaries

Budget and Appropriations

Balanced Budget Requirement (H.R. 444)

The Require a PLAN Act would require the president to send a supplemental budget to Congress, if his Fiscal Year 2014 budget proposal included deficits. The supplemental budget would be required to estimate when the budget would be balanced and describe what policy steps would be required to obtain this result.

The Leadership Conference opposed H.R. 444, which is little more than a gimmick that attempts to put the blame for high deficits—and the responsibility for balancing the budget—solely on the shoulders of the president. It would require the president to propose massive cutbacks to important government programs, regardless of the wisdom of doing so, and even though the ongoing “sequester” budget cuts have already harmed the economy. H.R. 444 is particularly disingenuous because the House has steadfastly opposed any tax increases or even the elimination of any special-interest tax loopholes, even though they would reduce the deficit.

The House passed H.R. 444 (253-167). A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 38 (2/6/2013).

Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Resolution (H. Con. Res. 25)

In March, the House considered H. Con. Res. 25, the Fiscal Year 2014 budget proposal offered by Representative Paul Ryan. R. Wis. H. Con. Res. 25 established general spending and tax policies for the next ten years.

The Leadership Conference opposed the Ryan budget. It proposed cuts that are extreme and irresponsible, slashing or eliminating many services that are needed by communities represented by our member organiza-

tions, including vulnerable people such as low-income families, communities of color, young children, students, older people, individuals with disabilities, the unemployed, and the uninsured. While it was short on details, it is clear that the majority of cuts in the Ryan budget were to programs that served lower-income Americans. With millions of families hurt by unemployment and reduced income, the Ryan budget would make things worse by gutting Medicare and Medicaid and calling for massive cuts in education, emergency food assistance, and other necessities. These cuts went well beyond those in effect under the sequester provisions of the Budget Control Act of 2011, in part because the Ryan budget would effectively cancel the defense half of the sequester cuts, reneging on the deficit reduction deal agreed to in 2011, and forcing the outright elimination of many important government functions. At the same time, it would give massive tax cuts to those who need them the least without providing any meaningful explanation of how to make them deficit-neutral. Rather than reducing deficits or restoring fiscal responsibility, which are certainly legitimate goals, the Ryan budget seemed aimed at fulfilling a radical vision to starve much of the federal government out of existence. We urged Congress instead to pass a budget that strikes a sensible balance between revenue increases and spending cuts, rather than one that attempted to balance the budget on the backs of the most vulnerable Americans.

The House adopted H. Con. Res. 25 (221-207). A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 88 (3/21/2013).

Fiscal 2014 Continuing Appropriations (H.J. Res 59)

During the debate between the House and Senate over FY 2014 government funding, just prior to the October

2013 government shutdown, the House made a motion to agree to the Senate funding bill, but only with the inclusion of language that would delay the individual mandate under the Affordable Care Act.

The Leadership Conference opposed the motion and the House's revised proposal. We believed the House should have agreed to the Senate's version of the bill, even though we had serious misgivings about the funding levels it would provide. Both the House and Senate versions of H.J. Res. 59 would maintain devastating federal spending cuts (the "sequester") that jeopardize the communities we represent and the economy as a whole. It would continue federal spending at an annualized rate of \$986.3 billion. The damage caused by the sequester was already widespread at that point: children had lost access to Head Start and other vital educational programs while class sizes had grown; health care programs and food inspection services had been cut back; law enforcement and public safety programs were being starved of vital resources; and badly needed upgrades to our transportation infrastructure had been put off. The Congressional Budget Office estimated that the overall economic drag caused by the sequester will cost 1.6 million jobs by the end of FY 2014. Unfortunately, we had no choice but to support the Senate version of the bill because it did not include a reckless effort to gut the Affordable Care Act, an effort that was guaranteed to result in the shutdown of the federal government.

The House agreed the motion on H.J. Res. 59 (228-201). A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call No. 504 (9/30/2013).

Education

Education Law Overhaul – Passage (H.R. 5)

The Student Success Act (H.R. 5) was introduced by Representative John Kline, R. Minn. The bill would reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

The Leadership Conference opposed the bill. Although ESEA must be updated and improved, the Student Success Act would undermine the core American value of equal opportunity in education and do significant damage to existing protections extended to traditionally underprivileged students. It eliminates accountability under federal law for the achievement and learning gains of subgroups of disadvantaged students. It also eliminates performance targets for academic achievement and removes parameters regarding permitted use of federal funds to support disadvantaged students. Finally, the bill does not address key disparities in opportunity

such as access to high-quality college preparatory curricula; restricts the federal government from protecting disadvantaged students; does not address poor quality assessments; and fails to advance the current movement toward college- and career-ready standards.

The Student Success Act was adopted (221-207) A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 374 (7/19/13).

Employment Rights

Eliminating Prevailing Wage Requirements (H.R. 2216)

In June 2013, the House considered the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act 2014 (H.R. 2216), which would determine appropriations for the Department of Defense, Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for fiscal year 2014. Representative Steve King, R. Iowa, offered an amendment (H.Amdt. 96) that would prohibit funds in the bill from being used to administer, enforce, or implement prevailing wage requirements in the Davis-Bacon Act. The Davis-Bacon Act requires contractors on federally assisted construction contracts and federal service contracts to pay their employees at rates prevailing in the communities where the work is performed.

The Leadership Conference opposed the King amendment because the fundamental principles underlying prevailing wage requirements are at the core of protecting workers' civil rights. By keeping rates at the prevailing local levels, the Davis-Bacon Act ensures a decent standard of living for construction workers.

The King amendment failed (192-231). A vote against the amendment was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 191. (6/4/2013).

Ensuring Fair Labor Standards (H.R. 4660)

During consideration of the Commerce, Justice, Science Appropriations Act, 2015, Representative Keith Ellison, D. Minn., offered an amendment that would bar the use of funds provided by the bill to enter contracts with contractors that committed wage theft or other violations of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Contractors receive taxpayer money and can commit wage theft if they deny their hourly workers overtime pay or force them to work off the clock. The Leadership Conference believes the federal government could lead the way by disqualifying contractors who practice wage theft.

