

The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights Voting Record

114th Congress
October 2016



Table of Contents

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

Introduction

Hampered by partisan bickering, and with a highly charged presidential election looming around the corner, the 114th Congress (2015-2016) was highly disappointing for those seeking to advance civil and human rights. The 2014 elections had resulted in the Republicans taking control of the Senate and expanding their majority in the House, heightening the divide with President Obama on a broad range of important policy issues and making it even more difficult than the previous several years to get much accomplished. To further complicate matters, ideological divisions within the Republican majority continued to grow, culminating in the resignation of a frustrated House Speaker John Boehner, R. Ohio, in late 2015. As in previous years, basic government functions such as funding federal agencies and confirming judicial nominees—or resolving complicated federal policy issues—remained ensnared in political posturing, brinkmanship, and partisan obstruction. In order to merely avert federal government shutdowns due to lack of funding, Republican leadership became dependent on compromise with the Democratic minority. Yet on issues like jobs, immigration, and voting rights, the divisions remained too significant for Congress to accomplish anything. As a result, the 114th Congress accomplished little to satisfy anyone, and Congress' approval rating remained extremely low, reaching no higher than 18 percent over the two years of the session.

The 114th Congress began with unfinished business from the previous session. Opposition to Obama's announcement in November 2014 that he would spare millions of undocumented immigrants from deportation led to a delay in passing year-long appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security. Congress deferred consideration of the issue until February 2015,

when opponents felt they would have a better chance to override Obama's policy. While Congress ultimately passed a "clean" appropriations bill that did not overturn Obama's policy, it became clear that the prospects for bipartisanship on immigration reform or other key issues were dim at best. On other longstanding issues, such as tax reform or the issue of what to do with the mortgage giants Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, Congress did not even try to take up legislation—exacerbating economic inequalities and throwing the recovery of the national housing market into question.

Signs of cooperation were evident in a few areas. The Republican leadership made it clear that it was not willing to be held responsible for a default on the federal debt or for allowing the shutdown of the federal government. In some instances, the leadership was forced to rely on Democratic support on these issues, which required them to compromise by avoiding the inclusion of highly controversial legislation. In addition, bipartisan cooperation on education and transportation resulted in bills being passed. The Leadership Conference worked closely with Sens. Lamar Alexander, R. Tenn., and Patty Murray, D. Wash., and Reps. John Kline, R. Minn., and Bobby Scott, D. Va., to hammer out a compromise on the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. In addition, we worked with Republicans and Democrats on reauthorization of the surface transportation bill. The Leadership Conference advocated for and got higher funding levels for public transit. Ultimately, President Obama signed the five-year, \$305 billion Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act (FAST Act) into law with bipartisan support.

But on other issues, little had changed. Congress still held numerous votes on legislation to roll back ma-

for priorities of the Obama administration, including the Affordable Care Act, the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (even after one of the nation's largest banks, Wells Fargo, was revealed to have engaged in widespread consumer fraud), labor and environmental regulations, LGBT protections, and many others. It also became ensnared in a debate over funding for Planned Parenthood. Immigrants were also targeted by legislative efforts, having been scapegoated first by a senseless murder of an American in San Francisco by an undocumented immigrant, and then by the terrorist attacks in France and San Bernardino, Calif.

The partisanship reached a new zenith shortly after the death of Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia in February 2016, when Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell, R. Ky., announced that he would not schedule a vote on any nominee to replace him until after the presidential election. Even though President Obama nominated Merrick Garland, one of the most highly respected appellate judges in the country and one who had been praised by many Republicans, McConnell stuck to his vow, spreading partisanship to the third branch of government.

Meanwhile, despite considerable bipartisan support, Congress failed to move on legislation to reform the criminal justice system or to restore key provisions of the Voting Rights Act. And despite numerous mass shootings throughout the country, Congress still refused to budge on any legislation to address firearm safety—culminating this summer in House Democrats staging a sit-in on the House floor.

As the 114th Congress breaks for its pre-election recess, The Leadership Conference will continue pressing it to take up bipartisan criminal justice reform and other priorities when it returns in November for a “lame duck” session. Yet it is unclear whether the election will settle much, and we could easily see more of the same gridlock and partisanship that we saw throughout the past two years. The House and Senate leadership will remain vulnerable to intraparty revolt if they try to compromise on substantive legislation, and they continue to have little appetite to do anything that could be seen as a “victory” for Obama as he prepares to leave office. Legislative progress on most of the issues of importance to The Leadership Conference, and the communities it represents, is likely to have to wait until a new Congress can hopefully hit the “reset” button next year.

About The Leadership Conference

The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights is a coalition charged by its diverse membership of more

than 210 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 114th 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 114th Congress through September 2016.

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 yeay or nay vote was not cast. An “i” indicates the member of Congress did not take a vote because he/she was not in office for the full term. The “Voting Record” reflects only roll call votes that were officially recorded on the floor of the U.S. Senate and U.S. House of Representatives.

In the House during the 114th Congress:

- Speaker of the House John Boehner, R. Ohio, resigned in October 2015 and his seat has been vacant since. Rep. Paul Ryan, R. Wis., was elected Speaker of the House on October 29, 2015.
- Rep. Chaka Fattah, D. Pa., resigned in June 2016 and his seat is currently vacant.
- Rep. Michael Grimm, R. N.Y., resigned in January 2015 and was replaced by Rep. Daniel Donovan, Jr., R. N.Y., who won a special election for the seat in May 2015.
- Rep. Aaron Schock, R. Ill., resigned in March 2015

and was replaced by Rep. Darin LaHood, R. Ill., who won a special election for the seat in September 2015.

- Rep. Mark Takai, D. Hawaii, passed away in July 2016 and his seat is currently vacant.
- Rep. Alan Nunnelee, R. Miss., passed away in February 2015 and was replaced by Rep. Trent Kelly, R. Miss., who won a special election for the seat in June 2015.
- Rep. Edward Whitfield, R. Ky., resigned in September 2016 and his seat is currently vacant.

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

The Leadership Conference can count on 177 House members and 41 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 Policy Department at 202.466.3311.

House Vote Summaries

BUDGET AND APPROPRIATIONS

FY 2016 Budget Resolution—Conference Report

The fiscal year 2016 budget resolution (known as a “conference report”) would have reduced spending for Medicare, Medicaid, and other mandatory programs, maintained sequester caps for non-defense discretionary spending but increased funding for defense discretionary funding through the Overseas Contingency Operations fund (OCO), and included reconciliation instructions to House and Senate committees to repeal the Affordable Care Act (ACA).

The Leadership Conference opposed adoption of the FY 2016 Budget Resolution—Conference Report. The budget resolution was nothing less than “Robin Hood in reverse,” with the majority of budget cuts coming from programs for low- and middle-income Americans, balancing the budget on the backs of the most vulnerable Americans and hiding the true costs of proposed cuts. The budget proposal would have more than doubled sequestration cuts to non-defense discretionary programs over the next 10 years, slashing or eliminating services that are critical to vulnerable groups such as young children, seniors, low-income families, individuals with disabilities, students, the unemployed, and the uninsured. It proposed \$5 trillion in cuts to Medicaid, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, child care, Head Start, transportation infrastructure spending, housing, and other programs that help the most vulnerable Americans, while continuing or even increasing tax cuts for corporations and repealing the estate tax, which benefits only the wealthiest Americans.

The House approved the FY 2016 Budget Resolution—Conference Report (226-197). A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 183 (4/30/2015).

CIVIL PROCEDURE AND REGULATIONS

The “Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny” Act (H.R. 427)

The “Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny” (REINS) Act, introduced by Rep. Todd Young, R. Ind., would require both houses of Congress to approve all major rules—any regulation with an annual economic impact greater than \$100 million—within 70 days with no alterations. If both chambers were unable to approve a major rule, it would not take effect and would be tabled until the next congressional session.

The Leadership Conference opposed the REINS Act. The bill creates additional procedural steps and adds additional costs to an already extensive process governed by statutory and constitutional requirements, including the Congressional Review Act, which gives Congress the authority to review and nullify a rule. The REINS Act would impose uncertainty in the regulatory process, and would result in the delay or shut down of the implementation of critical public health and safety safeguards, financial reforms, and worker protections.

The House passed H.R. 427 (243-165). A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 482 (7/28/2015).

The “Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act” (H.R. 758)

H.R. 758, the “Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act” (LARA), introduced by Rep. Lamar Smith, R. Texas, would change the current standard under Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure from allowing judges discretion regarding when to impose sanctions for frivolous claims to forcing judges to impose sanctions in all cases in which a claim appears to lack evidentiary support or involves novel legal theories, regardless of the underly-

ing facts. From 1983 to 1993, Rule 11 sanctions were mandatory and courts saw an explosion of satellite litigation causing delays and wasted judicial resources.

The Leadership Conference opposed the bill because the rule change would negatively impact cases where the bulk of the evidence rests with one party, disproportionately affecting civil rights cases. LARA would deter meritorious cases by imposing a one-size-fits-all mandate for federal judges. Mandatory sanctions inevitably chill meritorious claims particularly in cases of first impression or involving new legal theories, including cases to protect civil rights, the right to privacy, the environment, collective bargaining and the First Amendment.

The House passed H.R. 758 (241-185). A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 501 (9/17/2015).

