

LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE ON
CIVIL RIGHTS

VOTING RECORD

109th Congress



© Photohome.com

LC
CR

The 109th Congress was marked by an extreme partisan atmosphere, similar to that which has prevailed in recent years. This inability to work effectively on a bipartisan basis has made our work to press an aggressive civil rights agenda all the more difficult. However, despite the overall negative tone in the Congress, there were bright lights.

Of tremendous importance to the civil rights community, Republicans and Democrats came together to renew key expiring provisions of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. In an historic moment, the fiercely divided Congress renewed and strengthened one of the most important and effective civil rights laws in our nation's history. The bill, "The Fannie Lou Hamer, Rosa Parks and Coretta Scott King Voting Rights Act Reauthorization and Amendments Act," restores the Act's temporary provisions for 25 years, and clarifies the standard for stopping discriminatory voting changes, in response to two recent Supreme Court cases. On July 27, 2006, President George W. Bush signed the renewed Voting Rights Act into law.

In addition to this important victory, there were a few other positive actions on civil rights issues in the 109th Congress. The House rejected an amendment that would have undermined affirmative action in higher education, and passed a strengthened federal hate crimes bill, housing relief for the victims of Hurricane Katrina, and increased funding for peacekeeping in Darfur.

The Senate beat back efforts to enact draconian voter identification requirements, and passed increased spending for Low Income Energy Assistance, as well as an increase in Pell Grant awards. Although many of these efforts did not ultimately become law, they demonstrated Congress's capacity to work on a bipartisan basis to advance civil and human rights.

However, for much of the 109th Congress, House and Senate leaders continued to prioritize message, ideology, and special interest legislation to the detriment of passing meaningful bills that would positively impact the American people. For example, Congress passed the Bankruptcy Reform Bill and Class Action Reform Act, which were bad for working Americans and only good for big corporate interests. They also enacted the REAL ID Act, a national ID law that will drive immigrants underground, while imposing massive new burdens on everyone else. At the same time, measures to improve the lives of ordinary Americans, such as Social Security reform, progressive immigration reform, an increase in the minimum wage, and increased funding for education, were not approved.

In the 109th, Congress also pushed through a number of very controversial appointments to the federal courts, including many who are far outside the mainstream of American jurisprudence. The Bush administration's appointment of these far right judges served to further solidify the conservative grip on the federal judiciary.

Thus, while the 109th Congress saw some civil rights advances, the overall record on LCCR's priority issues was poor. Sadly, those who are most vulnerable and who would benefit most from a proactive civil rights agenda are getting the least from this Congress.

LCCR is eager to return to a time in which civil rights issues generally enjoy broad bipartisan support in both the House and Senate. Just over 20 years ago (in the 97th Congress), 220 representatives, and 52 senators voted in support of civil rights issues at least 80 percent of the time. Today, LCCR can count on only **181** representatives and **36** senators to support its priorities on **80 percent** or more of the votes in the *LCCR Voting Record*, while **135** representatives and **49** senators support LCCR priorities less than **20 percent** of the time. We hope that the bipartisan reauthorization of

the Voting Rights Act will bring Congress back to the earlier time.

About LCCR

LCCR is the nation's oldest, largest, and most diverse civil and human rights coalition. Founded in 1950, LCCR is currently made up of nearly 200 organizations representing persons of color, women, children, labor unions, individuals with disabilities, older Americans, major religious groups, gays and lesbians, and civil liberties and human rights groups. LCCR 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 LCCR Voting Record

Based on these votes, each member of Congress earns a percentage rating for support of LCCR priorities. This rating cannot indicate the full extent of a legislator's support for or opposition to LCCR positions and represents neither endorsement nor condemnation of any member of Congress.

LCCR has taken a sample of bills considered during the 109th Congress. The LCCR Voting Record was created with the bills in this sample. While it is difficult to predict what legislation will be enacted at the end of the session, the sample of bills that have already been considered reflects how members of Congress have aligned with LCCR priority areas during the 109th Congress.

A vote in accordance with LCCR's position is a "+" vote; a vote contrary to LCCR's position is a "-" vote. An "X" indicates a "yea" or "nay" vote was not cast. An "I" indicates the member of Congress was not in office for the full term. A "+" or "-" in parenthesis

reflects the announced position of the member, but is not reflected in the overall "report total."

Rep. Christopher Cox, R. Calif., resigned and was succeeded by Rep. John Campbell, R. Calif.; Rep. Doris O. Matsui, D. Calif., won a special election in March 2005; Rep. Robert J. Portman, R. Ohio, resigned and was succeeded by Rep. Jean Schmidt, R. Ohio, Rep. Brian Bilbray, R. Calif., won a special election in June 2006, Rep. Tom DeLay, R. Texas, resigned. Sen. Jon Corzine, D. NJ, resigned and appointed Sen. Robert Menendez, D. NJ, in January 2006.

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

The LCCR Voting Record for the 109th Congress reflects positions taken by every senator and representative on the legislative priorities of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights (LCCR) and its coalition members. The priorities for the 109th Congress include reauthorization of the Voting Rights Act, civil rights, judicial appointments, hate crimes, education, bankruptcy reform, tax cuts, the budget, class action reform, judicial appointments, rights of workers, relief for victims of Hurricane Katrina, immigration reform, and religious freedom.

The Voting Record reflects only roll call votes that were officially recorded on the floor of the U.S. Senate or House of Representatives. While the LCCR Voting Record is an important tool in monitoring the actions of Congress, it is important to recognize that it is not the sole reflection of a legislator's record.