The Leadership Conference supported the Ellison amendment because the fundamental principles underlying prevailing wage requirements are at the core of protecting workers' civil rights. By ensuring workers are protected from the wage theft and other violations of the Fair Labor Standards Act, workers may receive a decent standard of living.

The House rejected the Ellison amendment (196-211). A vote for the amendment was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 262. (5/30/2014).

Prohibiting Activities of the National Relations Labor Board (H.R. 1120)

Representative Phil Roe, R. Tenn., introduced the Preventing Greater Uncertainty in Labor-Management Relations Act (H.R. 1120), which would halt the critical work of the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB), strip workers of their essential rights, and open the door to workplace discrimination for all workers, especially vulnerable populations.

H.R. 1120 would have also created uncertainty in our labor-management system by effectively ending important functions of the NLRB. The NLRB is an independent federal agency vested with the power to safeguard employees' rights to organize. It also acts to prevent and remedy unfair labor practices by private sector employers and unions. H.R. 1120 directed the NLRB to "cease all activity that requires a quorum," thereby denying parties the opportunity to receive a legally binding decision in cases where they believe their legal rights have been violated. Thus, employers could ignore the law with impunity, knowing that the NLRB would lack the ability to issue a timely decision against them.

The Leadership Conference opposed the bill. Workers' rights—including the right to organize unions and engage in collective bargaining—are fundamental civil and human rights. This bill would have forced the NLRB into a state of perpetual instability, leaving employers free to reject orders and engage in unfair activity, including: warrantless firings, retaliation for complaints, and infringement of workers' rights to organize, petition their employers, and hold elections.

The House passed the bill (219-209). A vote against the bill is counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 101. (4/12/2013)

Workforce Investment Act Reauthorization – Passage (H.R. 803)

H.R. 803, the Supporting Knowledge and Investing in Lifelong Skills Act (SKILLS) was introduced by Representative Virginia Foxx, R. N.C. The bill would

reauthorize the Workforce Investment Act (WIA) by consolidating all its programs into a single grant; require two-thirds of state and local Workforce Investment Board to be employers; and require states and localities to adhere to common performance measures for all workforce development services.

The Leadership Conference could not support the bill because it would not have effectively upgraded and modernized federal job training programs to meet the dire needs of both prospective workers and employers. The Leadership Conference was especially concerned that the bill would block-grant targeted programs that help those most in need and who would benefit the most from high quality education, training, and workforce services. In addition, The Leadership Conference opposed the bill's proposal to alter the composition of local workforce boards to give employers a two-thirds supermajority. The Leadership Conference supported a substitute offered by Representative John Tierney, D. Mass., H.R. 798, the Workforce Investment Act of 2013, which was defeated.

The SKILLS Act was adopted (215-202) A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 75 (3/15/13).

Working Families Flexibility Act (H.R. 1406)

The Working Families Flexibility Act (H.R. 1406), introduced by Representative Martha Roby, R. Ala., would allow employers to pay nothing for overtime work at the time the work is performed—in exchange for a promise of future paid leave—thereby undermining the very purposes of the Fair Labor Standards Act. The legislation would mean more overtime hours and less money for workers without any guarantee of time off when they need it. H.R. 1406 would place unfettered discretion in the hands of employers, while limiting the ability of employees to earn the wages they need to support their families.

The Leadership Conference opposed the bill. Employees deserve fair wages, safe working conditions, and more flexible schedules to meet both workplace and family needs. H.R. 1406 threatens the rights of workers because it places significant power in the hands of employers to ignore overtime compensation requirements and fails to provide proper redress for those actions.

The House passed the bill (223-204). A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 137 (5/8/13).

Fair Housing

Amendment to Block "Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing" Rule

During consideration of the FY 2015 Transportation-

HUD appropriations bill, Representative Paul Gosar, R. Ariz., offered an amendment to block the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) from using any funds to finalize or implement its proposed “Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing” (AFFH) regulation. Under the Fair Housing Act of 1968, HUD is required to administer its programs in a way that affirmatively furthers fair housing, and this duty extends to local governments that benefit under various grant programs. HUD’s proposed rule would make vital improvements in how the AFFH requirements are implemented.

The Leadership Conference opposed the Gosar amendment, as it flies in the face of our nation’s efforts to expand opportunity and fairness for all. The proposed AFFH regulation provides helpful guidance to cities and counties on how to comply with existing obligations, ultimately making the process easier and less expensive. It does not impose any new obligations; rather, it provides more detail on the options that localities have for living up to the commitment that they’ve already made if they have obtained federal assistance. Ultimately, the AFFH rules help ensure that everybody has an equal chance to live in strong, diverse neighborhoods with good schools and the other resources people need to thrive.

The House adopted the Gosar amendment (219-207). A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call No. 285 (6/10/2014)

Financial Reform

Consumer Financial Protection Bureau Overhaul (H.R. 3193)

The Consumer Financial Freedom and Washington Accountability Act (H.R. 3193) was a compilation of a number of bills that had been considered in recent years to undermine the new Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB). Among other things, H.R. 3193 would alter the funding structure of the CFPB so its very existence would be subject to the whims of Congress, make it easier for other financial services regulators to veto CFPB policies, and replace its director, currently Richard Cordray, with a five-member panel.

The Leadership Conference opposed H.R. 3193. Since the CFPB’s creation under the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act of 2010, opponents in Congress—spurred on by many elements of the financial services industry—have tried incessantly to hobble the agency. For several years, a minority of senators even threatened to filibuster the confirmation of Cordray until legislation such as H.R. 3193 was enacted into law (he was eventually confirmed when the Senate leadership threatened to eliminate the filibuster altogether).

This bill was only the latest in this string of efforts, and it has already proven to be unwarranted. Since the CFPB’s founding, many industry leaders have expressed pleasant surprise at the deliberative, accessible, fair nature of the agency’s policymaking process. Gutting the CFPB’s authority to protect consumers would only strengthen industries that are rife with predatory and deceptive practices such as payday lending, debt collections, and subprime mortgages.