Class-Action Lawsuit Restrictions (H.R. 1927)

Rep. Bob Goodlatte, R. Va., introduced H.R. 1927, the Fairness in Class Action Litigation and Furthering Asbestos Claim Transparency Act of 2016. The bill restricts the ability of federal courts to certify proposed classes for class action lawsuits unless each member of the class suffered the same type and degree of injury.

The Leadership Conference opposed the bill because Section 2 of this bill would effectively eviscerate consumer, antitrust, employment, and civil rights class actions. Class action lawsuits are among the most important tools to enable individuals and small businesses to hold large corporations and institutions accountable and deter future misconduct. Under H.R. 1927, federal courts would be forced to deny class certification to important, worthy classes of aggrieved consumers, employees, and small businesses.

Class members must already meet common requirements spelled out in the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 23, which requires that the class as a whole have the same type of injury stemming from the same unlawful conduct. In addition, with this legislation, Congress circumvented the process that Congress itself established for promulgation of federal court rules under the Rules Enabling Act, bypassing both the Judicial Conference of the United States and the U.S. Supreme Court. Interference with the proper federal court rules process is reckless and irresponsible, particularly when this proposal is so damaging to victims.

The House passed the bill (211-188). A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 33 (1/8/2016).

EDUCATION

Amendment to Change ESEA Participation Rate Requirement

During consideration of H.R.5, the Student Success Act, on the House floor, Rep. Matt Salmon, R. Ariz., offered an amendment that would have excluded students who were “opted out” from the Elementary and Secondary Education Act’s requirement that 95 percent of students be assessed. That change would have created the opportunity to routinely exclude students from the assessment without consequence or even transparency.

The Leadership Conference opposed the Salmon amendment because the integrity of the 95 percent requirement, a previous victory of earlier civil rights advocacy efforts, is critically important to ensuring that the performance of all students is known and taken into consideration in decisionmaking. Without the requirement that all students, and all groups of students, be included in the assessment, we expected that the performance of underserved students (including students with disabilities, English learners, low-income students, and students of color) would be swept under the rug.

The House approved the Salmon amendment (251-178). A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 420 (7/8/2015).

Passage of the Student Success Act (H.R.5)

H.R. 5, the “Student Success Act,” was a partisan reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 sponsored by Rep. John Kline, R. Minn.

The Leadership Conference opposed the Student Success Act because it was inconsistent with the longstanding intent of ESEA to raise achievement for disadvantaged children. The bill would have changed the existing targeting of Title I funds, excessively restricted the secretary’s ability to implement and enforce the law, and eliminated accountability for student performance, while also failing to make progress on resource equity, data disaggregation, and other critical civil rights priorities.

The House passed H.R. 5 (218-213). A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 423 (7/8/2015).

EMPLOYMENT

Resolution of Disapproval of the National Labor Relations Board’s New Election Rules

On December 15, 2014, the National Labor Relations Board published election rules, following a comprehensive and lengthy review and public comment process. After the Senate adopted a joint resolution (S.J. Res. 8)

to disapprove and nullify the rules, the House of Representatives followed suit.

The Leadership Conference opposed the resolution because the NLRB rules are a fair, reasonable and appropriate approach to modernizing the board's election procedures. The rules would reduce unnecessary litigation and delay that were prevalent in the existing NLRB election process, as well as add efficiency and effectiveness to the NLRB election process that would benefit workers, employers, and unions.

The House approved the resolution (232-186). A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 128 (3/19/2015). President Obama vetoed the resolution on March 31, 2015.

Amendment to Bar Funds to Enforce Davis-Bacon Act's Prevailing Wage Requirements

During consideration of the Surface Transportation Reauthorization and Reform Act of 2015 (STRR Act, H.R. 3763), Rep. Steve King, R. Iowa, offered an amendment that would bar funds made available by the transportation bill from being used in the implementation, administration, or enforcement of the Davis-Bacon Act's prevailing wage requirements. The Davis-Bacon Act requires the payment of no less than local prevailing wage rates (as determined by the Department of Labor) to contractors and subcontractors performing on federally funded or assisted contracts in excess of \$2,000 for the construction, alteration, or repair (including painting and decorating) of public buildings or public works.

The Leadership Conference opposed the King amendment. The Davis-Bacon prevailing wage requirements have long ensured that individuals working on federally funded construction projects are paid fairly. Repeal of the Davis-Bacon prevailing wage requirements would erode labor standards within the transportation sector and could serve as troubling precedent for other construction areas.

The House rejected the King amendment (188-238). A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 602 (11/24/2015).

FAIR HOUSING

Amendment to Block "Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing" Rule

During consideration of the fiscal year 2016 Transportation-HUD appropriations bill, Rep. 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 "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 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 in housing for all. The proposed AFFH regulation, which was finalized in July, 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—which also translate into better schools, transportation, and the other resources people need to thrive.

The House approved the Gosar amendment (229-193). A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 311 (6/9/2015).

Amendment to Block "Disparate Impact" Rule

During consideration of the fiscal year 2016 Transportation-HUD appropriations bill, Rep. Scott Garrett, R. N.J., offered an amendment to block the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) from using any funds to finalize or implement its "Implementation of the Fair Housing Act's Discriminatory Effects Standard." Under the Fair Housing Act, it is illegal to refuse to rent, sell, or otherwise make unavailable a property to anyone because of race, religion, national origin, gender, or disability status. HUD's rule affirms that discriminatory housing policies and practices that harm minorities are illegal, regardless of whether or not the policy has a discriminatory intent, as long as they have a "disparate impact."

The Leadership Conference opposed the Garrett amendment. The Fair Housing Act is one of the nation's bedrock civil rights laws, and any rollback to its protections would be disastrous for communities of color. With residential segregation on the rise, a strong Fair Housing Act is as important now as it has been in the past, and disparate impact enforcement is a vital tool for ensuring equal opportunity. Only several weeks after the vote on the Garrett amendment, the Supreme Court upheld, in the case of *Texas Dept. of Housing and Community Affairs v. Inclusive Communities Project, Inc.*, the use of

disparate impact enforcement and agreed that Congress had intended to allow it in passing the Fair Housing Act.

The House approved the Garrett amendment (231-195). A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 323 (6/9/2015).

FINANCIAL REFORM

Disapproval of Department of Labor's "Fiduciary Duty" Rule for Retirement Savings Advisers (H.J.Res.88)

The Congressional Review Act of 1996 allows Congress to overrule new federal regulations. In April, the House invoked this law and voted on a "resolution of disapproval" to nullify a regulation by the Department of Labor (DOL) governing retirement savings advisers. Specifically, the DOL rule requires all retirement plan advisers to provide advice in their clients' best interest. Under a loophole in the previous regulations, banks, brokers, mutual funds, and insurance agents were allowed to provide investment advice that puts their own interests ahead of their clients, and to sell savings products to unsuspecting customers that include higher fees, riskier features, and lower returns, which ultimately reduced potential retirement savings.

The Leadership Conference opposed H.J.Res.88. For most people, retirement savings are a lifeline—and for this reason, Congress set a high standard for protecting retirement assets when it enacted the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (ERISA). The regulations under ERISA did not provide adequate protection, however, leaving savers exposed to recommendations from conflicted advisers who were free to recommend products that maximized fees rather than maximized returns for their customers. By imposing a "fiduciary duty" on advisers, the DOL rule provides badly needed protections for retirement savers, ones that are especially important to low-income savers who can least afford excessive fees. H.J.Res.88 would have voided this rule, protecting unscrupulous financial professionals who take advantage of loopholes in the law to profit at the expense of their clients.

The House approved the resolution (234-188), which was ultimately vetoed by President Obama. A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 176 (4/28/2016).

Discriminatory "Markups" in Auto Loans

During consideration of the fiscal year 2017 Financial Services Appropriations, Rep. Frank Guinta, R. N.H., offered an amendment to prohibit the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB) from implementing a

guidance that protects automobile buyers from discriminatory lending practices that occur in many dealerships. Currently, when a buyer obtains a loan through a dealership, the dealer is able to charge an extra percentage or two, called a "markup," on top of the interest rate the bank would charge on the basis of the borrower's credit. Extensive research has shown that borrowers of color are charged a higher markup, a problem that the CFPB guidance aims to resolve by clarifying that these markups are subject to federal civil rights laws.

The Leadership Conference opposed the Guinta amendment. It would effectively nullify the policy, despite the fact that discrimination in the auto finance marketplace has been well-documented for decades and despite the fact that discrimination has no place in our lending markets. Beyond the problems with its merits, the Guinta amendment also represents the latest in a long series of efforts in Congress to undermine the CFPB itself. The CFPB was established to allow the details of consumer protection and civil rights laws to be worked out in a process that is less vulnerable to the political manipulation and inaction that we witnessed in the years before the 2008 financial crisis, and to give consumers a stronger voice than they have in Congress or other financial regulatory agencies. Micromanaging complicated policy details, as the Guinta amendment does, only serves to undermine the very core of the consumer reforms enacted in 2010, and strengthens the hand of those who opposed the creation of the CFPB all along.

The House approved the Guinta amendment (260-162). A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 383 (7/7/2016).

