

## **National Right to Life Congressional Scorecard U.S. House | 116th Congress 2019-2020**

Key Votes 116th House of Representatives

### **1- Protecting Life in Global Health Assistance/United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA)**

On January 3, 2019, the U.S. House of Representatives considered the Consolidated Appropriations Act (H.R. 21), a bill to fund certain government programs through September 30, 2019. The bill contained language to overturn President Trump's pro-life Protecting Life in Global Health Assistance program, under which certain forms of foreign aid may go only to organizations that agree not to perform abortions (except to save the mother's life or in cases of rape or incest), lobby to change the abortion laws of host countries, or otherwise actively promote abortion as a method of family planning. Another objectionable provision of H.R. 21 would restore funding to the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA); such funding was blocked by the Trump Administration in 2017 due to that agency's involvement in coercive population-control policies. Because of these provisions, NRLC opposed the bill, as explained in detail in a letter sent to House members. However, the House passed the bill, 241-190 (House roll call no. 11, January 3, 2019). On this roll call, 234 Democrats and 7 Republicans voted for the bill (pro-abortion), while 190 Republicans opposed it (pro-life).

### **2- "For the People Act of 2019" (restrictions on free speech)**

The so-called "For the People Act of 2019" (H.R. 1) is intended to make it as difficult as possible for corporations (including nonprofit, issue-oriented corporations such as NRLC) to spend money to communicate with the public about the actions of federal officeholders, by applying an array of restrictions on ads, as well as requirements that violate the privacy rights of donors. NRLC expressed its strong opposition to the bill in a letter sent to members of the House of Representatives on March 6, 2019. NRLC said that the overriding purpose of the legislation is "to discourage, as much as possible, disfavored groups (such as NRLC) from communicating about officeholders, by exposing citizens who support such efforts to harassment and intimidation, and by smothering organizations in layer on layer of record keeping and reporting requirements, all backed by the threat of civil and criminal sanctions. On this roll call, 234 Democrats voted for the bill, while 190 Republicans opposed it (NRLC position).

### **3- The So-Called "Equality Act"**

In addition to other issues, H.R. 5 poses a significant pro-life threat. It amends the 1964 Civil Rights Act, adding language that could be used to make abortions more available, expand taxpayer funding of abortion, and weaken conscience protections for health care providers opposed to participating in abortions. National Right to Life Committee opposed passage of H.R. 5, which passed the House, 236-173, on May 16, 2019 (House Roll Call No. 217). The bill was supported by 228 Democrats and 8 Republicans. It was opposed by 173 Republicans. 7 Democrats and 16 Republicans did not vote. See more here: <https://www.nrlc.org/equality-act/>

#### **4- Amendment to Restore Conscience Protection (Cole)**

H.R. 2740, the Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, Defense, State, Foreign Operations, and Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2020 is a bill opposed by the National Right to Life Committee (NRLC) as it includes several provisions that roll back current pro-life policies. Among other things, H.R. 2740 would block implementation and enforcement of the recent rule, “Protecting Statutory Conscience Rights in Health Care,” issued by the Department of Health and Human Services. That rule would enforce approximately 25 existing longstanding statutory civil rights provisions that protect health care providers from suffering discrimination if they do not participate in abortion, sterilization, or assisted suicide.

Representative Cole offered an amendment to strike this language and permit the “Protecting Statutory Conscience Rights in Health Care” rule to stand. NRLC supported the Cole Amendment. On June 12, 2019, the House of Representatives blocked the Cole Amendment by a roll call vote of 230 to 172. The amendment was supported by 189 Republicans and 3 Democrats. Voting against it were 230 Democrats. NRLC opposes passage of the underlying bill, H.R. 2740. House roll call no. 266, June 12, 2019.

#### **5- Amendment to Restore Pro-life Protections to Title X Program (Roby)**

H.R. 2740 (see above) would block the Administration’s final rule related to prolife changes to the Title X family planning program. Under the rule, abortion facilities may not be in the same location where family planning services are delivered. The rule also states that Title X grantees may not refer for elective abortion. The rule does not cut one dime of funding for family planning, but ensures that funding goes to health facilities that do not perform or promote abortion as family planning. Under the Obama Administration policy (which H.R. 2740 would restore), Title X consistently funded family planning through organizations that promoted and provided abortions.