The House passed H.R. 3193 (232-182). A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call No. 85 (2/27/2014).

SEC Regulation Cost-Benefit Analysis (H.R. 1602)

The SEC Regulatory Accountability Act would require the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) to conduct new cost-benefit analyses of its regulations, take additional steps to explain the justification for any new rules, and perform additional ongoing analyses of its rules including the impact on jobs.

The Leadership Conference opposed the bill. While SEC rulemaking procedures may not stand out as a civil and human rights issue, H.R. 1062 is essentially another effort to undermine the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act of 2010, which was an important victory for communities that have been harmed by reckless financial industry practices. The new requirements under H.R. 1062 are both unnecessary and detrimental, because the SEC is already required to carefully consider the economic impact of its proposed rules, and the additional procedures in H.R. 1062 would only work to the advantage of the industries that are trying to evade regulation. In addition, H.R. 1062 would set a troubling precedent, as other regulatory and enforcement agencies—such as those dealing with civil rights, education, and consumer protection policies—could be hamstrung through the adoption of similar requirements.

The House passed the bill (235-161). A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call No. 160 (5/17/2013).

Gender Equality

Violence Against Women Act—Republican Substitute (S. 47)

The Violence Against Women Act Reauthorization—Republican Substitute (S. 47) would reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA), which expired in 2011, to protect women from domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault and stalking. It did not address serious gaps in the current law for the most vulnerable communities.

The Leadership Conference opposed S. 47 because it failed to provide adequate protections to Native Ameri-

can women, who experience some of the highest rates of gender-based violence, and failed to include specific protections for LGBT survivors of domestic violence.

The House rejected S. 47, (166-257). A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 54 (2/28/2013).

Immigration

Amendment to Bar Federal Funds for “Sanctuary Cities” (H.R. 4660)

During consideration of the FY 2015 Commerce, Justice, Science Appropriations Act, Representative Steve King, R-Iowa, offered an amendment to prevent state or local governments from receiving federal law enforcement assistance funds if they are refusing to cooperate with immigration enforcement officers. A number of cities throughout the country have declared themselves “sanctuary cities” that have expressly prohibited such cooperation.

The Leadership Conference opposed the King amendment. Some cities have refused to cooperate with federal immigration enforcement because they are concerned that overzealous deportation policies have resulted in needless removals, wasted valuable resources, and undermined the fragile trust between local police and the communities they protect. While Congress has the right to place certain conditions on federal funds it provides, it should not punish cities for adopting policies that are vital to effective community policing efforts. The appropriate way for Congress to deal with “sanctuary cities” is to enact comprehensive immigration reform that resolves the underlying issues.

The House adopted the King amendment (214-194). A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call No. 266 (5/30/2014).

Defunding of “Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals” Policy (H.R. 5272)

In the last week of July, the House turned its attention to a recent influx of children who were arriving at the southern U.S. border from Central American countries. The increase in children—most of whom surrendered upon arriving at the border—was straining federal resources, generating widespread media attention, and even causing tensions in some communities where the children were temporarily being held in custody while they awaited proceedings. While a high percentage of the children were likely eligible for asylum or refugee status, given the current conditions in much of Central America, many members of Congress argued that they were encouraged to come to the United States as a result

of President Obama’s 2012 Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) policy.

DACA allowed many unauthorized immigrants to stay in the United States and obtain work authorization if they were brought here as children (and thus had no say in their failure to obtain legal status). The policy was implemented as a response to the 2010 filibuster of the DREAM Act, which would have provided these young immigrants with a pathway to citizenship. H.R. 5272 would have effectively brought an end to the DACA policy.

The Leadership Conference opposed H.R. 5272. It would drastically limit the president’s authority to exercise common-sense prosecutorial discretion, a well-accepted aspect of law enforcement, to spare innocent immigrants from the threat of deportation and to direct limited resources towards higher-priority cases. While prosecutorial discretion is hardly a solution to the long-standing problems in our nation’s immigration policies, it has been the only remaining option at the president’s disposal given the House’s refusal to take up legislation on the underlying issues. With this measure, the House is effectively saying “until we act, no one else can act—and we’re not going to act.” Furthermore, DACA expressly did not apply to anyone who recently came to the country, so it was wrong to blame it for the surge in childhood arrivals earlier this year (a surge which has since subsided).

The House passed H.R. 5272 (216-192). A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 479 (8/1/2014).

Eliminating “Bed Mandate” in Immigration Detention (H.R. 2217)

During the consideration of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) Appropriations Act for FY 2014, Representatives Ted Deutch, D. Fla., and Bill Foster, R. Ill., offered an amendment to delete a part of the bill that directs U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement to maintain a minimum of 34,000 beds in its immigration detention facilities.

The Leadership Conference supported the Deutch-Foster amendment. Given the tremendous human rights implications, not to mention the staggering costs, immigrants should only be subject to detention (while awaiting deportation proceedings) if they are determined to be flight risks or a danger to public safety. The detention bed mandate prevents DHS from making careful decisions based on its enforcement priorities, policies, and need. It also makes it impossible to utilize effective alterna-

tives to detention that could easily save taxpayer money. Instead, it takes an inhumane and one-size-fits-all approach that makes a mockery of human rights principles, wastes valuable resources, and lines the pockets of the for-profit privately-owned prison corporations that do business with DHS.

The Deutch-Foster amendment failed (190-232). A vote for it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 198 (6/5/2013).

Eliminating Prosecutorial Discretion in Immigration Enforcement (H.R. 2217)

During the consideration of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) Appropriations Act for FY 2014, Representative Steve King, R. Iowa, offered an amendment that would bar the administration from using funds to implement a number of policies and memorandums that provided for the increased use of prosecutorial discretion, or common-sense judgment, in deciding whether or not to pursue deportation in certain cases. Most notably, it would have barred the administration from carrying out its June 2012 policy that allowed DHS to refrain from deporting unauthorized immigrants who came to the United States as children.