Independence of Consumer Financial Protection Bureau

During consideration of the Fiscal Year 2017 Financial Services Appropriations, Rep. Gwen Moore, D. Wisc., offered an amendment to delete language in the bill that would, among other things, eliminate the independent funding for the CFPB and change its leadership structure from a single director to a commission. The provisions she sought to remove would subvert the intent of the 2010 Dodd-Frank Act to create a more independent consumer watchdog.

The Leadership Conference supported the Moore amendment. The underlying bill, by changing the CFPB's funding structure, would leave the agency at the mercy of an annual appropriations process in which the deck is inherently stacked against consumers. Moreover, the language in the bill to have the CFPB led by a commission instead of a single director was fully considered

and ultimately rejected during the passage of the Dodd-Frank Act, because it would slow down the ability of the Bureau to enforce vital consumer protection laws. These changes would bog down the leadership of the CFPB with additional and unnecessary bureaucracy, increase the politicization of its decision-making process, reduce rather than enhance its accountability, and make it more difficult for the CFPB to respond and adapt to rapid changes in the financial services industry that have a drastic effect on the financial health of consumers. These proposed changes would put consumers back toward a regulatory system that failed miserably in the years leading up to our nation's mortgage crisis. The Moore amendment, on the other hand, would preserve the wise decisions made by Congress when the lessons of the financial crisis were still fresh.

The House rejected the Moore amendment (183-238). A vote for it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 361 (7/6/2016).

Regulation of Payday Lending

During consideration of the fiscal year 2017 Financial Services Appropriations, Rep. Terri Sewell, D. Ala., offered an amendment to delete language in the bill that would prevent the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB) from implementing its upcoming rules on payday loans, auto title loans, and other forms of small-dollar credit.

The Leadership Conference supported the Sewell amendment. Payday and auto title loans are sold as a quick, easy fix for people who have fallen behind on their bills or have emergency repairs, and are aggressively marketed in communities of color still reeling from the financial crisis and years of low wages and underemployment, but they rarely work as advertised. Through fees that quickly snowball out of control, and underwriting practices that ignore whether borrowers can actually retire their loans, payday loans leave many consumers in a much deeper financial hole than when they started. The CFPB found that nearly half of all payday loan customers take out 10 or more loans every year. Its pending rule would require payday lenders to do what every lender should do as a matter of common sense: make sure that borrowers can repay their loans, on time, without getting in over their heads and trapped in an endless cycle of debt. The Sewell amendment would help ensure that this rule can be finalized and enforced.

The House rejected the Sewell amendment (182-240). A vote for it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 369 (7/6/2016).

HEALTH CARE

Federal Funding for Planned Parenthood (H.R. 3762)

Representative Tom Price, R. Ga., made a motion to concur in the Senate amendment to the bill that would prohibit federal funding for Planned Parenthood Federation of America (PPFA) or any of the organization's affiliates, subsidiaries, successors, or clinics. The bill claims that it will not reduce overall federal funding for women's health because funds would be allocated to other federally funded providers.

The Leadership Conference opposed the bill, which was based on a distorted and fraudulent campaign against PPFA, a critical provider of vital health services, including routine examinations, cancer screening, contraceptive services, and HIV testing to millions of women, men and young people across the country.

Approximately one in five women in America will rely on PPFA for health care in her lifetime. Defunding PPFA would block access to basic health services, particularly for low-income women, women of color, women with disabilities, and young women.

The House approved the motion 240-181, which was ultimately vetoed by President Obama. A vote against it was considered as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 6 (1/6/2016). The House failed to override the veto on 2/12/2016.

Planned Parenthood Funding Moratorium (H.R. 3134)

After false claims were made based on selectively edited videos by the so-called "Center for Medical Progress" infiltration of PPFA, the House passed legislation that would bar, for one year, federal funding for PPFA. As amended, the bill would effectively redirect funds from PPFA to the community health center program; specifically, it would appropriate \$235 million for community health centers, in addition to any other funds available to the program.

The Leadership Conference opposed the bill, which was based on a distorted and fraudulent campaign against PPFA. Defunding PPFA would block access to vital health services, including routine examinations, cancer screenings, contraceptive services and HIV testing, for low-income women, women of color, women with disabilities, and young women. It would cut off access to basic health services for the two million women, men, and young people PPFA serves annually. Approximately one in five women in America will rely on PPFA for health care in her lifetime.

The House passed H.R. 3134 (241-187). A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 505 (9/18/2015).

D.C. Reproductive Health Law (H.R. 5485)

In 2014, the District of Columbia government enacted The Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act, which prohibits employers from discriminating based on an individual's reproductive health decisions. Rep. Gary Palmer, R. Ala., offered an amendment to the 2017 Fiscal Financial Services Appropriations bill that would prohibit funds from being used to implement this law.

The Leadership Conference opposed the amendment, as it was an infringement on home rule of the District of Columbia. It would also have the effect of limiting women's access to health services in the District of Columbia, particularly for low-income women and women of color.

The House approved the amendment in the Committee of the Whole (223-192). A vote against it was considered a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 390 (7/7/2016).

IMMIGRATION

The "Enforce the Law for Sanctuary Cities Act" (H.R. 3009)

H.R. 3009, the "Enforce the Law for Sanctuary Cities Act," would withhold certain federal law enforcement grants from state and local governments that place any limits on the ability of officials to inquire into the immigration status of community members. Many governments impose such policies, not because they condone unauthorized immigration, but because they have concluded it is more important to encourage all residents to participate in community policing, public health, and other efforts aimed at the greater good.

The Leadership Conference opposed H.R. 3009. While the bill was greatly motivated by the senseless murder of Kathryn Steinle by an undocumented immigrant earlier that month in San Francisco, H.R. 3009 would not have prevented her tragic death. Instead, it would simply punish San Francisco and other cities that prioritize public safety and community trust over cooperation with federal immigration officials. Among other things, these state and local policies encourage victims and witnesses of crime to come forward to assist local law enforcement, without fear of being questioned about their immigration status. Ultimately, H.R. 3009 was a misguided, kneejerk reaction that aimed to scapegoat immigrants based on the actions of a horrible but isolated incident.

The House passed H.R. 3009 (241-179). A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 466 (7/23/2015).

Restrictions on Refugee Admissions (H.R. 4038)

H.R. 4038, the "American Security Against Foreign Enemies Act of 2015" was brought to the House floor less than a week after the November 13 terrorist attacks in Paris. H.R. 4038 would prohibit the admission of any refugee from Iraq or Syria to the United States unless the secretary of Homeland Security, with the unanimous concurrence of the director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the director of National Intelligence, conducted a thorough background check on any refugee from Iraq or Syria and certified that they were not a security threat to the United States.

The Leadership Conference opposed H.R. 4038. The poorly considered and inhumane bill would effectively end the admission of refugees from Syria and Iraq for the foreseeable future. Doing so is simply unnecessary. Refugees resettled in the United States undergo more security vetting than immigrants or visitors who come here through any other channel, and more screening than refugees who are resettled in any other country—and the nation has admitted three million refugees from around the world since 1975, including 100,000 from Iraq. Doing so would also cause us to lose our decades-long moral high ground in protecting refugees who are fleeing for their lives, and would do little if anything to make America safer from those who are determined to harm us. It is worth noting that possibly none of the terrorists involved in the attacks in Paris, and none involved in any attacks here including those on September 11, 2001, would have been prevented from entering the U.S. under H.R. 4038. It is also worth noting that only five days after the attacks in Paris, French President Francois Hollande reaffirmed that France would honor its commitment to admit 30,000 Syrian refugees—three times more than President Obama had proposed to admit. In short, H.R. 4038 was a kneejerk reaction at its very worst.

The House passed H.R. 4038 (289-137). A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 643 (11/19/2015).

House Amicus Curiae brief in United States v. Texas (H.Res.639)

Following President Obama's November 2014 expansion of "deferred action" programs to spare many long-time undocumented immigrants from the threat of deportation and give them work permits, Texas and 25 other states filed suit in an effort to block the policies. A trial court ordered the program to be put on hold while the case was proceeding, and the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit later agreed. When the Obama administration appealed the injunction to the Supreme

Court, the House of Representatives voted on a resolution allowing the speaker to file an *amicus curiae* brief opposing the administration's position and supporting the state plaintiffs.

The Leadership Conference opposed the resolution. It has long been beyond dispute that the president has the authority to exercise common-sense "prosecutorial discretion" in criminal and immigration cases, and spare deserving individuals from the threat of future legal proceedings so that limited resources may be directed towards the pursuit of more serious offenders. We believe this authority extends to groups of people as well, such as parents of U.S. citizens who lack visas but are otherwise law-abiding (one of the groups covered by Obama's policies). While prosecutorial discretion is hardly a solution to the longstanding 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 comprehensive legislation on the underlying issues. With its position in this lawsuit, the House's position amounted to "until we act, no one else can—and we're not going to act." Ultimately, the Supreme Court narrowly sided with the states and the House, blocking implementation of the 2014 deferred action policy until the case is eventually resolved on the merits.

The House approved the resolution (234-186). A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 129 (3/17/2016).

JOBS AND POVERTY

Cellphone Service Subsidies (H.R. 5525)

H.R. 5525, sponsored by Rep. Austin Scott, R. Ga., would have prohibited commercial mobile services or commercial mobile data services from receiving Lifeline support. Since 1985, the Lifeline program has provided a discount on phone service for qualifying low-income consumers. In 2016, Lifeline was modernized to include broadband service.