Representative Roby offered an amendment to strike the language that prevents the implementation of the pro-life Title X rule. NRLC supported the Roby Amendment. On June 12, 2019, the House of Representatives blocked the Roby Amendment by a roll call vote of 231 to 171. The amendment was supported by 188 Republicans and 3 Democrats. Voting against it were 231 Democrats. NRLC opposes passage of the underlying bill, H.R. 2740. House roll call no. 267, June 12, 2019.

#### **6- Fiscal 2020 Labor-HHS-Education Appropriations**

H.R. 2740 includes several provisions that roll back pro-life policies. H.R. 2740 would block implementation and enforcement of the recent rule, “Protecting Statutory Conscience Rights in Health Care,” issued by the Department of Health and Human Services. That rule would enforce approximately 25 existing longstanding statutory civil rights provisions that protect health care providers from suffering discrimination if they do not participate in abortion, sterilization, or assisted suicide.

H.R. 2740 would block the Administration’s final rule related to prolife changes to the Trump Administration Title X family planning program. See more above. H.R. 2740 contains language that would effectively overturn the current pro-life Protecting Life in Global Health Assistance program, and further, it would create a statutory prohibition against a future Administration ever issuing a similar pro-life policy again. This vital pro-life policy, sometimes referred to as the Mexico City Policy, was originally adopted by President Reagan and announced at a 1984 population conference in Mexico City. The policy was reinstated by President’s Bush in 2001, and restored and expanded under President Trump in 2017. Under the Protecting Life in Global Health Assistance program, in order to be eligible for U.S. “population assistance,” a private organization must sign a contract promising not to perform abortions (except to save the mother’s life or in cases of rape or incest), lobby to change the abortion laws of host countries, or otherwise “actively promote abortion as a method of family planning.” National Right to Life Committee opposed passage of H.R. 2740, which passed the House, 226-203, on June 20, 2019 (House Roll Call No. 367). 226 Democrats voted in favor of the bill. 7 Democrats and 196 Republicans voted against the bill.

#### **7- Fiscal 2020 Financial Services and General Government Appropriations (D.C. Hyde)**

H.R. 3351 repeals the “D.C. Hyde Amendment” (sometimes called the Dornan Amendment) that has prevented tax-funded abortion in the District of Columbia for many years.

The “D.C. Hyde Amendment” prohibits the use of government funds to pay for abortion in the Federal District (except to save the life of the mother, or in cases of rape or incest), which for decades (with brief interruptions) has been part of the annual appropriations bill that covers the District.

National Right to Life Committee opposed passage of H.R. 3351, which passed the House, 224-196, on June 26, 2019 (House Roll Call No. 424). 224 Democrats voted in favor of the bill. 5 Democrats and 191 Republicans voted against the bill.

#### **8 - The “Shield Act” (restrictions on free speech)**

The so-called "Shield Act" (H.R. 4617) is intended to make it as difficult as possible for corporations (including nonprofit, issue-oriented corporations such as NRLC) to engage in non-political campaigns. H.R. 4617 expands the definition of "qualified political advertisement" to "any political matter of national importance, including... a national legislative issue of public importance." Therefore, advertisements (digital or broadcast) that touched on abortion and were run, for example, in favor choosing adoption, or that described a developing unborn child, close enough to an election could only be done by a political action committee, and would be subject to new burdensome disclaimer and reporting requirements from the FEC. This would have a powerful chilling effect on the ability of groups like NRLC to talk about abortion in the public space.

Since the bill would expand the definition of "electioneering communications," a standard currently limited to radio and television campaigns, to include online campaigns, these online communications will be subject to FEC requirements for the first time. This would result in organizations, like NRLC, becoming subject to politically motivated complaints, investigations, and legal liability. These costs would negate the many benefits organizations like NRLC have in using online grassroots campaigns to effect social change.

On this roll call, 227 Democrats voted for the bill, while 179 Republicans, 1 Democrat, and 1 Independent opposed it (NRLC position). The bill then went to the U.S. Senate, which is not expected to take up the legislation. House roll call no. 583, October 23, 2019.

### **9 - H.R. 3 Prescription Drug**

H.R. 3, the so-called "Lower Drug Costs Now Act of 2019", if enacted, would prevent people from accessing current life-saving medication and prevent new innovative medications from coming to market. H.R. 3 would effectively impose rationing of lifesaving drugs through drug price controls, not only in Medicare, but in the entire U.S. health market.