For more information, please contact LCCR's Public Policy Department at 202/466-3311.

Affirmative Action

Higher Education Act Reauthorization -- Demographics of Admissions (H.R. 609)

Rep. Steve King, R. Iowa, offered an amendment that would require institutions that receive federal funding to report each year to the Education Department on whether and how race, color, or national origin is considered in the process of admitting students.

LCCR opposed the King amendment because it threatened equal access to higher education, violated the privacy rights of college students, and imposed burdensome reporting requirements on institutions of higher education. The amendment would have discouraged colleges and universities from maintaining the equal opportunity programs they need to create diverse educational environments for students.

The House rejected the King amendment (83-337). A vote against the amendment was counted as a + vote. Roll Call No. 79 (3/30/2006)

Budget

Budget Reconciliation-Passage (H.R. 4241)

The Budget Reconciliation sets broad changes to government spending programs over the next five years. The Reconciliation calls for an overall reduction in spending of \$49.5 billion, including cuts for student loans by \$14.3 billion, reduction in aid to states to enforce child support payments by \$4.9 billion, and a more than \$11 billion reduction in federal spending on Medicaid in the next five years. The bill also cut foster care programs, SSI funding, and food stamps.

LCCR opposed the final Budget Reconciliation because it balances the budget on the backs of the most vulnerable Americans -- those who are least able to bear it. This Reconciliation calls for cuts in some of the most important and needed programs for low-

income families. The Budget Reconciliation facilitates further tax cuts at the expense of social services programs like food stamps, Medicaid, student loans, foster care and education. This reconciliation would result in decreased spending, not to offset the growing deficit, but to pay for continuing tax cuts that benefit the wealthy. It has been the longstanding position of LCCR to oppose any budget plan that results in tax breaks for the wealthy at the expense of the social service needs of low income Americans, women, children and the elderly. The House-passed bill will result in increased hardship for low income and working families, and as these individuals are forced to pay more for services or find a growing reduction in basic services, many will be pushed deeper into poverty.

The House passed this legislation (217-215). A vote against this bill was recorded as a + vote. Roll Call No. 601 (11/18/2005).

Education

Higher Education Act Reauthorization -- Democratic Substitute (H.R. 609)

Rep. George Miller, D. Calif., introduced a substitute amendment that would reauthorize for another five years provisions of the 1998 Higher Education Act that were not included in the recently enacted budget reconciliation law. The substitute would cut in half the student loan interest rate for borrowers that are most in need. It would provide for year-round Pell grants and repeal the single lender rule, which requires student borrowers to consolidate their loans with their existing lender.

LCCR supported the substitute because we believe that the Higher Education Act has been vital in helping to open the doors of higher education for many lower income Americans, students of color and women. Important provisions of the law were allowed to expire in the House bill to reauthorize the law. The Miller

amendment would have corrected that flaw and would have lowered student loan interest rates for the neediest students while introducing more flexibility, choice, and competition to the Act.

The House rejected the Miller amendment (200-220). A vote in favor of the amendment was recorded as a + vote. Roll Call No. 80 (3/30/2006)

Fiscal 2006 Labor-HHS-Education Appropriations-Conference (H.R. 3010)

The Labor-HHS-Education Appropriations bill provided \$602 billion in appropriations, including \$142.5 billion in discretionary spending for the Labor, Health and Human Services and Education departments and related agencies in fiscal 2006. The bill provides \$63.5 billion for the Education Department, including \$13.2 billion for Pell Grants; \$14.8 billion for the Labor Department, including \$5.1 billion for training and employment services; and \$474.1 billion for Health and Human Services, including \$28.5 billion for the National Institutes of Health. Overall funding, however, was below FY 05 levels, with education, job training, rural health care and employment benefits taking deep cuts. Additionally, the bill provided no earmarks for existing or new projects traditionally funded under this Appropriations bill.

LCCR opposed this legislation because of the inadequate funding levels that will have a devastating impact on social services programs that help working families, children, and the unemployed. This bill cuts funding for job training and employment programs; eliminates any increase to Pell Grants and freezes all other student aid programs; cuts access to health care initiatives in rural and urban areas; and reduces spending on education programs under No Child Left Behind to below FY 05 levels. This legislation makes it impossible to fund current services for the most vulnerable Americans, with cuts to education, health care and job training drastically undermining any opportunity for those individuals and their families to get

ahead. Additionally, program cuts at minority-serving institutions will disproportionately impact people of color and undermine efforts to eliminate disparities in education and health care.

The House rejected this legislation (209-224). A vote against this bill was recorded as a + vote. Roll Call No. 598 (11/17/2005).

NASA Reauthorization-Minority-Serving Institutions (H.R. 3070)

This amendment, offered by Rep. Nita Velazquez, D. N.Y., to the NASA Reauthorization Bill (H.R. 3070), would have created a four-year pilot program focused on the development of technology laboratories in minority-serving institutions. Under the amendment, \$4 million is authorized to award grants to minority-serving institutions for the development of NASA research facilities and infrastructure. The authorization would be for FY 2006 through 2009 and would require each grant to have a matching amount provided from a non-federal source.