The Leadership Conference opposed H.R. 5525. Prohibiting the use of mobile devices in Lifeline would be a counter-productive measure that would reduce the likelihood that low-income people could reestablish financial stability. The Leadership Conference believes that it is essential to ensure that people of color, low-income people, and other vulnerable populations have access to broadband. Accordingly, we were a strong supporter of the Federal Communications Commission's proposed modernization of the Lifeline program to include broadband, to address the persistent digital divide

between those who have a broadband Internet connection and those who do not. H.R. 5525 would undercut both the goals of the Lifeline program and the principles for Lifeline modernization supported by our members and a wide range of other consumer and public interest organizations.

The House rejected the motion to suspend the rules (207-143). A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 334 (6/21/16).

LGBT

Amendment to Prohibit the Use of Funds in Contravention of Executive Orders Regarding Antidiscrimination

Rep. Sean Maloney, D. N.Y., introduced Amendment 1079 to H.R. 4974, the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2017, to enforce an executive order President Obama issued in 2014 to prohibit federal contractors from discriminating on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity.

The Leadership Conference supported this amendment because it would ensure fair treatment for LGBT federal contractor employees. This is particularly important because there are currently no federal anti-discrimination laws to protect LGBT employees.

The House rejected the amendment (212-213). A vote in favor of it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 226 (5/19/2016).

Senate Vote Summaries

BUDGET AND APPROPRIATIONS

FY 2016 Budget Resolution—Equal Pay (S. Con. Res. 11)

During consideration of the FY 2016 Budget Resolution, Sen. Barbara Mikulski, D. Md., introduced an amendment that would create a deficit-neutral reserve fund to allow for legislation related to equal pay policies, including allowing for punitive damages, limiting the exception for unequal pay, and preventing retaliation against employees who share salary information.

The Leadership Conference supported the Mikulski amendment, which was based on the Paycheck Fairness Act, because it would help narrow the wage gap between men and women in the workforce. Women who work full-time still earn, on average, only 80 cents for every dollar men earn. African-American women and Latinas are paid even less, earning only 63 cents and 54 cents respectively, for every dollar paid to White, non-Hispanic men.

The Senate rejected the Mikulski amendment (45-54). A vote for it was counted as a + vote.

Roll Call Vote No. 82 (3/24/2015).

FY 2016 Budget Resolution—Revision to Sequester Caps (S. Con. Res. 11)

During consideration of the FY 2016 Budget Resolution, Sen. Patty Murray, D. Wash., offered an amendment that would adjust the proposed budget resolution offered by Senate Republicans, which would have maintained devastating federal spending cuts (the “sequester”) for the coming year. The Murray amendment would have reversed the draconian sequester cuts and instead increased funding above sequester levels by \$148 billion in fiscal years 2016 and 2017. It also would have

established a deficit-neutral reserve fund to allow for legislation that would revise or repeal sequestration.

The Leadership Conference supported the Murray amendment. Raising the sequester caps for non-defense discretionary spending, including programs like Head Start, Pell grants, the Children’s Health Insurance Program, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, and workforce training programs, would stimulate economic growth for all Americans and help vulnerable communities that have been greatly harmed by the effects of sequestration.

The Senate rejected the Murray amendment (46-53). A vote for it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 91 (3/25/2015).

National Defense Authorization (S. 2943)

During consideration of the National Defense Authorization bill, Sen. Jack Reed, D. R.I., offered an amendment that would have authorized an increase of \$18 billion in Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) funding for nondefense discretionary spending.

The Leadership Conference supported a vote for cloture on the Reed amendment. The amendment was a response to a previous amendment offered by Sen. John McCain, R. Ariz., which would have increased defense spending by \$18 billion through OCO, with no accompanying increase for non-defense spending. This would have violated both the spending caps set out in the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015 (BBA) and the principle of parity that any increase in defense spending must be made in tandem with an equal increase in non-defense discretionary spending.

The Senate voted to reject the motion to invoke cloture (43-55). A vote in favor of it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 95 (6/9/2016).

EDUCATION

Amendment to Improve Disaggregation of Asian American Pacific Islander Student Data

During consideration of S.1177, the Every Student Achieves Act, Sen. Mazie Hirono, D. Hawaii, offered an amendment to improve the disaggregation of Asian American Pacific Islander data by requiring the inclusion of national origin categories by the same race response categories as the decennial census of the population. The provision would be limited to school districts with at least 1,000 Asian American and Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander students.

The Leadership Conference supported the Hirono amendment because the existing aggregate category of Asian American students obscures significant and important differences among students of different national origin categories.

The Senate rejected the Hirono amendment (47-50). A vote for it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 223 (7/8/2015).

Amendment to Prohibit Discrimination against LGBT Students

During consideration of S.1177, the Every Student Achieves Act, Sen. Al Franken, D. Minn., offered an amendment to prohibit discrimination in schools based on a student's actual or perceived gender identity or sexual orientation. The amendment provided for enforcement, including denial of funding by federal programs, a private right of action for individuals who faced discrimination, and authority for the attorney general to bring civil actions for violations.

The Leadership Conference supported the Franken amendment because all students deserve to be safe and free from discrimination in schools. These antidiscrimination protections are critical to ensuring that all students have a fair and equal education.

The Senate rejected the Franken amendment (52-45). A vote for it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 236 (7/14/2015). Note: a 60 vote threshold was required for adoption of the amendment, pursuant to a unanimous consent agreement.

Amendment to Require Accountability for Student Performance

During consideration of S.1177, the Every Student Achieves Act, Sen. Chris Murphy, D. Conn., offered an amendment to require states to identify and intervene in the lowest-performing 5 percent of schools, high schools where fewer than two-thirds of students graduate, and any school that misses performance goals for any group

of students for two years in a row. Once identified, school districts would need to develop and implement intervention and support strategies. If interventions failed to raise student achievement after three years, the state would be required to intervene.

The Leadership Conference supported the Murphy amendment because without accountability for student performance, federal funds are unlikely to drive the types of interventions that will support increased achievement for all students and all groups of students.

The Senate rejected the Murphy amendment (43-54). A vote for it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 241 (7/15/2015). Note: a 60 vote threshold was required for adoption of the amendment, pursuant to a unanimous consent agreement.

EMPLOYMENT

Resolution of Disapproval of the National Labor Relations Board's New Election Rules (S.J. Res. 8)

On December 15, 2014, the National Labor Relations Board published election rules, following a comprehensive and lengthy review and public comment process. On February 9, 2015, Sen. Lamar Alexander, R. Tenn., introduced Senate Joint Resolution (S.J. Res.) 8 to disapprove and nullify the rules.

The Leadership Conference opposed the resolution because the NLRB rules are a fair, reasonable, and appropriate approach to modernize the Board's election procedures. The rules would reduce unnecessary litigation and delay that were prevalent in the existing NLRB election process, as well as add efficiency and effectiveness to the NLRB election process that would benefit workers, employers, and unions.

The Senate approved the resolution (53-46). A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 67 (3/4/15). President Obama vetoed the resolution on March 31, 2015.

FAIR HOUSING

"Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing" Rule (H.R. 2577)

During the fiscal year 2017 appropriations process, Sen. Mike Lee, R. Utah, offered an amendment to block the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) from using any funds to finalize or implement its "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 rule would make vital improvements in how the AFFH requirements are implemented. Sen. Susan Collins, R. Maine, who was concerned about the drastic nature of the Lee amendment and had been working on a compromise, moved to table (defeat) the Lee amendment so she could offer hers.

The Leadership Conference supported this motion. The Lee amendment flew in the face of our nation's efforts to expand opportunity and fairness in housing for all. The new AFFH regulation, which was finalized in July 2015, 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—which also translate into better schools, transportation, and other resources people need to thrive. The Collins compromise amendment, which ultimately passed in place of Lee's proposal, gave local governments more control over the AFFH process—which also raises concerns, but which at least would preserve much of the AFFH rule going forward.

The Senate approved the motion to table the Lee amendment (60-37). A vote for it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 81 (5/19/2016).

FINANCIAL REFORM

Disapproval of Department of Labor's "Fiduciary Duty" Rule for Retirement Savings Advisers (H.J.Res.88)

The Congressional Review Act of 1996 allows Congress to overrule new federal regulations. In May, the Senate invoked this law and voted on a "resolution of disapproval," previously passed by the House, to nullify a regulation by the Department of Labor (DOL) governing retirement savings advisers. Specifically, the DOL rule requires all retirement plan advisers to provide advice in their clients' best interest. Under a loophole in the previous regulations, banks, brokers, mutual funds, and insurance agents were allowed to provide investment advice that puts their own interests ahead of their clients, and to sell savings products to unsuspecting customers that include higher fees, riskier features, and lower returns, which ultimately reduced potential retirement savings.

The Leadership Conference opposed H.J.Res.88. For most people, retirement savings are a lifeline—and for

this reason, Congress set a high standard for protecting retirement assets when it enacted the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (ERISA). The regulations under ERISA did not provide adequate protection, however, leaving savers exposed to recommendations from conflicted advisers who were free to recommend products that maximized fees rather than maximized returns for their customers. By imposing a "fiduciary duty" on advisers, the DOL rule provides badly needed protections for retirement savers, ones that are especially important to low-income savers who can least afford excessive fees. H.J.Res.88 would have voided this rule, protecting unscrupulous financial professionals who take advantage of loopholes in the law to profit at the expense of their clients.