The Leadership Conference opposed the King amendment. We believe the administration has acted properly in expanding the use of prosecutorial discretion in its enforcement of immigration laws, as deportation should not be a one-size-fits-all policy. Many immigrants, despite their lack of legal status, have become too connected to their families and communities in the United States, are making too many contributions to our economy and our culture, and pose no threat to either public safety or our economic well-being. This is especially true of unauthorized immigrants who were brought to the United States as children; for them, this is the only home they have ever known—and it is senseless and inhumane to force them to leave or otherwise penalize them for the actions of their parents. The ultimate aim of the King Amendment was to require the deportation of all unauthorized immigrants, regardless of mitigating circumstances.

The House agreed to the King Amendment (224-201). A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 208 (6/6/2013).

Poverty and Welfare

Child Tax Credit Expansion (H.R. 4935)

In July, the House took up H.R. 4935, the “Child Tax Credit Improvement Act of 2014.” The Child Tax Credit has helped to lift many families with children out of

poverty, especially after improvements were made to the law in 2009. Those improvements are set to expire in 2017, however, which could wipe out the credit for many families who need it the most. Rather than extend the 2009 improvements, H.R. 4935 made a number of other changes including adjusting the tax credit for inflation, extending it to higher-income families, and introducing new eligibility requirements.

The Leadership Conference opposed H.R. 4935. Failing to reauthorize the 2009 changes would cause families with earnings below about \$15,000 (i.e., minimum wage earners) to lose the credit altogether. An analysis by the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities warned that 12 million people, including 6 million children, would be pushed into or deeper into poverty. Meanwhile, the bill would require tax return filers to have a valid Social Security Number in order to obtain the credit. While we can understand why the House would want to prevent unauthorized immigrants from obtaining taxpayer benefits, the Child Tax Credit is meant to help children—and about 5.5 million children, 4.5 million of whom are U.S. citizens, would be denied this vital assistance. If the House was truly interested in addressing the impact of unauthorized immigration, rather than in grandstanding on a bill that President Obama was sure to veto, it could have taken up a bipartisan comprehensive reform effort similar to the bill that passed the Senate in 2013.

The House passed H.R. 4935 (237-173). A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call No. 451 (7/25/2014).

Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (H.R. 3102)

H.R. 3102 would reauthorize the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), formerly known as food stamps, through 2016. In doing so, however, it proposed to cut \$40 billion from the SNAP program and deny assistance to nearly three million of the most vulnerable Americans among us.

The Leadership Conference opposed H.R. 3102. It would make several drastic changes to the SNAP program under the false pretense of encouraging recipients to work. First, by eliminating a provision that allows states to provide relief beyond the normal three-month cutoff, it would eliminate SNAP for low-income, unemployed, childless adults who live in areas of high unemployment, affecting 1.7 million jobless individuals in 2014. Second, another provision would cut off an additional 2.1 million people in 2014—mostly low-income working families and low-income seniors—if they had gross incomes or assets that are modestly above the

federal SNAP limits, but had disposable incomes (the income that a family has available for food and other needs) below the poverty line, as well as low-income, unemployed parents and their children (other than parents of infants) who want to work but who cannot find a job or an opening in a job training program. Third, it would give states a strong financial incentive to cut off SNAP relief, by letting them keep half of any federal savings. It makes these changes while doing nothing to provide jobs or additional funding for job training. Finally, it would allow states to engage in drug testing of beneficiary recipients, opening the door to discriminatory and abusive implementation. While we agree that it is vital to address our nation's long-term debt, it is fundamentally inhumane to impose new "savings" squarely on the backs of the people who can least afford them.

The House passed H.R. 3102 (217-210). A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call No. 476 (9/19/2013).

Transportation

Short-term reauthorization of the Highway Trust Fund

During the debate on transportation reauthorization, Representative Earl Blumenauer, D. Ore., offered a motion to recommit the Highway Trust Fund Reauthorization bill and report it back with an amendment extending the authority for the trust fund through December 2014, rather than May 2015.

This motion would ensure that Congress would revisit patching the Highway Trust Fund—and possibly a long-term surface bill—during the lame-duck session.

The Leadership Conference supported the Blumenauer motion, because a longer extension delays completing a long-term and urgently needed surface transportation reauthorization bill. The Leadership Conference strongly supports a long-term reauthorization, because in the absence of adequate funding, transit systems continue to cut service and lay off workers despite record demand. Long-term investment is needed to support projects that will provide new or expanded public transportation services at a time when demand for transit services is increasing.

The House rejected the motion (193-227). A vote for the motion was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 413 (7/15/2014).

KEY (c) = Civil Rights Score

ALABAMA



<i>Senate</i>	<i>House of Representatives</i>	
		Byrne* (R)..... (c) 0%
Sessions (R)..... (c) 0%	Aderholt (R)..... (c) 0%	Roby (R) (c) 0%
Shelby (R) (c) 5%	Bachus, S. (R) (c) 10%	Rogers (R)..... (c) 5%
	Bonner* (R)..... (c) 0%	Sewell (D) (c) 100%
	Brooks, M. (R)..... (c) 0%	

*Representative Jo Bonner, R. Ala., resigned in August 2013 and was replaced by Representative Bradley Byrne, R. Ala., who won a special election in December 2013.