H.R. 3 would instruct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to negotiate prices for many prescription drugs. The prices resulting from these "negotiations" would then be imposed on the entire U.S. healthcare market. Manufacturers that attempt to deviate from these fixed prices would face massive civil monetary penalties.

Under current law, prices are negotiated by competing private insurers --not simply accepted at a level set by the drug companies. However, there are checks and balances on these negotiations by private parties that help prevent them from driving prices so low as to result in rationing and harm to new drug development — checks and balances not present when the government steps in to set prices. Under new government price setting, H.R. 3 would drive most companies out of the process of innovation, if not out of business altogether.

National Right to Life Committee opposed passage of H.R. 3, which passed the House, 230-192, on December 12, 2019 (House Roll Call No. 682). The bill was supported by 228 Democrats and 2 Republicans. It was opposed by 191 Republicans. 4 Democrats and 4 Republicans did not vote.

### **10- EPA Water Regulations and Unborn Children**

H.R. 535, the PFAS Action Act of 2019, H.R. 535, deals with the Safe Drinking Water Act and would require the Environmental Protection Agency to declare two types of substances, known as PFAS, as hazardous. Rep. Cathy McMorris Rodgers (R-WA) offered a motion to recommit to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to add “unborn child” to the list of subpopulations at greater risk of being affected by contaminants in drinking water.

Currently, Section 1458 of the Safe Drinking Water Act identifies subpopulations that include “infants” and “pregnant women.” This MTR recognizes that, when a pregnant woman is exposed to contaminated drinking water, there are two people put at risk in that situation: the pregnant woman and her unborn child.

The MTR uses the definition of “unborn child” from the Unborn Victims of Violence Act (18 U.S. Code § 1841). It defines “unborn child” as “a child in utero,” which is defined as “a member of the species homo sapiens, at any stage of development who is carried in the womb.” On January 10th, 2020, the House of Representatives blocked the motion by a vote of 187-219. The motion was supported by 183 republicans and 4 Democrats. Voting against it were 219 Democrats. House roll call 12, January 10, 2020.

### **11- "Equal Rights Amendment" to U.S. Constitution**

The National Right to Life Committee (NRLC) opposes adding any so-called "Equal Rights Amendment" to the federal Constitution, unless an "abortion-neutral amendment" is included to prevent the ERA from being used as a pro-abortion legal weapon. In 1972, Congress submitted to the states an ERA that contained no abortion-neutral language, and therefore could be used to attack virtually all limits on abortion. The ERA failed to achieve ratification by the required 38 state legislatures by the 1979 deadline that Congress included in the original resolution; only 35 legislatures passed ratification resolutions, most of which explicitly referred to the deadline, and five states rescinded their ratifications before the deadline. In 1982, the U.S. Supreme Court recognized that the 1972 ERA was dead.

Nevertheless, pro-abortion Rep. Jackie Speier (D-Ca.) introduced H. J. Res. 79, which purports to retroactively remove the ratification deadline. NRLC opposes H.J. Res. 79 because it seeks to place the pro-abortion 1972 ERA into the U.S. Constitution, and also because it seeks to employ an unconstitutional method. On this roll call, No. 70, 232 Democrats and 5 Republicans voted for the joint resolution, while 182 Republicans and one Independent opposed it (NRLC position).

### **12- MTR Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act**

"The Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act (BAASPA), sponsored by Congresswoman Ann Wagner (R-Mo.), would enact an explicit requirement that a baby born alive during an abortion must be afforded “the same degree” of care that would apply “to any other child born alive at the same gestational age,” including transportation to a hospital. In addition, the bill applies the existing penalties of 18 U.S.C. Sec. 1111 (the federal murder statute) to anyone who performs “an overt act that kills a child born alive.” The bill also empowers women with a right to sue their abortionists and others for harm caused by violations of the act.

On February 28, 2020, during consideration of H.R. 2339, Republican offered a Motion to Recommit with instructions to consider BAASPA. The bill was supported by all 183 Republicans, three Democrats, and one Independent. 220 Democrats voted against the Motion to recommit. Eight Democrats and 14 republicans were absent. House roll call no. 77."