The Senate approved H.J.Res.88 (56-41), which was ultimately vetoed by President Obama. A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 84 (5/24/2016).

HEALTH CARE

Federal Funding for Planned Parenthood (S. 1881)

Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell, R. Ky., moved to invoke cloture to proceed to the consideration of a bill that would prohibit federal funding for the Planned Parenthood Federation of America (PPFA) or any of the organization's affiliates, subsidiaries, successors, or clinics. The bill claimed that it would not reduce overall federal funding available for women's health because funds would be allocated to other federally funded health services.

The Leadership Conference opposed the bill, which was based on a distorted and fraudulent campaign against PPFA. Defunding PPFA would block access to vital health services, including routine examinations, cancer screenings, contraceptive services, and HIV testing, for low-income women, women of color, women with disabilities, and young women. It would cut off access to basic health services for the two million women, men, and young people PPFA serves annually. Approximately one in five women in America will rely on PPFA for health care in her lifetime. Further, contrary to claims by McConnell and others, if PPFA is defunded, community health centers will not be able to accommodate the millions of women served by Planned Parenthood.

A 60-vote threshold is required to invoke cloture. Subsequently, McConnell offered a motion to reconsider the vote.

The motion to invoke cloture failed (53-46). A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 262 (8/3/2015).

Blocking Federal Funding for Planned Parenthood (H.R. 2577)

During consideration of Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2017 (H.R. 2577), a provision was added to provide funds to combat the Zika virus, which also prohibited funding for Planned Parenthood Federation of America (PPFA). Majority Leader Mitch McConnell offered a motion to invoke cloture, which requires 60 votes to succeed, instead of a simple majority vote.

The Leadership Conference opposed linking Zika funding with blocking funding to PPFA, which would largely deprive women, particularly low-income women and women in Puerto Rico, Florida, and elsewhere, from accessing reproductive health care, even if their area were affected by the Zika virus. This was the case despite the fact that Zika is a sexually transmitted disease that can cause potentially serious birth defects for infected pregnant women.

The Senate voted to reject the motion to invoke cloture (52-48). A vote against it was considered a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 112 (6/28/2016).

HUMAN RIGHTS**FY 2016 Defense Authorization—Sexual Assault (H.R. 1735)**

During consideration of the fiscal year 2016 National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA), Sen. Kirsten Gillibrand, D. N.Y., introduced an amendment to the McCain substitute amendment, which would incorporate provisions of the Military Justice Improvement Act (MJIA). The MJIA would remove the military chain of command from decisions to prosecute major crimes, except offenses unique to the military. The Gillibrand amendment would give the authority to convene courts martial for major crimes, including sexual assault, to military prosecutors with the rank of colonel or higher.

The Leadership Conference supported the Gillibrand amendment to shift decision-making authority away from commanders to professional military justice prosecutors to ensure that appropriate legal action is taken to prosecute and prevent future incidences of sexual assault. Despite repeated promises from the Department of Defense and modest reforms made in the 2014 NDAA, a recent Rand Corporation study found that the sexual assault rate in the military remains the same as in 2010. Moreover, one in seven victims were assaulted by someone in their chain of command. The survey also found that in 2014, 86 percent of victims did not report the crime. The nation's military service members risk their lives for the country and should not have to fear

coming forward to report unwanted sexual contact. The Gillibrand amendment would make meaningful structural changes in the military justice system to ensure their safety.

The Senate rejected the Gillibrand amendment (50-49). A vote for it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 211 (6/16/2015). Note: a 60 vote threshold was required for adoption of the amendment, pursuant to a unanimous consent agreement.

Background Checks for Gun Purchases (H.R. 2578)

In the wake of the horrific June 12 mass shooting at Pulse, a gay nightclub in Orlando, Fla., Sen. Chris Murphy, D. Conn., and some of his colleagues launched a filibuster of Senate business, demanding up-or-down votes on gun control legislation. Responding to the clamor, Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell, R. Ky., offered a procedural vote on an amendment by Murphy to a pending appropriations bill. His amendment would require a background check for virtually every firearm sale, not just those at gun dealerships. This vote was on a motion to invoke cloture (i.e. limiting debate), which was the first of several hurdles the amendment would have to clear, and one that would require 60 votes.

The Leadership Conference supported this motion, and urged the Senate to adopt the Murphy amendment. Expanding and strengthening the background check system, as his amendment would do, is the most effective way to keep guns out of the hands of those who commit crimes. Since its inception, the National Background Check System has blocked more than 2.6 million gun purchasers by prohibited buyers. In states that require background checks for private gun sales, there is ample evidence that fewer women are shot to death by their intimate partners, there are fewer firearm-related suicides, and there are fewer cases of gun trafficking.

The Senate voted to reject the motion to invoke cloture (44-56). A vote for it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 104 (6/20/2016).

IMMIGRATION**Immigration Riders in DHS Appropriations**

In late 2014, Congress took up an omnibus appropriations bill to fund most government operations in Fiscal Year 2015. Because of the controversy over President Obama's "deferred action" policies to spare many unauthorized immigrants from the threat of deportation, however, many in Congress refused to support a complete appropriations package unless it also blocked the deferred action initiatives. Congress ultimately punted

on appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security until early the following year, believing that the incoming Congress would be more likely to attach such measures. The House did just that in early 2015. But when it became clear that the standoff would not be resolved, the Senate leadership relented and offered an amendment, sponsored by Sen. Thad Cochran, R. Miss., to strip the immigration provisions from the House-passed bill while it was pending in the Senate.

The Leadership Conference supported the Cochran amendment, which resulted in a “clean” appropriations bill. The House-passed bill would have drastically limited the president’s authority to exercise common-sense prosecutorial discretion, a well-accepted aspect of law enforcement, to spare classes of deserving immigrants from the threat of deportation and to direct limited resources toward 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 comprehensive legislation on the underlying issues. With its version of the bill, the House had effectively said “until we act, no one else can act—and we’re not going to act.” The Cochran amendment represented a far more responsible approach.

The Senate approved the Cochran amendment (66-33). A vote for it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 61 (2/27/2015).

Restrictions on Refugee Admissions (H.R. 4038)

H.R. 4038, the “American Security Against Foreign Enemies Act of 2015” was passed by the House less than a week after the November 13, 2015 terrorist attacks in Paris. H.R. 4038 would prohibit the admission of any refugee from Iraq or Syria to the United States unless the secretary of Homeland Security, with the unanimous concurrence of the director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the director of National Intelligence, conducted a thorough background check on any refugee from Iraq or Syria and certified that they were not a security threat to the United States. In January of this year, Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell, R. Ky., filed a cloture motion to proceed to Senate consideration of the bill, a motion that would require 60 votes to succeed.

The Leadership Conference opposed H.R. 4038. The poorly considered and inhumane bill would effectively end the admission of refugees from Syria and Iraq for the foreseeable future. Doing so is simply unnecessary. Refugees resettled in the United States undergo more security vetting than immigrants or visitors who come

here through any other channel, and more screening than refugees who are resettled in any other country—and we have admitted 3 million refugees from around the world since 1975, including 100,000 from Iraq. Doing so would also cause the U.S. to lose our decades-long moral high ground in protecting refugees who are fleeing for their lives, and would do little if anything to make America safer from those who are determined to harm us. It is worth noting that possibly none of the terrorists involved in the attacks in Paris, and none involved in any attacks here including those on September 11, 2001, would have been prevented from entering the U.S. under H.R. 4038. It is also worth noting that only five days after the attacks in Paris, French President Francois Hollande reaffirmed that France would honor its commitment to admit 30,000 Syrian refugees—three times more than President Obama had proposed to admit. In short, H.R. 4038 was a kneejerk reaction to the Paris events.

The Senate voted to reject the motion to invoke cloture (55-43). A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 4 (1/20/2016).

Cutting off Funds for “Sanctuary Cities” (S. 3100)

S.3100, the “Stop Dangerous Sanctuary Cities Act,” would withhold certain federal economic development grants from state and local governments that do not comply with “detainer” requests issued by the Department of Homeland Security to maintain custody of deportable immigrants who have been involved in criminal proceedings. Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell, R. Ky., filed a cloture motion to proceed to Senate consideration of the bill, a motion that would require 60 votes to succeed.

The Leadership Conference opposed S. 3100. It would penalize jurisdictions for attempting to strike the delicate balance between cooperating with federal immigration authorities, on one hand, and respecting the constraints imposed on them by the U.S. Constitution, on the other—a conflict that the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) itself has recognized and has been working to resolve. While the senseless and tragic murder of Kathryn Steinle in San Francisco renewed the debate over so-called “sanctuary cities,” the truth is that state and local law enforcement agencies (“LEAs”) throughout the country already aid in the identification of individuals who are subject to immigration enforcement action through the sharing of fingerprints of those who are taken into custody. LEAs with limited detainer policies have determined, however, that they cannot continue to detain individuals for immigration enforcement purposes, under the Fourth Amendment and pursuant to numerous court rulings, unless DHS obtains a judicial

warrant, as all other law enforcement agencies are required to do. S. 3100 arbitrarily adds to the dilemma faced by these LEAs while ultimately failing to solve the underlying constitutional issues.