ALASKA



<i>Senate</i>	<i>House of Representatives</i>
Begich (D) (c) 95%	Young, D. (R) (c) 33%
Murkowski (R) (c) 38%	

ARIZONA



<i>Senate</i>	<i>House of Representatives</i>	
		Kirkpatrick (D)..... (c) 89%
Flake (R)..... (c) 19%	Barber (D) (c) 75%	Pastor (D)..... (c) 100%
McCain (R) (c) 20%	Franks (R)..... (c) 0%	Salmon (R) (c) 0%
	Gosar (R)..... (c) 5%	Schweikert (R) (c) 5%
	Grijalva (D) (c) 100%	Sinema (D) (c) 75%

KEY (c) = Civil Rights Score

ARKANSAS



<i>Senate</i>	<i>House of Representatives</i>	
Boozman (R) (c) 0%	Cotton (R)..... (c) 5%	Griffin (R)..... (c) 0%
Pryor (D)..... (c) 85%	Crawford (R) (c) 5%	Womack (R) (c) 0%

CALIFORNIA



<i>Senate</i>		
Boxer (D)..... (c) 100%	Cook (R) (c) 15%	Lofgren (D)..... (c) 100%
Feinstein (D) (c) 100%	Costa (D)..... (c) 100%	Lowenthal (D) (c) 100%
	Davis (D) (c) 100%	Matsui (D)..... (c) 100%
	Denham (R)..... (c) 25%	McCarthy (R)..... (c) 0%
<i>House of Representatives</i>	Eshoo (D) (c) 100%	McClintock (R) (c) 5%
Bass (D) (c) 100%	Farr (D) (c) 100%	McKeon (R)..... (c) 5%
Becerra (D)..... (c) 100%	Garamendi (D)..... (c) 84%	McNerney (D) (c) 100%
Bera (D)..... (c) 85%	Hahn (D)..... (c) 100%	Miller, George (D) (c) 100%
Brownley (D)..... (c) 95%	Honda (D)..... (c) 100%	Miller, Gary (R) (c) 14%
Calvert (R) (c) 5%	Huffman (D) (c) 100%	Napolitano (D)..... (c) 100%
Campbell (R) (c) 0%	Hunter (R) (c) 0%	Negrete MecLeod (D) (c) 100%
Capps (D) (c) 100%	Issa (R) (c) 5%	Nunes (R)..... (c) 5%
Cárdenas (D) (c) 95%	LaMalfa (R) (c) 0%	Pelosi (D)..... (c) 100%
Chu (D)..... (c) 100%	Lee (D) (c) 100%	Peters (D)..... (c) 85%

KEY (c) = Civil Rights Score

CALIFORNIA, con't.



House of Representatives, con't.		
Rohrabacher (R) (c) 0%	Sanchez, Loretta (D)..... (c) 100%	Thompson (D) (c) 100%
Roybal-Allard (D) (c) 100%	Schiff (D) (c) 100%	Valadao (R) (c) 35%
Royce (R) (c) 0%	Sherman (D)..... (c) 100%	Vargas (D) (c) 100%
Ruiz (D) (c) 79%	Speier (D)..... (c) 100%	Waters (D) (c) 100%
Sánchez, Linda (D) (c) 100%	Swalwell (D)..... (c) 100%	Waxman (D)..... (c) 100%
	Takano (D)..... (c) 100%	

COLORADO



Senate	House of Representatives	
Bennet (D) (c) 100%	Lamborn (R) (c) 5%	Perlmutter (D) (c) 95%
Udall (D) (c) 100%	Coffman (R)..... (c) 20%	Polis (D)..... (c) 100%
	DeGette (D)..... (c) 100%	Tipton (R) (c) 5%
	Gardner (R) (c) 17%	

CONNECTICUT



Senate	House of Representatives	
Blumenthal (D)..... (c) 100%	Esty (D) (c) 100%	Himes (D)..... (c) 95%
Murphy (D)..... (c) 100%	Courtney (D) (c) 100%	Larson (D) (c) 100%
	DeLauro (D) (c) 100%	

KEY (c) = Civil Rights Score

DELAWARE



Senate

Carper (D)(c) 100%
Coons (D).....(c) 95%

House of Representatives

Carney (D).....(c) 100%

FLORIDA



Senate

Nelson (D).....(c) 100%	Deutch (D).....(c) 100%	Radel* (R)(c) 8%
Rubio (R)(c) 5%	Diaz-Balart (R)(c) 28%	Rooney (R)(c) 0%
	Frankel (D).....(c) 100%	Ros-Lehtinen (R)(c) 25%
	Garcia (D)(c) 95%	Ross (R)(c) 0%

House of Representatives

Bilirakis (R)(c) 5%	Grayson (D).....(c) 100%	Southerland (R).....(c) 0%
Brown (D)(c) 100%	Hastings (D)(c) 100%	Wasserman Schultz (D)(c) 100%
Buchanan (R).....(c) 0%	Jolly* (R)(c) 0%	Webster (R)(c) 0%
Castor (D).....(c) 100%	Mica (R)(c) 0%	Wilson (D).....(c) 100%
Clawson (R)(c) 0%	Miller (R)(c) 0%	Yoho (R)(c) 5%
Crenshaw (R)(c) 0%	Murphy (D).....(c) 95%	Young* (R)(c) 8%
DeSantis (R).....(c) 5%	Nugent (R)(c) 0%	
	Posey (R).....(c) 0%	

*Representative Bill Young, R. Fla., passed away in October 2013 and was replaced by Representative David Jolly, R. Fla., who won a special election for Young's seat in March 2014. Representative Trey Radel, R. Fla., resigned in January 2014 and was replaced by Representative Curt Clawson, R. Fla., who won a special election for Radel's seat in June 2014.