LCCR supported this amendment because it would have created opportunities for students to pursue technology careers and help train those students for jobs of the future, especially in fields where minority students are underrepresented. This program would have also helped to create a talent pool of students prepared to meet the needs of NASA and other agencies and expose those students to the types of science and technology that these agencies need and are pursuing. Additionally, students would have received mentoring and developed knowledge and understanding of the inner working of NASA, which would place them in a better position to pursue entrepreneurial opportunities at the agency. By focusing on developing technology laboratories that are specific to the needs of NASA, this pilot program would have helped young scientists develop successful careers while ensuring that there were resources for NASA to use to fulfill its small and minority business contracting goals.

The House rejected the vote by (192-206). A vote in favor of this amendment was recorded as a + vote. Roll Call No. 415 (7/22/2005).

Election Reform

Election Infrastructure Funding for Hurricane-Devastated Areas (H.R. 4939)

During consideration of a bill to provide supplemental appropriations for the war in Iraq and for Hurricane Katrina and Rita recovery efforts, Rep. Juanita Millender-McDonald, D. Calif., offered an amendment to provide the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) with an additional \$50 million to repair and replace election systems in hurricane-damaged areas.

LCCR supported the amendment. Because the right to vote is the most important civil right of all, LCCR believes that disaster recovery efforts must make the rebuilding of election infrastructure a high priority. Hurricanes Katrina and Rita destroyed hundreds of polling places, necessitated the replacement of voting machines and registration lists, and displaced hundreds of thousands of registered voters. FEMA denied it had the legal authority to help states restore election infrastructure. The amendment was especially important because New Orleans was scheduled to hold local elections approximately a month later.

The House rejected the amendment (194-227). A vote for it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call No. 58 (3/16/2006).

Hate Crimes

Local Law Enforcement Hate Crime Prevention Act (H.R. 3132)

Rep. John Conyers, D. Mich., proposed an amendment to the Children's Safety Act of 2005 (H.R. 3121) to attach the Local Law Enforcement Hate Crimes Prevention Act (H.R. 2662). The amendment would

eliminate overly-restrictive obstacles to federal involvement in certain hate crimes based on race, national origin, or religion, and would allow federal prosecution of offenses motivated by the victim's sex, disability, or sexual orientation. It also would authorize funds for the Justice Department to assist states and local authorities in investigating and prosecuting hate crimes.

LCCR supported the Conyers amendment because of the need to strengthen existing federal hate crime laws. Across the country, we continue to witness hate crime violence directed toward racial, ethnic, religious, and other minorities, as well as an unfortunate and deeply disturbing rise in the incidence of hate-motivated violence against Arab Americans, Muslims, South Asians and Sikhs. Documentation on hate crime activity makes clear that additional governmental action is necessary to address the problem. While LCCR recognizes that bigotry cannot be legislated out of existence, we strongly believe Congress must do everything possible to empower the federal government to assist in local hate crime prosecutions and, where appropriate, expand existing federal authority to permit a wider range of investigations and prosecutions.

The House passed the motion to amend the Children's Safety Act with the Local Law Enforcement Hate Crimes Prevention Act (223-199). A vote in favor of the motion was counted as a + vote. Roll Call No. 469 (September 14, 2005).

Housing and Lending

Ban on Voter Registration & Participation Efforts in Affordable Housing Legislation (H.R. 1461)

During consideration of H.R. 1461, the Federal Housing Finance Reform Act of 2005, Rep. Michael Oxley, R. Ohio, offered an amendment that included

language to disqualify nonprofit organizations from participating in a new Affordable Housing Fund – a fund meant to increase the supply of affordable homes for low and extremely low-income families – if the organizations have, in the previous twelve months, engaged in nonpartisan voter registration, get-out-the-vote, other voter participation activities, or certain forms of lobbying and grassroots lobbying.

LCCR opposed the amendment. While there is nothing wrong with prohibiting Affordable Housing Fund recipients from using federal dollars for voter registration or other nonpartisan election-related activities, the amendment would prohibit recipients from even using their own separate funds for such efforts. As such, it probably violates the First Amendment. In addition, it would have conflicted with the National Voter Registration Act (“Motor Voter” law), which requires certain nonprofit organizations to register voters – meaning that many organizations would have to choose between their legal obligation to register voters and their ability to provide housing to individuals who need it most.

The House agreed to the amendment (210-205). A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call No. 541 (10/26/2005).

Immigration

Requiring State & Local Governments to Share Information about Immigrants (H.R. 5441)

During consideration of a bill to fund the Department of Homeland Security, Rep. Steve King, R. Iowa, offered an amendment that would prohibit any money in the bill from being spent on state or local governments, if they have restrictions on sharing information with the federal government about an individual’s immigration status.

LCCR opposed the amendment, as it would force state and local police officers to double as federal immigration agents, without providing them with the extensive training necessary for such a role. It would also undermine law enforcement efforts, as undocumented immigrants would be far less likely to report crimes, if they fear being turned over by local police to immigration authorities. Rather than enact measures that treat hardworking immigrants like criminals, Congress should focus its efforts on enacting comprehensive immigration reform.

The House agreed to the amendment (218-179). A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call No. 223 (6/6/2006).

Passage of REAL ID Act (H.R. 418)

Touted by its sponsors as an anti-terrorism measure, the “REAL ID Act”: (1) institutes broad new federal requirements for drivers’ licenses, including a requirement that motor vehicle agencies investigate and verify each piece of ID that an applicant shows as proof of identity; (2) for noncitizens, requires drivers’ licenses to expire on the same date as an applicant’s visa; (3) authorizes the Secretary of Homeland Security to waive “all laws” that might impede the construction of roads and barriers at U.S. borders; and (4) introduces new rules of evidence in asylum cases that will make it more difficult to prove legitimate claims. It also changes the process for appealing some deportation orders in federal court.