### **13- Obamacare Expansion and Drug Price Controls**

H.R. 1425 contains several objectionable provisions including: 1) Permanent tax credit increases to the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (PPACA); 2) A new federal reinsurance program run by states without Hyde-like protections; and 3) Prescription drug price controls that will lead to the rationing of treatment.

Up until the passage of Obamacare, an array of long-established laws, including the Hyde Amendment, had created a nearly uniform policy that federal programs did not pay for abortion or subsidize health plans that included coverage of abortion, with narrow exceptions. Regrettably, provisions of the 2010 Obamacare health law ruptured that longstanding policy. Among other objectionable provisions, the Obamacare law authorized massive federal subsidies to assist many millions of Americans to purchase private health plans that cover abortion on demand. H. R. 1425 amends the PPACA by permanently enlarging the federal insurance premium subsidies and also by expanding eligibility for who can receive the premium tax credits. In addition, H.R. 1425 creates a new federal insurance program dealing with cost-sharing reductions (CSR) and reinsurance, and these payments do not include Hyde-like protections. If enacted, the H.R. 1425 CSR payments can be expected to underwrite a significant number of Obamacare plans that cover abortion on demand. H.R. 1425 also contains significant components of H.R. 3, the so-called "Lower Drug Costs Now Act of 2019". (see above)

National Right to Life Committee opposed passage of H.R. 1425, which passed the House, 230-192, on June 29, 2020 (House Roll Call No. 124). The bill was supported by 232 Democrats and 2 Republicans. It was opposed by 177 Republicans and 1 Independent. 18 Republicans did not vote.

### **14- Tax Subsidies for Abortion-Promoting Groups Overseas**

On July 24, 2020, the U.S. House of Representatives considered the Consolidated Appropriations Act (H.R. 7608), a bill to fund certain government programs through September 30, 2021. The bill contained language to overturn President Trump's pro-life Protecting Life in Global Health Assistance program (formerly known as the Mexico City Policy), under which certain forms of foreign aid may go only to organizations that agree not to perform abortions (except to save the mother's life or in cases of rape or incest), lobby to change the abortion laws of host countries, or otherwise actively promote abortion as a method of family planning.

Additionally, H.R. 7608 would weaken the Kemp-Kasten Amendment while also providing increased funding to the UNFPA. The Kemp-Kasten Amendment was originally enacted in 1985 in response to the UNFPA's extensive involvement in China's coercive population control program. The amendment prohibits giving U.S. "population assistance" funds to "any organization or program which, as determined by the President of the United States, supports or participates in the management of a program of coercive abortion or involuntary sterilization." In 2017, the Trump Administration determined that the UNFPA remains in violation of the Kemp-Kasten anti-coercion law and withheld funding. The Appropriations bill would increase funding, while at the same time weaken the ability of the administration to withhold funds.

Because of these provisions, NRLC opposed the bill, as explained in detail in a letter sent to House members. However, the House passed the bill, 224-189 (House roll call no. 166, July 24, 2020). On this roll call, 224 Democrats voted for the bill (pro-abortion), while 182 Republicans and 7 Democrats opposed it (pro-life). The bill then went to the U.S. Senate, which is not expected to pass it without extensive modifications.

## **15 - Fiscal Year 2020 Appropriations Conscience/Title X/DC Hyde Amendment**

H.R. 7617 includes several provisions that roll back current pro-life policies. H.R. 7617 would block implementation and enforcement of the recent rule, “Protecting Statutory Conscience Rights in Health Care,” issued by the Department of Health and Human Services. That rule would enforce approximately 25 existing longstanding statutory civil rights provisions that protect health care providers from suffering discrimination if they do not participate in abortion, sterilization, or assisted suicide.

H.R. 7617 would block the Administration’s final rule related to prolife changes to the Title X family planning program. Under the rule, abortion facilities may not be in the same location where family planning services are delivered. The rule also states that Title X grantees may not refer for elective abortion. The rule does not cut one dime of funding for family planning, but ensures that funding goes to health facilities that do not perform or promote abortion as family planning. Under the Obama Administration policy (which H.R. 7617 would restore), Title X consistently funded family planning through organizations that promoted and provided abortions.

H.R. 7617 repeals the “D.C. Hyde Amendment” (sometimes called the Dornan Amendment) that has prevented tax-funded abortion in the District of Columbia for many years. The “D.C. Hyde Amendment” prohibits the use of government funds to pay for abortion in the Federal District (except to save the life of the mother, or in cases of rape or incest), which for decades (with brief interruptions) has been part of the annual appropriations bill that covers the District.