KEY (c) = Civil Rights Score

GEORGIA



Senate	Broun (R).....(c) 25%	Price (R)(c) 0%
Chambliss (R).....(c) 11%	Collins (R).....(c) 0%	Scott, A. (R).....(c) 0%
Isakson (R)(c) 10%	Gingrey (R)(c) 11%	Scott, D. (D)(c) 100%
	Graves (R)(c) 0%	Westmoreland (R).....(c) 0%
House of Representatives	Johnson (D)(c) 100%	Woodall (R)(c) 0%
Barrow (D).....(c) 45%	Kingston (R)(c) 0%	
Bishop (D)(c) 95%	Lewis (D)(c) 100%	

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) 5%	Labrador (R)(c) 0%
Risch (R).....(c) 0%	Simpson (R)(c) 5%

KEY (c) = Civil Rights Score

ILLINOIS



Senate		Duckworth (D)..... (c) 100%	Quigley (D)..... (c) 100%
Durbin (D) (c) 100%	Enyart (D) (c) 95%	Roskam (R) (c) 5%	
Kirk (R) (c) 22%	Foster (D) (c) 100%	Rush (D)..... (c) 100%	
	Gutierrez (D) (c) 100%	Schakowsky (D) (c) 100%	
House of Representatives		Hultgren (R) (c) 5%	Schneider (D) (c) 90%
Bustos (D)..... (c) 90%	Kelly* (D) (c) 100%	Schock (R)..... (c) 5%	
Davis, D. (D)..... (c) 100%	Kinzinger (R)..... (c) 10%	Shimkus (R) (c) 5%	
Davis, R. (R) (c) 16%	Lipinski (D) (c) 84%		

*Representative Robin Kelly, D. Ill., won a special election in April 2013.

INDIANA



Senate		House of Representatives		Rokita (R) (c) 0%
Coats (R) (c) 5%	Brooks (R) (c) 0%	Stutzman (R) (c) 0%		
Donnelly (D) (c) 90%	Bucshon (R) (c) 0%	Visclosky (D) (c) 100%		
	Carson (D)..... (c) 100%	Walorski (R) (c) 0%		
	Messer (R) (c) 0%	Young (R) (c) 0%		

KEY (c) = Civil Rights Score

IOWA



<i>Senate</i>	<i>House of Representatives</i>	
		Latham (R) (c) 5%
Grassley (R) (c) 0%	Braley (D) (c) 90%	Loeb sack (D) (c) 90%
Harkin (D) (c) 100%	King (R) (c) 5%	

KANSAS



<i>Senate</i>	<i>House of Representatives</i>	
Moran, Jerry (R) (c) 5%	Huelskamp (R) (c) 5%	Pompeo (R) (c) 6%
Roberts (R) (c) 0%	Jenkins (R) (c) 0%	Yoder (R) (c) 0%

KENTUCKY



<i>Senate</i>	<i>House of Representatives</i>	
		Rogers (R) (c) 0%
McConnell (R) (c) 0%	Barr (R) (c) 0%	Whitfield (R) (c) 0%
Paul (R) (c) 0%	Guthrie (R) (c) 5%	Yarmuth (D) (c) 100%
	Massie (R) (c) 25%	

KEY (c) = Civil Rights Score

LOUISIANA



<i>Senate</i>	<i>House of Representatives</i>	
Landrieu (D) (c) 100%	Alexander* (R) (c) 0%	Fleming (R) (c) 0%
Vitter (R) (c) 5%	Boustany (R) (c) 0%	McAllister* (R) (c) 0%
	Cassidy (R) (c) 0%	Richmond (D) (c) 100%
		Scalise (R) (c) 0%

*Representative Rodney Alexander, R. La., resigned in September 2013; Representative Vance McAllister, R. La., won a special election in November 2013.

MAINE



<i>Senate</i>	<i>House of Representatives</i>
Collins (R) (c) 43%	Michaud (D) (c) 90%
King (I) (c) 90%	Pingree (D) (c) 100%

MARYLAND



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

KEY (c) = Civil Rights Score

MASSACHUSETTS



<i>Senate</i>	<i>House of Representatives</i>	
Cowan* (D) (c) 100%	Capuano (D) (c) 100%	Lynch (D) (c) 100%
Kerry* (D) (c) 0%	Clark* (D) (c) 100%	McGovern (D) (c) 100%
Markey* (D) (c) 100%	Keating (D) (c) 100%	Neal (D) (c) 100%
Warren (D) (c) 100%	Kennedy (D) (c) 100%	Tierney (D) (c) 100%
		Tsongas (D) (c) 100%

*Senator John Kerry, D. Mass., resigned in January 2013 upon confirmation to be the U.S. Secretary of State and was replaced by Senator Mo Cowan, D. Mass., who was appointed in January 2013, but declined to run for the remainder of the 113th Congress. Senator Ed Markey, D. Mass., won a special election for that seat in July 2013, at which point he resigned his seat in the House. Representative Katherine Clark won a special election in December 2013 for Markey's House seat.

MICHIGAN



<i>Senate</i>		
Levin (D) (c) 100%	Bentivolio (R) (c) 0%	Miller, C. (R) (c) 5%
Stabenow (D) (c) 100%	Camp (R) (c) 5%	Peters (D) (c) 95%
	Conyers (D) (c) 100%	Rogers (R) (c) 0%
	Dingell (D) (c) 100%	Upton (R) (c) 11%
<i>House of Representatives</i>		
Amash (R) (c) 20%	Huizenga (R) (c) 0%	Walberg (R) (c) 0%
Benishek (R) (c) 0%	Kildee (D) (c) 100%	
	Levin (D) (c) 100%	

KEY (c) = Civil Rights Score

MINNESOTA



<i>Senate</i>	<i>House of Representatives</i>	
		Nolan (D)..... (c) 95%
Franken (D) (c) 100%	Bachmann (R) (c) 5%	Paulsen (R)..... (c) 0%
Klobuchar (D) (c) 100%	Ellison (D)..... (c) 100%	Peterson (D)..... (c) 80%
	Kline (R) (c) 0%	Walz (D) (c) 95%
	McCollum (D)..... (c) 100%	

MISSISSIPPI



<i>Senate</i>	<i>House of Representatives</i>	
Cochran (R) (c) 5%	Harper (R) (c) 0%	Palazzo (R)..... (c) 0%
Wicker (R) (c) 10%	Nunnelee (R)..... (c) 0%	Thompson (D) (c) 100%

MISSOURI



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

*Representative Jo Ann Emerson, R. Mo., resigned in January 2013; Representative Jason T. Smith, R. Mo., won a special election in June 2013.