LCCR opposed the REAL ID Act. The drivers’ license provisions are extremely burdensome and expensive, for citizens and noncitizens alike, and will do little to reduce the threat of terrorism. Rather than preventing terrorists from boarding planes as they did on September 11, the requirements will increase discrimination and will simply lead to more unlicensed drivers on the roads. The waiver of “all laws” is an extremely disturbing and unprecedented assault on our most basic constitutional principles. Under it, the Secretary can

ignore not only environmental protections, as previous law allowed in limited circumstances, but also any civil rights laws, immigration laws, labor laws or even criminal laws that he unilaterally believes pose a burden. The asylum provisions will prevent many legitimate refugees from obtaining safe haven in the United States, while doing little to prevent terrorism, as terrorists are already barred from asylum or any other immigration benefit.

The House passed the REAL ID Act (261-161). A vote against H.R. 418 was counted as a + vote. H.R. 418 was subsequently attached to an unrelated bill to provide emergency funding for U.S. troops and tsunami relief (H.R. 1268), and was enacted into law. Roll Call No. 31 (2/10/2005).

Border Protection, Antiterrorism, and Illegal Immigration Control Act (H.R. 4437)

In December 2005, the House considered H.R. 4437, an immigration enforcement bill that included a number of extremely harsh and unjustified provisions.

LCCR opposed the measure. Among its many troubling provisions, H.R. 4437 would treat any unlawful presence in the United States, even a visa overstay, as a felony – instantly turning millions of undocumented immigrants into criminals. It would also criminalize anyone who tried to help undocumented immigrants in any way, even by providing humanitarian assistance, and would allow the government to keep immigrants locked up behind bars indefinitely if they cannot be deported to their native countries. H.R. 4437 was just as troubling for what it did not include: a comprehensive approach to immigration reform that would provide safe, effective alternatives for hardworking, non-criminal immigrants to obtain legal status. Instead of controlling unauthorized immigration, H.R. 4437 would simply drive millions of immigrants further underground.

The House passed H.R. 4437 (239-182). A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call No. 661 (12/16/2005).

International Human Rights

Funding for Peacekeeping Efforts in Darfur (H.R. 4939)

During consideration of a bill to provide supplemental appropriations for the war in Iraq, Hurricane Katrina and Rita recovery efforts, and other purposes, Rep. Michael Capuano, D. Mass., offered an amendment to provide an additional \$50 million of funding, in addition to the \$290 million already provided in the bill, for African Union troops who were on a peacekeeping mission in the Darfur region of western Sudan.

LCCR supported the amendment. By the time it was offered, an estimated 400,000 people had died and millions of people had been displaced in Darfur at the hands of the Janjaweed, an armed militia group encouraged by the Sudanese government. A mission by the African Union, an organization comprised of 53 African states, sent 7,700 troops to Darfur to protect civilians from the ongoing genocide. While there have been plans to expand the African Union mission in Darfur into a broader multinational peacekeeping force, its forces were outmanned and outnumbered, making more resources and support necessary.

The House agreed to the amendment (213-208). A vote for it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call No. 46 (3/16/2006).

Judiciary/Legal Rights

Pledge Protection Act (H.R. 2389)

In June 2006, the House considered H.R. 2389, a bill that would deprive all federal courts, including the U.S. Supreme Court, of jurisdiction to consider

any constitutional challenge to the language of the Pledge of Allegiance. The bill was first introduced in response to a 2002 federal appellate court ruling that the phrase “under God” violated the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment.

LCCR opposed H.R. 2389. For decades, the judicial branch has often served as the sole protector of the rights of minority groups against the will of the popular majority. Any law that interferes with this role, by declaring that an issue involving civil rights or liberties is off limits to judicial review, would set a dangerous precedent and could ultimately make it harder for other minority groups to obtain relief when their civil rights have been violated.

The House passed H.R. 2389 (260-167). A vote against it was counted as a + vote. Roll Call No. 385 (7/19/2006).

Federal Marriage Amendment (H.J. Res. 88)

This resolution, if passed by a two-thirds majority of both chambers of Congress and ratified by three-fourths of the states, would amend the U.S. Constitution to prohibit same sex couples from marrying. The Senate had considered and blocked an identical proposal (S.J. Res. 1) the previous month.

LCCR opposed the Federal Marriage Amendment because it would, for the first time in American history, use the Constitution to restrict the rights of citizens rather than expand them. H. J. Res. 88 is highly divisive, wholly unnecessary under current law, and sets an extremely dangerous precedent. It is so far-reaching that it would not only prohibit states from granting equal marriage rights to same sex couples, but may also deprive same sex couples and their families of fundamental legal protections whether conveyed through marriage or other legally recognized partnerships. Such a proposal runs afoul of basic principles of fairness and does little but harm children and families in the process.

The House defeated H.J. Res. 88 (236-187). A vote against H.J. Res. 88 was counted as a + vote. Roll Call No. 378 (7/18/2006).

Veterans’ Memorials, Boy Scouts, Public Seals, and Other Public Expressions of Religion Protection Act of 2006 (H.R. 2679)

This bill would prevent parties who win lawsuits brought under the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment from recovering attorneys fees, and would make injunctive and declaratory relief the only types of remedies available in such cases.