Because of these provisions, NRLC opposed the bill. However, the House passed the bill, 217-197 (House roll call no. 178, July 31, 2020). On this roll call, 217 Democrats voted for the bill (pro-abortion), while 185 Republicans and 12 Democrats opposed it (pro-life).

## **16- Heroes Act Abortion Expanding Provisions**

NRLC opposed the House Amendment to the Senate Amendment to H.R. 925, or Heroes 2.0. Heroes 2.0 deals broadly with addressing the Covid-19 pandemic. However, the legislation contains numerous provisions aimed at propping up the abortion industry as well as potentially funneling millions of dollars into programs without Hyde Amendment protections. Heroes 2.0 specifically states “no person otherwise eligible shall be excluded from participation in, denied the benefits of, or subjected to discrimination in the administration of, programs and services receiving funding under a covered law... based on any factor that is not merit-based, such as age, disability, sex...” In the legislation, “sex” is defined to include “pregnancy, childbirth, or related medical conditions.” It is well established that abortion will be regarded as a “related medical condition.”

The language of Heroes 2.0 would open the door to legal challenges regarding abortion because it would establish that any pregnancy-related medical conditions—including abortion—could not be treated less favorably than other physical conditions.

Heroes 2.0 would also apply retroactively to previous Covid-19 relief packages. On this roll call, No. 214, 214 Democrats voted for the measure, while 188 Republicans, 18 Democrats, and one Independent opposed it (NRLC position)







28 Schiff, Adam B.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0%
29 Cárdenas, Tony	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0%
30 Sherman, Brad	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0%
31 Aguilar, Pete	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0%
32 Napolitano, Grace F.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0%
33 Lieu, Ted	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	NV	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0%
34 Gomez, Jimmy	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0%
35 Torres, Norma J.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0%
36 Ruiz, Raul	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0%
37 Bass, Karen	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0%
38 Sánchez, Linda T.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0%
39 Cisneros, Gilbert Ray, Jr.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0%
40 Roybal-Allard, Lucille	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0%
41 Takano, Mark	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	NV	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0%
42 Calvert, Ken	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	100%
43 Waters, Maxine	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0%
44 Barragán, Nanette Diaz	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0%
45 Porter, Katie	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0%
46 Correa, J. Luis	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0%
47 Lowenthal, Alan S.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0%
48 Rouda, Harley	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0%
49 Levin, Mike	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0%
50 Hunter, Duncan**	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	NV	NV	I	I	I	I	I	I	100%
51 Vargas, Juan	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0%
52 Peters, Scott H.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	NV	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0%
53 Davis, Susan A.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0%

\*Vacancy due to the resignation of Katie Hill, November 3, 2019. Mike Garcia assumed office May 19, 2020.

\*\*Vacancy due to the resignation of Duncan Hunter, January 1, 2020.

**COLORADO**

1 DeGette, Diana	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0%
2 Neguse, Joe	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0%
3 <i>Tipton, Scott R.</i>	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	100%
4 <i>Buck, Ken</i>	X	X	X	NV	NV	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	100%
5 <i>Lamborn, Doug</i>	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	100%
6 Crow, Jason	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0%
7 Perlmutter, Ed	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0%

**CONNECTICUT**

1 Larson, John B.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	NV	O	0%
2 Courtney, Joe	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0%
3 DeLauro, Rosa L.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0%
4 Himes, James A.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0%
5 Hayes, Jahana	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0%

**DELAWARE**

Blunt Rochester, Lisa	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0%
-----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

**FLORIDA**

1 <i>Gaetz, Matt</i>	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	100%
2 <i>Dunn, Neal P.</i>	X	NV	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	NV	X	X	X	NV	100%
3 <i>Yoho, Ted S.</i>	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	100%
4 <i>Rutherford, John H.</i>	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	100%
5 Lawson, Al, Jr.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0%
6 <i>Waltz, Michael</i>	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	100%
7 Murphy, Stephanie N.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0%
8 <i>Posey, Bill</i>	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	100%
9 Soto, Darren	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0%
10 Demings, Val Butler	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0%
11 <i>Webster, Daniel</i>	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	NV	O	X	X	X	100%



13	Scott, David	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0%
14	<i>Graves, Tom</i>	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	NV	X	X	NV	X	NV	100%