KEY (c) = Civil Rights Score

MONTANA



<i>Senate</i>	<i>House of Representatives</i>
Baucus* (D) (c) 94%	Daines (R) (c) 5%
Tester (D) (c) 100%	
Walsh* (D) (c) 80%	

*Senator Max Baucus, D. Mont., resigned in February 2014 upon confirmation to be the U.S. Ambassador of China; Senator John Walsh, D. Mont., was appointed in February 2014.

NEBRASKA



<i>Senate</i>	<i>House of Representatives</i>
Fischer (R)..... (c) 5%	Fortenberry (R)..... (c) 5%
Johanns (R)..... (c) 0%	Smith (R)..... (c) 0%
	Terry (R) (c) 5%

NEVADA



<i>Senate</i>	<i>House of Representatives</i>	
		Horsford (D) (c) 95%
Heller (R)..... (c) 19%	Amodei (R)..... (c) 5%	Titus (D) (c) 95%
Reid* (D)..... (c) 86%	Heck (R) (c) 25%	

*Senator Reid, D. Nev., switched his vote to “no” for procedural reasons on a couple of votes that The Leadership Conference scored, but he agrees with The Leadership Conference’s position on those measures.

KEY (c) = Civil Rights Score

NEW HAMPSHIRE



<i>Senate</i>	<i>House of Representatives</i>
Ayotte (R) (c) 19%	Kuster (D)..... (c) 90%
Shaheen (D) (c) 100%	Shea-Porter (D) (c) 100%

NEW JERSEY



<i>Senate</i>	<i>House of Representatives</i>	
Booker* (D)..... (c) 100%	Andrews (D)..... (c) 100%	Pallone (D) (c) 100%
Chiesa* (R) (c) 20%	Frelinghuysen (R) (c) 5%	Pascrell (D)..... (c) 100%
Lautenberg* (D)..... (c) 100%	Garrett (R) (c) 5%	Payne (D) (c) 100%
Menendez (D)..... (c) 100%	Holt (D) (c) 100%	Runyan (R) (c) 37%
	Lance (R)..... (c) 10%	Sires (D) (c) 100%
	LoBiondo (R) (c) 35%	Smith (R)..... (c) 15%

* Senator Frank Lautenberg, D. N.J., passed away on June 2013 and was replaced by Senator Jeffrey Chiesa, R. N.J., who was appointed in June 2013, but declined to run for the remainder of the 113th Congress. Senator Cory Booker won a special election for Chiesa's seat in in October 2013. Representative Rob Andrews, D. N.J., resigned in February 2014 and his seat is currently vacant.

NEW MEXICO



<i>Senate</i>	<i>House of Representatives</i>	
Heinrich (D) (c) 100%	Luján, B. (D) (c) 100%	Lujan Grisham, M. (D) (c) 100%
Udall (D) (c) 100%		Pearce (R) (c) 5%

KEY (c) = Civil Rights Score

NEW YORK



Senate	Grimm (R) (c) 40%	Meeks (D) (c) 100%
Gillibrand (D) (c) 100%	Hanna (R) (c) 21%	Meng (D) (c) 100%
Schumer (D) (c) 100%	Higgins (D) (c) 100%	Nadler (D) (c) 100%
	Israel (D) (c) 100%	Owens (D) (c) 80%
House of Representatives	Jeffries (D) (c) 100%	Rangel (D) (c) 100%
Bishop (D) (c) 100%	King (R) (c) 25%	Reed (R) (c) 11%
Clarke (D) (c) 100%	Lowey (D) (c) 100%	Serrano (D) (c) 100%
Collins (R) (c) 0%	Maffei (D) (c) 80%	Slaughter (D) (c) 100%
Crowley (D) (c) 100%	Maloney, C. (D) (c) 100%	Tonko (D) (c) 100%
Engel (D) (c) 100%	Maloney, S. (D) (c) 80%	Velázquez (D) (c) 100%
Gibson (R) (c) 45%	McCarthy (D) (c) 100%	

NORTH CAROLINA



Senate	Coble (R) (c) 0%	McHenry (R) (c) 5%
Burr (R) (c) 10%	Ellmers (R) (c) 0%	McIntyre (D) (c) 55%
Hagan (D) (c) 95%	Foxx (R) (c) 0%	Meadows (R) (c) 5%
	Holding (R) (c) 0%	Pittenger (R) (c) 0%
House of Representatives	Hudson (R) (c) 0%	Price (D) (c) 100%
Butterfield (D) (c) 100%	Jones (R) (c) 30%	Watt* (D) (c) 100%

*Representative Mel Watt, D. N.C., resigned in December 2013 upon confirmation to be the director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency and his seat is currently vacant.

KEY (c) = Civil Rights Score

NORTH DAKOTA



Senate

Heitkamp (D)..... (c) 95%
Hoeven (R)..... (c) 10%

House of Representatives

Cramer (R) (c) 0%

OHIO



Senate

Brown (D) (c) 100%
Portman (R)..... (c) 24%

Chabot (R)..... (c) 0%
Fudge (D) (c) 100%
Gibbs (R)..... (c) 0%
Johnson (R)..... (c) 0%

Latta (R) (c) 0%
Renacci (R)..... (c) 0%
Ryan (D) (c) 100%
Stivers (R) (c) 5%

House of Representatives

Beatty (D)..... (c) 100%
Boehner (R)..... (c) 0%

Jordan (R) (c) 0%
Joyce (R)..... (c) 21%
Kaptur (D)..... (c) 100%

Tiberi (R) (c) 5%
Turner (R) (c) 10%
Wenstrup (R)..... (c) 0%

OKLAHOMA



Senate

Coburn (R)..... (c) 6%
Inhofe (R) (c) 0%

House of Representatives

Bridenstine (R) (c) 10%
Cole (R) (c) 5%
Lankford (R) (c) 0%

Lucas (R)..... (c) 0%
Mullin (R) (c) 5%

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) 90%
Wyden (D)..... (c) 100%	Bonamici (D) (c) 100%	Walden (R) (c) 5%
	DeFazio (D) (c) 95%	