The Senate voted to reject the motion to invoke cloture (53-44). A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 119 (7/6/2016).

JOBS AND POVERTY

FY 2016 Budget Resolution—Minimum Wage (S. Con. Res. 11)

During consideration of the Fiscal Year 2016 Budget Resolution, Sen. Bernie Sanders, I. Vt., offered an amendment that would have created a deficit-neutral reserve fund to allow for legislation that would increase the federal minimum wage.

The Leadership Conference supported the Sanders amendment. The federal minimum wage has been frozen at \$7.25 since 2009, harming millions of people in low-wage jobs and failing to pay working people sufficiently for the work they do. Raising it would boost wages for a substantial share of working people and have a disproportionate impact on women and people of color.

The Senate rejected the Sanders amendment (48-52). A vote for it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 93 (3/26/2015).

FY 2016 Budget Resolution—Paid Sick Leave (S. Con. Res. 11)

During consideration of the Fiscal Year 2016 Budget Resolution, Sen. Patty Murray, D. Wash., introduced an amendment that would create a deficit-neutral reserve fund to allow for legislation that would allow workers to earn paid sick leave.

The Leadership Conference supported the Murray amendment, which is based on the Healthy Families Act. It would require employers to allow workers to earn a minimum of 5 paid sick days a year. Too many women, particularly women of color, working in low-wage jobs have no paid sick days and therefore have to choose between staying home with a sick child or losing a day of pay needed to support basic needs of her family.

The Senate adopted the Murray amendment (61-39). A vote for it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 98 (3/26/2015).

NOMINATIONS

Nomination of Loretta Lynch as Attorney General

On November 8, 2014, President Obama nominated former U.S. Attorney Loretta E. Lynch to serve as U.S. Attorney General.

The Leadership Conference supported the confirmation of Lynch because she is a strong, independent prosecutor, who twice headed one of the most important U.S. attorney offices in the country, and who has decades of experience as a lawyer and leader. This belief was shared broadly and widely; many members of the committee, as well as all of those who testified, expressed unyielding support for Lynch's nomination. In addition, the Senate Judiciary Committee received numerous letters of support for Lynch's nomination from a wide range of supporters. Further, Lynch's nomination was historic, as she would be the first African-American woman to serve as U.S. Attorney General. Despite Lynch's stellar resume and reputation, several members of the Senate Judiciary Committee stated that they would oppose Lynch's nomination as a way to protest the president's executive actions on immigration.

The Senate confirmed Lynch (56-43). A vote for her confirmation was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 165 (4/23/15).

Xinis Nomination—Confirmation

On March 26, 2015, President Obama nominated Paula Xinis to the U.S. District Court for the District of Maryland. The Senate Judiciary Committee voted Xinis' nomination out of the committee by voice vote on September 17, 2015. However, Xinis waited until May 16, 2016 to be confirmed by the full Senate by a 53-24 vote.

The Leadership Conference supported the confirmation of Xinis because she was well-qualified to be a federal district court judge. Xinis' background includes practicing civil and criminal litigation at the law firm of Murphy, Falcon & Murphy from 2011 until her confirmation. She previously served as the director of training for the Federal Public Defender's office in Maryland from 2006 to 2011, and as an assistant federal public defender from 1998 to 2011. Xinis' experience representing defendants who cannot afford counsel brings much needed professional diversity to the federal court system.

The delay of Xinis' confirmation was emblematic of the unprecedented obstruction of judicial nominees in the 114th Congress, and the lack of broad support in the final floor vote also represents opposition to professional diversity of experience on the federal bench. Public defenders, civil rights attorneys, professors, and other public interest lawyers are vastly underrepresented on the federal bench.

The Senate confirmed Xinis to the district court (53-34). A vote in favor was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 72 (5/16/2016).

VOTING RIGHTS

FY 2016 Budget Resolution—Voter Rights (S. Con. Res. 11)

During the consideration of the FY 2016 Budget Resolution, Sen. Ben Cardin, D. Md., offered an amendment to provide a funding stream for a voter re-enfranchisement initiative, which would include Bureau of Prisons notifications to released inmates of voting rights, notifications by U.S. attorneys of voting rights restrictions during plea agreements, and a Justice Department report on the disproportionate impact of criminal disenfranchisement laws on minority populations.

The Leadership Conference supported the Cardin amendment. The widespread disenfranchisement of formerly incarcerated persons is contrary to the nation's democratic principles, disproportionately impacts communities of color, and is a barrier to a person's successful reintegration back into society. Research has shown that formerly incarcerated individuals who vote are less likely to be rearrested. Given the patchwork of state voting laws on re-enfranchisement, it is important for the federal government to provide individuals with notice of their rights and broadly study the impact that disenfranchisement has on communities of color.

The Senate rejected the Cardin amendment (47-51). A vote for it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call No. 133 (3/27/15).

KEY (c) = Civil Rights Score

ALABAMA



<i>Senate</i>	<i>House of Representatives</i>	
Palmer (R) (c) 0%		
Sessions (R) (c) 0%	Aderholt (R) (c) 0%	Roby (R) (c) 0%
Shelby (R) (c) 0%	Brooks (R) (c) 5%	Rogers (R) (c) 5%
	Byrne (R) (c) 0%	Sewell (D) (c) 95%

ALASKA



<i>Senate</i>	<i>House of Representatives</i>
Murkowski (R) (c) 33%	Young (R) (c) 10%
Sullivan (R) (c) 0%	

ARIZONA



<i>Senate</i>	<i>House of Representatives</i>	
Kirkpatrick (D) (c) 95%		
Flake (R) (c) 10%	Franks (R) (c) 0%	McSally (R) (c) 18%
McCain (R) (c) 14%	Gallego (D) (c) 100%	Salmon (R) (c) 0%
	Gosar (R) (c) 0%	Schweikert (R) (c) 5%
	Grijalva (D) (c) 100%	Sinema (D) (c) 86%

KEY (c) = Civil Rights Score

ARKANSAS



<i>Senate</i>	<i>House of Representatives</i>	
Boozman (R) (c) 0%	Crawford (R) (c) 5%	Westerman (R) (c) 0%
Cotton (R)..... (c) 0%	Hill (R) (c) 0%	Womack (R) (c) 0%

CALIFORNIA



<i>Senate</i>		
Boxer (D)..... (c) 100%	Cook (R) (c) 5%	LaMalfa (R) (c) 0%
Feinstein (D) (c) 100%	Costa (D)..... (c) 77%	Lee (D) (c) 100%
	Davis (D) (c) 100%	Lieu (D) (c) 100%
	Denham (R)..... (c) 5%	Lofgren (D)..... (c) 100%
<i>House of Representatives</i>	DeSaulnier (D)..... (c) 100%	Lowenthal (D) (c) 100%
Aguilar (D) (c) 91%	Eshoo (D) (c) 100%	Matsui (D) (c) 100%
Bass (D) (c) 100%	Farr (D) (c) 100%	McCarthy (R)..... (c) 0%
Becerra (D)..... (c) 100%	Garamendi (D)..... (c) 95%	McClintock (R) (c) 0%
Bera (D)..... (c) 86%	Hahn (D)..... (c) 95%	McNerney (D) (c) 100%
Brownley (D) (c) 95%	Honda (D)..... (c) 100%	Napolitano (D) (c) 100%
Calvert (R) (c) 0%	Huffman (D) (c) 100%	Nunes (R) (c) 0%
Capps (D) (c) 100%	Hunter (R) (c) 0%	Pelosi (D)..... (c) 100%
Cárdenas (D) (c) 100%	Issa (R)..... (c) 0%	Peters (D)..... (c) 95%
Chu (D)..... (c) 100%	Knight (R) (c) 0%	Rohrabacher (R) (c) 5%

KEY (c) = Civil Rights Score

CALIFORNIA, con't.



<i>House of Representatives, con't.</i>		
Schiff (D)	(c) 100%	Torres (D) (c) 100%
Roybal-Allard (D)	(c) 100%	Sherman (D)..... (c) 100%
Royce (R)	(c) 0%	Speier (D)..... (c) 100%
Ruiz (D)	(c) 95%	Swalwell (D)..... (c) 100%
Sánchez, Linda (D)	(c) 100%	Takano (D)..... (c) 100%
Sanchez, Loretta (D).....	(c) 100%	Thompson (D)..... (c) 100%
		Valadao (R) (c) 5%
		Vargas (D) (c) 100%
		Walters (R) (c) 0%
		Waters (D) (c) 95%

COLORADO



<i>Senate</i>	<i>House of Representatives</i>	
Bennet (D)	(c) 100%	Buck (R) (c) 5%
Gardner (R)	(c) 14%	Coffman (R)..... (c) 9%
		DeGette (D)..... (c) 100%
		Lamborn (R) (c) 0%
		Perlmutter (D) (c) 100%
		Polis (D)..... (c) 95%
		Tipton (R) (c) 0%

CONNECTICUT



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

KEY (c) = Civil Rights Score

DELAWARE



Senate

Carper (D) (c) 90%
Coons (D) (c) 100%

House of Representatives

Carney (D) (c) 95%

FLORIDA



Senate

Nelson (D) (c) 95%
Rubio (R) (c) 6%

Curbelo (R) (c) 43%
DeSantis (R) (c) 5%
Deutch (D) (c) 100%
Diaz-Balart (R) (c) 25%