**HAWAII**

1	Case, Ed	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0%
2	Gabbard, Tulsi	O	O	O	NV	O	O	NV	NV	NV	NV	NV	NV	O	NV	O	O	0%

**IDAHO**

1	<i>Fulcher, Russ</i>	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	100%
2	<i>Simpson, Michael K.</i>	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	NV	X	X	X	X	X	X	100%

**ILLINOIS**

1	Rush, Bobby L.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0%
2	Kelly, Robin L.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0%
3	Lipinski, Daniel	O	O	O	X	X	O	X	O	O	X	O	X	O	X	O	X	44%
4	García, Jesús G. "Chuy"	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	X	O	6%
5	Quigley, Mike	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0%
6	Casten, Sean	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0%
7	Davis, Danny K.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0%
8	Krishnamoorthi, Raja	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0%
9	Schakowsky, Janice D.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0%
10	Schneider, Bradley Scott	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0%
11	Foster, Bill	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0%
12	<i>Bost, Mike</i>	X	X	X	NV	NV	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	100%
13	<i>Davis, Rodney</i>	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	O	X	X	X	X	X	94%
14	Underwood, Lauren	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0%
15	<i>Shimkus, John</i>	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	100%
16	<i>Kinzinger, Adam</i>	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	NV	X	X	NV	NV	X	100%
17	Bustos, Cheri	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0%
18	<i>LaHood, Darin</i>	X	X	NV	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	NV	X	X	NV	X	X	100%













4 Rice, Kathleen M.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0%
5 Meeks, Gregory W.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0%
6 Meng, Grace	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0%
7 Velázquez, Nydia M.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0%
8 Jeffries, Hakeem S.	NV	NV	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0%
9 Clarke, Yvette D.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0%
10 Nadler, Jerrold	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	NV	O	O	O	O	O	O	0%
11 Rose, Max	O	O	NV	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	X	6%
12 Maloney, Carolyn B.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0%
13 Espaillat, Adriano	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0%
14 Ocasio-Cortez, Alexandria	O	O	O	O	O	X	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	X	O	13%
15 Serrano, José E.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	NV	NV	O	O	O	O	O	O	0%
16 Engel, Eliot L.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	NV	O	0%
17 Lowey, Nita M.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0%
18 Maloney, Sean Patrick	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0%
19 Delgado, Antonio	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0%
20 Tonko, Paul	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0%
21 <i>Stefanik, Elise M.</i>	O	X	O	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	88%
22 Brindisi, Anthony	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	X	X	13%
23 <i>Reed, Tom</i>	X	X	O	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	O	X	X	O	X	X	82%
24 <i>Katko, John</i>	O	X	O	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	NV	X	X	X	87%
25 Morelle, Joseph D.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0%
26 Higgins, Brian	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0%
27 <i>Collins, Chris*</i>	X	X	X	X	X	X	NV	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	100%
27 <i>Jacobs, Chris</i>	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	X	X	X	X	X	100%

\*Vacancy due to the resignation of Chris Collins, September 30, 2019.

**NORTH CAROLINA**

1 Butterfield, G. K.	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0%
2 <i>Holder, George</i>	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	NV	NV	X	X	NV	100%















5	<i>Sensenbrenner, F. James</i>	X	X	X	NV	NV	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	100%
6	<i>Grothman, Glenn</i>	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	NV	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	100%
7	<i>Duffy, Sean*</i>	X	X	NV	X	X	X	X	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	100%
7	<i>Tiffany, Tom</i>	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	X	X	X	X	X	X	100%
8	<i>Gallagher, Mike</i>	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	NV	X	X	X	100%

\*Vacancy due to the resignation of Sean P. Duffy, September 23, 2019. Replaced by Tom Tiffany May 19th, 2020

**WYOMING**

AL	<i>Cheney, Liz</i>	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	100%
----	--------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	------

LEGEND

- X - Voted with Us
- O - Voted Against Us
- P - Voted Present
- NV - Did Not Vote
- I - Not In Office

LEGEND

- X - Voted with Us
- O - Voted Against Us
- P - Voted Present
- NV - Did Not Vote
- I - Not In Office

LEGEND

- X - Voted with Us
- O - Voted Against Us
- P - Voted Present
- NV - Did Not Vote
- I - Not In Office