PENNSYLVANIA



<i>Senate</i>	<i>House of Representatives</i>	
Dent (R) (c) 10%	Murphy (R)..... (c) 5 %	
Casey (D) (c) 95%	Doyle (D)..... (c) 100%	Perry (R) (c) 0%
Toomey (R)..... (c) 10%	Fattah (D) (c) 100%	Pitts (R) (c) 0%
	Fitzpatrick (R) (c) 25%	Rothfus (R)..... (c) 0%
<i>House of Representatives</i>	Gerlach (R) (c) 10%	Schwartz (D) (c) 100%
Barletta (R) (c) 5%	Kelly (R)..... (c) 0%	Shuster (R)..... (c) 6%
Brady (D)..... (c) 100%	Marino (R) (c) 5%	Thompson (R) (c) 5%
Cartwright (D) (c) 100%	Meehan (R) (c) 25%	

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) 100%

KEY (c) = Civil Rights Score

SOUTH CAROLINA



<i>Senate</i>	<i>House of Representatives</i>	
Graham (R)..... (c) 10%	Clyburn (D)..... (c) 100%	Mulvaney (R)..... (c) 0%
Scott (R)..... (c) 0%	Duncan (R)..... (c) 5%	Rice (R)..... (c) 0%
	Gowdy (R)..... (c) 0%	Sanford* (R)..... (c) 7%
		Wilson (R)..... (c) 0%

*Representative Mark Sanford, R. S.C., won a special election in May 2013 to replace Representative Tim Scott, R. S.C.

SOUTH DAKOTA



<i>Senate</i>	<i>House of Representatives</i>
Johnson (D)..... (c) 100%	Noem (R)..... (c) 5%
Thune (R)..... (c) 0%	

TENNESSEE



<i>Senate</i>	<i>House of Representatives</i>	
Alexander (R)..... (c) 10%	Black (R)..... (c) 0%	DesJarlais (R)..... (c) 0%
Corker (R)..... (c) 19%	Blackburn (R)..... (c) 0%	Duncan (R)..... (c) 10%
	Cohen (D)..... (c) 100%	Fincher (R)..... (c) 5%
	Cooper (D)..... (c) 100%	Fleischmann (R)..... (c) 0%
		Roe (R)..... (c) 0%

KEY (c) = Civil Rights Score



TEXAS

Senate	Farenthold (R) (c) 5%	McCaul (R) (c) 0%
Cornyn (R) (c) 0%	Flores (R) (c) 0%	Neugebauer (R) (c) 0%
Cruz (R) (c) 0%	Gallego (D) (c) 85%	O'Rourke (D) (c) 100%
	Gohmert (R) (c) 15%	Olson (R) (c) 5%
House of Representatives	Granger (R) (c) 6%	Poe (R) (c) 10%
Barton (R) (c) 11%	Green, A. (D) (c) 100%	Sessions (R) (c) 0%
Brady (R) (c) 0%	Green, G. (D) (c) 100%	Smith (R) (c) 0%
Burgess (R) (c) 0%	Hall (R) (c) 0%	Stockman (R) (c) 5%
Carter (R) (c) 0%	Hensarling (R) (c) 0%	Thornberry (R) (c) 0%
Castro (D) (c) 100%	Hinojosa (D) (c) 100%	Veasey (D) (c) 100%
Conaway (R) (c) 0%	Jackson Lee (D) (c) 100%	Vela (D) (c) 100%
Cuellar (D) (c) 75%	Johnson, S. (R) (c) 0%	Weber (R) (c) 0%
Culberson (R) (c) 10%	Johnson, E. (D) (c) 100%	Williams (R) (c) 0%
Doggett (D) (c) 100%	Marchant (R) (c) 0%	

UTAH



Senate	House of Representatives	Matheson (D) (c) 55%
Hatch (R) (c) 16%	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) 100%	Cantor (R)..... (c) 0%	Hurt (R) (c) 0%
Warner (D) (c) 100%	Connolly (D) (c) 95%	Moran (D)..... (c) 100%
	Forbes (R) (c) 5%	Rigell (R) (c) 0%
	Goodlatte (R)..... (c) 0%	Scott (D)..... (c) 100%
	Griffith (R) (c) 0%	Wittman (R) (c) 0%
		Wolf (R)..... (c) 5%

WASHINGTON



<i>Senate</i>	<i>House of Representatives</i>	
Cantwell (D) (c) 100%	DelBene (D) (c) 100%	Larsen, R. (D) (c) 100%
Murray (D)..... (c) 100%	Hastings, D. (R)..... (c) 5%	McDermott (D)..... (c) 100%
	Heck (D) (c) 100%	McMorris Rodgers (R) (c) 0%
	Herarra Beutler (R)..... (c) 6%	Reichert (R) (c) 20%
	Kilmer (D)..... (c) 100%	Smith (D)..... (c) 100%

KEY (c) = Civil Rights Score

WEST VIRGINIA



<i>Senate</i>	<i>House of Representatives</i>
Manchin (D) (c) 81%	Capito (R) (c) 18%
Rockefeller (D) (c) 100%	McKinley (R) (c) 30%
	Rahall (D) (c) 70%

WISCONSIN



<i>Senate</i>	<i>House of Representatives</i>	
		Pocan (D) (c) 100%
Baldwin (D) (c) 100%	Duffy (R) (c) 5%	Ribble (R) (c) 0%
Johnson (R) (c) 0%	Kind (D) (c) 100%	Ryan (R) (c) 5%
	Moore (D) (c) 100%	Sensenbrenner (R) (c) 5%
	Petri (R) (c) 10%	

WYOMING



<i>Senate</i>	<i>House of Representatives</i>
Barrasso (R) (c) 0%	Lummis (R) (c) 5%
Enzi (R) (c) 0%	



The Leadership Conference on
Civil and Human Rights

1629 K Street, NW
10th Floor
Washington, DC
20006

202.466.3311 voice
202.466.3435 fax
www.civilrights.org

Copyright © 2014 by
The Leadership Conference.
All Rights Reserved.