LCCR opposed H.R. 2679. It would, for the first time, single out one area of constitutional protections under the Bill of Rights and prevent its full enforcement. Citizens would be less likely to enforce their rights under the Establishment Clause, because it would become prohibitively expensive to pursue a case without the possibility of recovering attorneys fees or other court costs. As such, it would effectively insulate constitutional violations from judicial review, making it easier for government officials to engage in illegal religious coercion of public school students or in blatant discrimination against particular religions.

The House passed H.R. 2679 (244-173). A vote against H.R. 2679 was recorded as a + vote. Roll Call No. 480 (9/26/2006).

Labor/Working Families/Employment

Job Training Reauthorization -- Religious Preferences (H.R. 27)

During consideration of H.R. 27, a bill to reauthorize the Workforce Investment Act (WIA), Rep. Bobby Scott, D. Va., offered an amendment to strike a provision in the bill that would permit faith-based organizations to use religion as a factor in hiring decisions. The underlying bill allowed faith-based employers who received federal grant dollars under the Work-

force Investment Act to discriminate based on religion when they are hiring employees under the WIA program. The amendment provided that if a religious organization chose to take federal funds to do job training or workforce preparation under the WIA, they cannot then discriminate using those federal funds. The amendment would have retained existing law that allows religious institutions to make hiring decisions based on religion as long as the position for which they are hiring is not funded with federal dollars.

LCCR supported the Scott amendment because of the importance of ensuring that entities that receive federal funds under the Workforce Investment Act are prohibited from engaging in discrimination in employment decisions. The Scott amendment would make clear that the Title VII exemptions for religious organizations remain in effect for privately funded activity, while any organization that accepts funds or grants under the WIA program is prohibited from engaging in employment discrimination for any position that is funded through those taxpayer dollars. The amendment prevented institutions that receive federal funding for job training under H.R. 27 from discriminating when hiring people to deliver the job training. The distinction between publicly-funded and privately-funded activity is important and reinforces a bedrock principle of our nation's civil rights policy: that federal civil rights obligations to prohibit discrimination follow federal dollars, regardless of who receives them.

The House rejected the amendment (186-239). A vote in favor of the amendment was recorded as a + vote. Roll Call No. 46 (3/2/05).

Head Start Reauthorization -- Religious Organizations (H.R. 2123)

During consideration of the School Readiness Act of 2005 (H.R. 2123), Rep. John Boehner, R. Ohio, proposed an amendment that would allow faith-based charities that operate Head Start programs to consider religion as a factor in hiring decisions.

LCCR opposed this amendment because it would roll back 30 years of existing civil rights protections that have always been a part of the bipartisan Head Start program. It would authorize faith-based providers of Head Start programs to discriminate in their hiring practices when spending federal money, and even allow parent volunteers who held different religious beliefs to be excluded from participating in their child's Head Start program. The amendment is unnecessary because religious institutions are already active participants in Head Start and are already exempt from Title VII's religious discrimination prohibition when spending their own money. Even the association representing Head Start providers found the amendment so offensive as to oppose the final passage of the full Head Start reauthorization because the provision was included.

A vote in favor of the amendment was a vote in support of the president's position. A vote against the amendment was counted as a + vote. The House adopted the amendment (220-196). Roll Call No. 492 (9/22/05).

Voting Rights

Federal Election Integrity Act of 2006 (H.R. 4844)

This bill would require anyone voting in a federal election, starting in 2008, to show a government-issued photo identification. Beginning in 2010, any photo ID used for voting would also have to include proof of U.S. citizenship. For most voters, only a U.S. passport (which currently costs \$97) would meet this requirement.

LCCR opposed H.R. 4844. While there is nothing wrong with wanting to ensure that voters are who they claim to be, photo ID requirements – and H.R. 4844 in particular – place an often-severe financial burden on low-income and minority citizens, who

are less likely to have photo ID. Photo ID requirements also give poll workers a tremendous amount of discretion to accept or reject the validity of the photo ID, opening the door to widespread racial and ethnic discrimination at polling places.

The House passed H.R. 4844 (228-196). A vote against H.R. 4844 was counted as a + vote. Second Session Roll Call No. 459 (9/20/2006).

Voting Rights Act Reauthorization and Amendments Act (H.R. 9) – Final Passage

Passage of the bill that would extend expiring provisions of the 1965 Voting Rights Act for 25 years, including a requirement that states with a history of voter discrimination pre-clear any voting law changes with the federal government and a requirement that states provide language assistance to citizens who need it. H.R. 9 is a direct response to the evidence of discrimination that was gathered by the House Judiciary Subcommittee on the Constitution during 10 oversight hearings. The bill addresses this compelling record by renewing the Voting Rights Act's temporary provisions for 25 years; restoring the ability of the Attorney General, under Section 5 of the Act, to block implementation of voting changes motivated by a discriminatory purpose; clarifying that Section 5 is intended to protect the ability of minority citizens to elect their candidates of choice; and authorizing recovery of expert witness fees in lawsuits brought to enforce the Voting Rights Act.

LCCR supported passage of H.R. 9 because the right to vote is the foundation of our democracy and the Voting Rights Act provides the legal basis to protect this right for all Americans.

The House passed H.R. 9 (390-33). A vote in favor of the bill was counted as a + vote. Roll Call No. 374 (07/13/2006)

Voting Rights Act Reauthorization and Amendments Act (H.R. 9) – Bail out Amendment

Rep. Lynn Westmoreland, R. Ga., offered an amendment to the VRARA that would require the Attorney General to annually determine whether each state and political subdivision subject to Section 5 preclearance requirements meets the requirements for bailout. The Attorney General would then be required to inform the public and each state and political subdivision that they are eligible to bail out. Also, the amendment requires that the Attorney General consent to the bail out in federal court.