Murphy (D) (c) 90%
Nugent (R) (c) 6%
Posey (R) (c) 0%
Rooney (R) (c) 0%

House of Representatives

Bilirakis (R) (c) 0%
Brown (D) (c) 95%
Buchanan (R) (c) 0%
Castor (D) (c) 100%
Clawson (R) (c) 5%
Crenshaw (R) (c) 0%

Frankel (D) (c) 100%
Graham (D) (c) 91%
Grayson (D) (c) 95%
Hastings (D) (c) 100%
Jolly (R) (c) 23%
Mica (R) (c) 0%
Miller (R) (c) 5%

Ros-Lehtinen (R) (c) 29%
Ross (R) (c) 0%
Wasserman Schultz (D) (c) 100%
Webster (R) (c) 0%
Wilson (D) (c) 100%
Yoho (R) (c) 5%

KEY (c) = Civil Rights Score

GEORGIA



Senate		
Carter (R)	(c) 0%	Price (R) (c) 0%
Isakson (R)	(c) 10%	Collins (R)..... (c) 0%
Perdue (R)	(c) 0%	Scott, A. (R)..... (c) 0%
		Scott, D. (D) (c) 91%
		Westmoreland (R)..... (c) 0%
House of Representatives		
Johnson (D)	(c) 100%	Woodall (R) (c) 0%
Allen (R)	(c) 0%	Lewis (D) (c) 100%
Bishop (D)	(c) 86%	Loudermilk (R) (c) 0%

HAWAII



Senate	House of Representatives
Hirono (D) (c) 100%	Gabbard (D)..... (c) 95%
Schatz (D)..... (c) 100%	Takai* (D) (c) 100%

*Rep. Mark Takai, D. Hawaii, passed away in July 2016 and his seat is currently vacant.

IDAHO



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

KEY (c) = Civil Rights Score

ILLINOIS



Senate		
Durbin (D) (c) 100%	Davis, R. (R) (c) 9%	LaHood (R) (c) 7%
Kirk (R) (c) 52%	Dold (R) (c) 45%	Lipinski (D) (c) 81%
	Duckworth (D) (c) 100%	Quigley (D) (c) 100%
	Foster (D) (c) 100%	Roskam (R) (c) 5%
House of Representatives		
Bost (R) (c) 5%	Gutierrez (D) (c) 100%	Rush (D) (c) 100%
Bustos (D) (c) 95%	Hultgren (R) (c) 5%	Schakowsky (D) (c) 100%
Davis, D. (D) (c) 100%	Kelly (D) (c) 100%	Schock* (R) (c) 0%
	Kinzinger (R) (c) 5%	Shimkus (R) (c) 5%

*Representative Aaron Schock, R. Ill., resigned in March 2015 and was replaced by Representative Darin LaHood, R. Ill., who won a special election for the seat in September 2015.

INDIANA



Senate		House of Representatives
Coats (R) (c) 14%	Brooks (R) (c) 0%	Rokita (R) (c) 0%
Donnelly (D) (c) 80%	Bucshon (R) (c) 5%	Stutzman (R) (c) 5%
	Carson (D) (c) 100%	Visclosky (D) (c) 100%
	Messer (R) (c) 0%	Walorski (R) (c) 0%
		Young (R) (c) 0%

KEY (c) = Civil Rights Score

IOWA



<i>Senate</i>	<i>House of Representatives</i>	
Ernst (R) (c) 0%	Blum (R) (c) 0%	Loeb sack (D) (c) 95%
Grassley (R) (c) 10%	King (R) (c) 5%	Young (R) (c) 0%

KANSAS



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

KENTUCKY



<i>Senate</i>	<i>House of Representatives</i>	
McConnell* (R) (c) 29%	Barr (R) (c) 0%	Rogers (R) (c) 0%
Paul (R) (c) 10%	Guthrie (R) (c) 0%	Whitfield* (R) (c) 5%
	Massie (R) (c) 14%	Yarmuth (D) (c) 100%

*For procedural reasons, the Senate Majority Leader often opts to switch his vote, which reserves his right to bring up the issue again. Senator McConnell did so on Votes 165, 262, and 112. Thus, McConnell's score in support of The Leadership Conference's issues is 14 percent, not 29 percent.

* Rep. Edward Whitfield, R. Ky., resigned in September 2016 and his seat is currently vacant.

KEY (c) = Civil Rights Score

LOUISIANA



<i>Senate</i>	<i>House of Representatives</i>	
Cassidy (R) (c) 5%	Abraham (R) (c) 0%	Graves (R) (c) 5%
Vitter (R) (c) 5%	Boustany (R) (c) 5%	Richmond (D) (c) 100%
	Fleming (R) (c) 5%	Scalise (R) (c) 0%

MAINE



<i>Senate</i>	<i>House of Representatives</i>	
Collins (R) (c) 38%	Pingree (D) (c) 100%	
King (I) (c) 84%	Poliquin (R) (c) 9%	

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) 94%	Ruppersberger (D) (c) 95%
	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>	
		Lynch (D)..... (c) 95%
Markey (D) (c) 100%	Capuano (D) (c) 95%	McGovern (D) (c) 100%
Warren (D) (c) 100%	Clark (D) (c) 100%	Moulton (D)..... (c) 100%
	Keating (D) (c) 86%	Neal (D)..... (c) 100%
	Kennedy (D) (c) 100%	Tsongas (D)..... (c) 100%

MICHIGAN



<i>Senate</i>		
	Bishop (R) (c) 0%	Miller (R) (c) 0%
Peters (D) (c) 100%	Conyers (D) (c) 100%	Moolenaar (R) (c) 0%
Stabenow (D) (c) 100%	Dingell (D) (c) 100%	Trott (R) (c) 0%
	Huizenga (R) (c) 0%	Upton (R) (c) 23%
<i>House of Representatives</i>	Kildee (D) (c) 100%	Walberg (R) (c) 0%
Amash (R) (c) 18%	Lawrence (D) (c) 100%	
Benishek (R) (c) 0%	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%	Ellison (D)..... (c) 95%	Paulsen (R)..... (c) 5%
Klobuchar (D) (c) 100%	Emmer (R) (c) 9%	Peterson (D)..... (c) 45%
	Kline (R) (c) 0%	Walz (D) (c) 95%
	McCollum (D)..... (c) 95%	

MISSISSIPPI



<i>Senate</i>	<i>House of Representatives</i>	
Cochran (R) (c) 14%	Harper (R) (c) 0%	Palazzo (R)..... (c) 0%
Wicker (R) (c) 0%	Kelly* (R)..... (c) 0%	Thompson (D) (c) 100%
	Nunnelee* (R)..... (c) 0%	

*Representative Alan Nunnelee, R. Miss., passed away in February 2015 and was replaced by Representative Trent Kelly, R. Miss., who won a special election for the seat in June 2015.

MISSOURI



<i>Senate</i>	<i>House of Representatives</i>	
		Long (R) (c) 0%
Blunt (R)..... (c) 5%	Clay (D) (c) 100%	Luetkemeyer (R) (c) 0%
McCaskill (D)..... (c) 95%	Cleaver (D) (c) 100%	Smith (R)..... (c) 0%
	Graves (R) (c) 14%	Wagner (R)..... (c) 0%
	Hartzler (R)..... (c) 0%	

KEY (c) = Civil Rights Score

MONTANA



Senate

Daines (R) (c) 5%
 Tester (D) (c) 76%

House of Representatives

Zinke (R) (c) 14%

NEBRASKA



Senate

Fischer (R) (c) 0%
 Sasse (R) (c) 0%

House of Representatives

Ashford (D) (c) 82%
 Fortenberry (R) (c) 0%
 Smith (R) (c) 0%

NEVADA



Senate

Heller (R) (c) 19%
 Reid (D) (c) 100%

House of Representatives

Amodei (R) (c) 5%
 Hardy (R) (c) 5%

Heck (R) (c) 9%
 Titus (D) (c) 100%

KEY (c) = Civil Rights Score

NEW HAMPSHIRE



<i>Senate</i>	<i>House of Representatives</i>
Ayotte (R) (c) 29%	Guinta (R) (c) 0%
Shaheen (D) (c) 95%	Kuster (D) (c) 95%

NEW JERSEY



<i>Senate</i>		
Booker (D) (c) 100%	Lance (R) (c) 9%	Sires (D) (c) 90%
Menendez (D) (c) 100%	LoBiondo (R) (c) 36%	Smith (R) (c) 9%
	MacArthur (R) (c) 19%	Watson Coleman (D) (c) 100%
	Norcross (D) (c) 95%	
<i>House of Representatives</i>	Pallone (D) (c) 100%	
Frelinghuysen (R) (c) 9%	Pascrell (D) (c) 95%	
Garrett (R) (c) 0%	Payne (D) (c) 100%	

NEW MEXICO



<i>Senate</i>	<i>House of Representatives</i>
Heinrich (D) (c) 100%	Luján (D) (c) 95%
Udall (D) (c) 100%	Lujan Grisham (D) (c) 95%
	Pearce (R) (c) 0%

KEY (c) = Civil Rights Score

NEW YORK



Senate	Grimm* (R) (c) 0%	Meng (D)..... (c) 100%
Gillibrand (D) (c) 100%	Hanna (R) (c) 32%	Nadler (D)..... (c) 100%
Schumer (D) (c) 100%	Higgins (D) (c) 100%	Rangel (D) (c) 100%
	Israel (D) (c) 95%	Reed (R) (c) 14%
House of Representatives	Jeffries (D) (c) 100%	Rice (D) (c) 91%
Clarke (D) (c) 100%	Katko (R) (c) 27%	Serrano (D)..... (c) 100%
Collins (R)..... (c) 0%	King (R) (c) 14%	Slaughter (D)..... (c) 95%
Crowley (D) (c) 100%	Lowey (D) (c) 95%	Stefanik (R) (c) 18%
Donovan* (R) (c) 15%	Maloney, C. (D) (c) 100%	Tonko (D)..... (c) 100%
Engel (D) (c) 100%	Maloney, S. (D) (c) 91%	Velázquez (D) (c) 100%
Gibson (R) (c) 36%	Meeks (D) (c) 100%	Zeldin (R)..... (c) 9%

*Representative Michael Grimm, R. N.Y., resigned in January 2015 and was replaced by Representative Daniel Donovan, Jr., R. N.Y., who won a special election for the seat in May 2015.