LCCR opposed the Westmoreland amendment because this profound change to the existing bailout structure would weaken the incentives to comply with the Act and to provide equal voting opportunities. Currently the burden to establish eligibility for bailout appropriately rests with the covered jurisdictions, requiring that those who are uniquely positioned with the evidence prove compliance with the Act. Moreover, requiring an exhaustive annual review of the nearly 900 jurisdictions covered by Section 5 would shut down enforcement of the Voting Rights Act by the Department of Justice.

The House rejected the amendment (118-302). A vote against the amendment was counted as a + vote. Roll Call No. 373 (7/13/06)

Voting Rights Act Reauthorization and Amendments Act (H.R. 9) – Amendment to Repeal Minority Language Provisions of the Act

Rep. Steve King, R. Iowa, offered an amendment to the VRARA that would repeal the requirement in the Voting Rights Act that mandates certain jurisdictions with concentrations of citizens who don't speak English very well to provide language assistance to voters who need it.

LCCR opposed the King amendment because it amounted to an attack on the fundamental right to vote

for millions of American citizens across the country. According to the most recent information from the Census, more than 70 percent of citizens who use language assistance are native born, including American Indians, Alaska natives and Puerto Ricans. The denial of language assistance to citizens who need it amounts to a modern-day literacy test for voting.

*The House rejected the amendment (185-238). A vote against the amendment was counted as a + vote.
Roll Call No. 372 (7/13/06)*

Voting Rights Act Reauthorization and Amendments Act (H.R. 9) – Ten-year extension

Rep. Louie Gohmert, R. Texas, offered an amendment to the VRARA that would reduce the reauthorization period from 25 to 10 years.

LCCR opposed the Gohmert amendment because limiting the extension of the Voting Rights Act to ten years would undermine the Act's goal of eliminating racial discrimination in voting. The evidence presented in the House record demonstrates a level of continued discrimination that is unlikely to be eradicated in 10 years. In the past, when Congress has reauthorized the Act for short periods of time, it created an incentive for jurisdictions to "wait out" their obligations, thus contributing to the widespread non-compliance with the statute that continued into the late 1970s. Further, given the huge investment of Congressional resources in compiling and considering the detailed record necessary for reauthorization, renewing the Act for too short a period would have been inefficient.

*The House rejected the amendment (134-288). A vote against the amendment was counted as a + vote.
Roll Call No. 371 (7/13/06)*

Voting Rights Act Reauthorization and Amendments Act (H.R. 9) – Replace Section 5 coverage formula

Rep. Charles Norwood, R. Ga., offered an amendment to the VRARA that would replace the existing Section 5 coverage formula with one keyed to whether a jurisdiction has a test or device or voter turnout of less than 50 percent in any of the three most recent presidential elections.

LCCR opposed the Norwood amendment because it would amount to a repeal of Section 5, even though voting discrimination continues to occur in the currently covered jurisdictions. In 1965, low registration and turnout numbers were indicators of the problem of discrimination, not the problem itself. The problem is thus solved not by raising turnout, but by ending discrimination. Under current law, jurisdictions that are free from voting discrimination for ten years can bail out of their Section 5 obligations. Any amendment that would de-link Section 5 coverage from a record of discrimination also would have made the statute vulnerable to a constitutional challenge.

*The House rejected the amendment (96-318). A vote against the amendment was counted as a + vote.
Roll Call No. 370 (7/13/06)*

Budget

Permanent Repeal of the Estate Tax (H.R. 8)

Motion to invoke cloture (thus limiting debate) on the motion to proceed to a bill that would permanently repeal the estate tax.

LCCR opposed the motion to invoke cloture. America's working families are already struggling to overcome the challenges of rising health care and housing costs and cuts in public education. A repeal of the estate tax would cost our nation nearly \$1 trillion during the first ten years. Reducing revenues so dramatically would divert needed funds from investments in education, healthcare, and other vital services, such as rebuilding the devastated Gulf Coast. At a time when some Congressional leaders are responding by cutting the safety net for vulnerable Americans, it is reprehensible to grant costly tax breaks to millionaires and billionaires.

The Senate rejected the motion to invoke cloture (57-41). 60 votes are required to invoke cloture. A vote against the motion was counted as a + vote. Roll Call No. 164 (6/8/2006).

Education

Fiscal 2007 Budget Resolution -- After-School Programs (S. Con. Res. 83)

Sen. Barbara Boxer, D. Calif., introduced an amendment (no. 3105) that would raise the discretionary spending limit by \$750 million to allow additional funding for after-school programs. It would be offset by eliminating tax breaks for individuals with annual incomes of more than \$1 million.

LCCR supported the amendment because we believe that successful education reform requires funding for supplemental services like quality after-school programs. In order for the bipartisan No Child Left

Behind Act to succeed, Congress must be willing to invest the necessary funds so that the remedial provisions of the law will help failing schools raise the academic performance of their students. Eliminating tax breaks for the wealthiest Americans is a reasonable way to finance necessary programs for children in need.