NORTH CAROLINA



Senate	Butterfield (D) (c) 100%	McHenry (R) (c) 0%
Burr (R) (c) 10%	Ellmers (R) (c) 6%	Meadows (R) (c) 9%
Tillis (R) (c) 5%	Foxx (R) (c) 0%	Pittenger (R)..... (c) 0%
	Holding (R) (c) 0%	Price (D) (c) 100%
House of Representatives	Hudson (R)..... (c) 0%	Rouzer (R) (c) 0%
Adams (D) (c) 100%	Jones (R)..... (c) 27%	Walker (R) (c) 0%

KEY (c) = Civil Rights Score

NORTH DAKOTA



<i>Senate</i>	<i>House of Representatives</i>
Heitkamp (D)..... (c) 86%	Cramer (R) (c) 0%
Hoeven (R) (c) 10%	

OHIO



<i>Senate</i>	<i>House of Representatives</i>	
	Davidson (R) (c) 0%	Renacci (R)..... (c) 5%
Brown (D) (c) 100%	Fudge (D) (c) 100%	Ryan (D) (c) 91%
Portman (R)..... (c) 38%	Gibbs (R) (c) 0%	Stivers (R) (c) 5%
	Johnson (R)..... (c) 5%	Tiberi (R) (c) 5%
<i>House of Representatives</i>	Jordan (R) (c) 5%	Turner (R) (c) 14%
Beatty (D)..... (c) 100%	Joyce (R) (c) 9%	Wenstrup (R)..... (c) 9%
Boehner* (R)..... (c) 0%	Kaptur (D)..... (c) 95%	
Chabot (R)..... (c) 0%	Latta (R) (c) 0%	

*Speaker of the House John Boehner, R. Oh., resigned in October 2015. The seat has been vacant since.

OKLAHOMA



<i>Senate</i>	<i>House of Representatives</i>	
		Mullin (R) (c) 0%
Inhofe (R) (c) 0%	Bridenstine (R) (c) 0%	Russell (R)..... (c) 9%
Lankford (R) (c) 5%	Cole (R) (c) 0%	
	Lucas (R)..... (c) 0%	

KEY (c) = Civil Rights Score

OREGON



<i>Senate</i>	<i>House of Representatives</i>	
Merkley (D) (c) 100%	Blumenauer (D)..... (c) 100%	Schrader (D) (c) 91%
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>	
Casey (D) (c) 100%	Cartwright (D) (c) 100%	Meehan (R) (c) 23%
Toomey (R)..... (c) 5%	Costello (R) (c) 18%	Murphy (R) (c) 5%
	Dent (R) (c) 14%	Perry (R) (c) 0%
	Doyle (D) (c) 100%	Pitts (R) (c) 0%
<i>House of Representatives</i>	Fattah* (D) (c) 100%	Rothfus (R)..... (c) 5%
Barletta (R) (c) 9%	Fitzpatrick (R) (c) 14%	Shuster (R)..... (c) 5%
Boyle (D) (c) 95%	Kelly (R)..... (c) 9%	Thompson (R) (c) 5%
Brady (D)..... (c) 100%	Marino (R) (c) 0%	

*Rep. Chaka Fattah, D. Penn., resigned in June 2016 and his seat is currently vacant.

RHODE ISLAND



<i>Senate</i>	<i>House of Representatives</i>
Reed (D)..... (c) 95%	Cicilline (D)..... (c) 100%
Whitehouse (D)..... (c) 95%	Langevin (D)..... (c) 95%

KEY (c) = Civil Rights Score

SOUTH CAROLINA



<i>Senate</i>	<i>House of Representatives</i>	
Graham (R)..... (c) 24%	Clyburn (D)..... (c) 100%	Mulvaney (R)..... (c) 5%
Scott (R)..... (c) 0%	Duncan (R)..... (c) 0%	Rice (R)..... (c) 0%
	Gowdy (R)..... (c) 0%	Sanford (R)..... (c) 5%
		Wilson (R)..... (c) 0%

SOUTH DAKOTA



<i>Senate</i>	<i>House of Representatives</i>
Rounds (R)..... (c) 5%	Noem (R)..... (c) 0%
Thune (R)..... (c) 14%	

TENNESSEE



<i>Senate</i>	<i>House of Representatives</i>	
Alexander (R)..... (c) 24%	Black (R)..... (c) 0%	DesJarlais (R)..... (c) 5%
Corker (R)..... (c) 14%	Blackburn (R)..... (c) 0%	Duncan (R)..... (c) 9%
	Cohen (D)..... (c) 95%	Fincher (R)..... (c) 0%
	Cooper (D)..... (c) 86%	Fleischmann (R)..... (c) 0%
		Roe (R)..... (c) 0%

KEY (c) = Civil Rights Score



TEXAS

Senate		Doggett (D) (c) 95%	McCaul (R) (c) 0%
Cornyn (R) (c) 5%	Farenthold (R) (c) 0%	Neugebauer (R) (c) 0%	
Cruz (R) (c) 7%	Flores (R) (c) 0%	O'Rourke (D) (c) 100%	
	Gohmert (R) (c) 5%	Olson (R) (c) 0%	
House of Representatives		Granger (R) (c) 5%	Poe (R) (c) 5%
Babin (R) (c) 0%	Green, A. (D) (c) 100%	Ratcliffe (R) (c) 0%	
Barton (R) (c) 0%	Green, G. (D) (c) 91%	Sessions (R) (c) 0%	
Brady (R) (c) 0%	Hensarling (R) (c) 0%	Smith (R) (c) 0%	
Burgess (R) (c) 5%	Hinojosa (D) (c) 100%	Thornberry (R) (c) 0%	
Carter (R) (c) 0%	Hurd (R) (c) 5%	Veasey (D) (c) 91%	
Castro (D) (c) 100%	Jackson Lee (D) (c) 100%	Vela (D) (c) 91%	
Conaway (R) (c) 0%	Johnson, S. (R) (c) 0%	Weber (R) (c) 0%	
Cuellar (D) (c) 68%	Johnson, E. (D) (c) 100%	Williams (R) (c) 0%	
Culberson (R) (c) 0%	Marchant (R) (c) 0%		



UTAH

Senate	House of Representatives	Love (R) (c) 0%
Hatch (R) (c) 19%	Bishop (R) (c) 0%	Stewart (R) (c) 0%
Lee (R) (c) 5%	Chaffetz (R) (c) 0%	

KEY (c) = Civil Rights Score

VERMONT



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

VIRGINIA



<i>Senate</i>	<i>House of Representatives</i>	
Kaine (D) (c) 95%	Beyer (D)..... (c) 100%	Goodlatte (R)..... (c) 0%
Warner (D) (c) 95%	Brat (R)..... (c) 0%	Griffith (R) (c) 10%
	Comstock (R) (c) 0%	Hurt (R) (c) 0%
	Connolly (D) (c) 95%	Rigell (R) (c) 5%
	Forbes (R) (c) 0%	Scott (D)..... (c) 100%
		Wittman (R) (c) 0%

WASHINGTON



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

KEY (c) = Civil Rights Score

WEST VIRGINIA



<i>Senate</i>	<i>House of Representatives</i>
Capito (R) (c) 0%	Jenkins (R) (c) 5%
Manchin (D) (c) 67%	McKinley (R) (c) 14%
	Mooney (R) (c) 0%

WISCONSIN



<i>Senate</i>	<i>House of Representatives</i>	
Baldwin (D) (c) 100%	Duffy (R) (c) 5%	Pocan (D) (c) 100%
Johnson (R) (c) 20%	Grothman (R) (c) 5%	Ribble (R) (c) 0%
	Kind (D) (c) 95%	Ryan (R) (c) 0%
	Moore (D) (c) 100%	Sensenbrenner (R) (c) 9%

WYOMING



<i>Senate</i>	<i>House of Representatives</i>
Barrasso (R) (c) 5%	Lummis (R) (c) 0%
Enzi (R) (c) 10%	



The Leadership Conference on
Civil and Human Rights

1620 L Street, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC
20036

202.466.3311 voice
202.466.3435 fax
www.civilrights.org

Copyright © 2016 by
The Leadership Conference.
All Rights Reserved.