The Senate rejected the Boxer amendment to authorize additional funding for after-school programs (43-57). A vote in favor of the amendment was recorded as a + vote. Roll Call No. 69 (3/16/2006)

Fiscal 2007 Budget Resolution -- Title I Grants (S. Con. Res. 83)

Sen. Daniel Akaka, D. Hawaii, introduced an amendment (no. 3071) that would raise the discretionary spending cap by \$3 billion to allow for additional funding for Title I education grants. It would be offset by eliminating certain corporate tax breaks.

LCCR supported the amendment because we believe that Title I is the most important federal education law and it requires full funding. Title I is intended to provide additional federal funding for schools and districts serving the poorest children in the nation. Nationally, approximately 45 percent of education funding is local, most of which is derived from property taxes. Districts serving the lowest income families have significantly lower property values and therefore lower tax bases to provide for educational funding. While LCCR believes that states bear the ultimate responsibility for equalizing funding between districts, the federal government must play a role by boosting funding to the schools and districts in the greatest need, particularly in light of the fact that they have the most work to do to comply with federal accountability requirements.

The Senate rejected the Akaka amendment to raise the spending cap on Title I grants (49-51). A vote in favor of the amendment was recorded as a + vote. Senate Roll Call No. 64 (3/16/2006)

Fiscal 2007 Budget Resolution -- Education Funding (S. Con. Res. 83)

Sen. Edward Kennedy, D. Mass., introduced an amendment (no. 3028) that would increase the discretionary spending limit in the budget by \$6.3 billion to \$879.3 billion to restore education program cuts and increase the maximum Pell Grant award to \$4,500. The additional spending would be offset by closing certain corporate tax loopholes.

LCCR supported the amendment because we believe that Pell Grants are crucial to providing low-income students access to higher education. The maximum Pell Grant amount has not kept up with the rapid increase in the cost of post-secondary education, often closing the door to students with the greatest need. The amendment would also have restored cuts to other education programs at a time when the American educational system is in the greatest need of federal support. Closing federal tax loopholes for corporations that would benefit from a better educated workforce is a reasonable and appropriate way to pay for maintaining crucial education programs.

The Senate rejected the Kennedy amendment to increase Pell Grants and undue budget cuts to education programs (50-50). A vote in favor of the amendment was recorded as a + vote. Roll Call No. 39 (3/14/2006)

Amendment to Increase Elementary and Secondary Education Funding (S. Con. Res. 18)

During consideration of the FY 2006 budget resolution, Senator Jeff Bingaman, D. N.M., proposed an amendment that would increase education funding for FY 2006 by \$4.75 billion, restoring it to fiscal 2005 levels, and reduce the federal debt by \$4.75 billion. It would be offset by a \$9.5 billion reduction in tax cuts.

LCCR supported the amendment because schools and students will continue to struggle to meet the requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act until the bipartisan law is fully funded. The Budget Resolution fell

woefully short of the commitment of financial support that was made when the law was passed. It only spends two cents of every federal dollar on education, and completely eliminates funding for 48 important programs, including the Teacher Quality Enhancement program and the Excellence in Economic Education Act. Full funding of the No Child Left Behind Act should be a national priority.

The Senate rejected the Bingaman amendment to increase education funding (44-49). A vote in favor of the amendment was recorded as a + vote. Roll Call No. 45 (3/14/2005).

Amendment to Increase Higher Education Funding (S. Con. Res. 18)

During consideration of the fiscal year 2006 budget resolution, Senator Kennedy, D. Mass., offered an amendment that would increase the discretionary spending limit in the budget by \$5.4 billion, to a total of \$848.8 billion, in order to increase the maximum Pell Grant award to \$4,500; restore vocational education programs that were facing cuts including Perkins Grants; and expand student loan forgiveness programs for future math and science teachers. It would decrease the five-year tax cut reconciliation instruction figure by \$5.4 billion.

LCCR supported the Kennedy amendment. It is essential that the Pell Grant program continue to provide equal educational opportunity, by increasing the grants in response to continually rising college tuition costs. The Kennedy amendment would make it possible for more low-income children to pursue higher education. The loan forgiveness programs would help to attract and retain 57,000 teachers in math, science, and another woefully understaffed area, special education. Finally, this amendment would ensure the future competitiveness of the workforce by preserving investments in workforce development, adult literacy, and vocational education – giving adults the tools they need to be economically productive.

The Senate adopted the Kennedy amendment (51-49). A vote in favor of the amendment was counted as a + vote. Roll Call No. 68 (3/17/2005).

GLBT

Federal Marriage Amendment (S.J. Res. 1)

This resolution, if passed by a two-thirds majority of both chambers of Congress and ratified by three-fourths of the states, would amend the U.S. Constitution to prohibit same sex couples from marrying. When the Senate leadership attempted to bring S. J. Res. 1 to the floor for consideration, a number of senators objected. In response, Senator Mitch McConnell, R. KY, filed a motion to invoke cloture, which would force the Senate to proceed with the consideration of the proposed amendment. A motion to invoke cloture requires a three-fifths vote (60) of the Senate to succeed.

LCCR opposed the Federal Marriage Amendment because it would, for the first time in American history, use the Constitution to restrict the rights of citizens rather than expand them. S. J. Res. 1 is highly divisive, wholly unnecessary under current law, and sets an extremely dangerous precedent. It is so far-reaching that it would not only prohibit states from granting equal marriage rights to same sex couples, but may also deprive same sex couples and their families of fundamental legal protections whether conveyed through marriage or other legally recognized partnerships. Such a proposal runs afoul of basic principles of fairness, and does little but harm children and families in the process.

The motion to invoke cloture on S. J. Res. 1 failed (49-48). A vote against the motion was counted as a + vote. Roll Call No. 163 (6/7/2006).

Immigration

Requiring Voters to Show “REAL ID” Card (S. 2611)

During consideration of S. 2611, the “Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act of 2006,” Senator Mitch McConnell, R. Ky., offered an amendment that would require all voters, beginning in 2008, to present a new form of high-tech photo ID that states are already expected to produce under the so-called “REAL ID Act of 2005” (Public Law 109-13). Senator Christopher Dodd, D. Conn., moved to table, or kill, the McConnell amendment.

LCCR supported the Dodd motion. LCCR strongly opposed the “REAL ID Act” when it was enacted, and believes its expansion would make a bad law even worse. Under the law, in order for a state ID to be acceptable for federal purposes (including boarding an airplane), the issuing authority must verify that the applicant is legally present in the U.S. and verify all supporting documents (such as a birth certificate) with the issuing agency, among other requirements. The states have estimated that the law will cost \$11 billion to implement, and they are still waiting on federal guidelines before they can move forward. As such, it remains unclear when “REAL ID” cards will become available, or how much they will cost individual applicants. Making the right to vote depend on the implementation of the REAL ID Act, as the McConnell amendment would do, would likely have disastrous consequences for the voting rights of all Americans.

The Dodd motion to table the McConnell amendment failed (48-49), but the amendment was subsequently withdrawn. A vote in favor of the motion was recorded as a + vote. Roll Call No. 143 (5/24/2006).

Path to Legalization for Agricultural Guestworkers (H.R. 1268).

H.R. 1268 was introduced as an emergency measure to provide badly-needed funds for U.S. troops serving in Iraq as well as for tsunami relief efforts. During its consideration, however, the House leadership attached the text of H.R. 418, the REAL ID Act (see House votes). When the bill reached the Senate, and because the bill had now become a vehicle for unrelated immigration amendments, Senators Larry Craig, R. Idaho, and Edward Kennedy, D. Mass., offered the text of the Agricultural Job Opportunity, Benefits, and Security Act of 2005 (“AgJOBS”) as another amendment. AgJOBS is a compromise bill that has been endorsed by both farmworkers and their agricultural employers, as it would give employers a stable labor supply and provide farmworkers – the majority of whom are undocumented – a realistic path to legalization.

LCCR supported the AgJOBS amendment. The treatment of guestworkers is of great importance to the civil rights community, because guestworkers have long faced severe social and economic discrimination as well as a shortage of labor protections. They are subject to below-poverty level wages, non-existent or substandard housing, and a lack of coverage by basic labor standards that other American workers take for granted. The long-overdue AgJOBS bill would significantly improve the status and conditions of agricultural workers. Because opponents of the measure tried to prevent it from getting an up-or-down vote, 60 votes were required in order to invoke “cloture,” or cut off debate and proceed to a vote on the amendment itself.

The motion to invoke cloture on the Craig amendment failed (53-45). A vote in favor of the motion was counted as a + vote. First Session Roll Call No. 98 (4/19/05).

Indigenous Peoples

Native Hawaiian Government Reorganization Act of 2005 (S. 147)

This bill would reaffirm the right of Native Hawaiians to self-determination and would establish a process for federal recognition of a reorganized Native Hawaiian government. Its sponsor, Senator Daniel Akaka, D. Hawaii, had attempted to bring it to the Senate floor, but opponents blocked the measure from being considered. In an effort to move the bill forward, Sen. Akaka moved to invoke cloture, which requires a three-fifths vote in order to succeed.

LCCR supported S. 147. Unlike other indigenous peoples living in the lands that now constitute the United States, Native Hawaiians currently do not have a process for establishing a government-to-government relationship. As it has done with American Indians and Alaska Natives, Congress should formally acknowledge the right of Native Hawaiians to self-determination. While opponents have argued that S. 147 would create a race-based government, such an argument distorts the true purpose of the 14th and 15th Amendments, which were created in order to prohibit discrimination against individuals and were never intended to prevent the political empowerment of a class of sovereign, indigenous people. S. 147 would simply establish parity in the federal government’s treatment of all indigenous peoples.

The motion to invoke cloture on S. 147 failed (56-41). A vote in favor of the motion was recorded as a + vote. Roll Call No. 165 (6/8/2006).

Judiciary/Legal Rights

Confirmation of Jerome A. Holmes

The Senate confirmed President Bush’s nomination of Jerome A. Holmes to serve on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

LCCR opposed the confirmation of Mr. Holmes because he failed to assure senators that he would separate his personal views from how he would rule on cases involving civil and human rights. In a number of published articles, Mr. Holmes has expressed open hostility to affirmative action programs, referring to such policies as a way to sow “the seeds of racial disharmony” and criticizing the Supreme Court for missing “an important opportunity to drive the final nail in the coffin of affirmative action.” He has also expressed troubling views regarding criminal justice, on matters such as wrongful executions and racial bias in the jury system.

The Senate confirmed the nomination of Jerome A. Holmes (67-30). A vote against confirmation was counted as a + vote. Second Session Roll Call Vote No. 213 (7/25/2006).

Confirmation of Brett M. Kavanaugh

The Senate confirmed President Bush’s nomination of Brett M. Kavanaugh of Maryland to be a judge on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

LCCR opposed his confirmation. While serving in the White House Counsel’s office, one of Kavanaugh’s primary responsibilities was helping to select most of President Bush’s most controversial nominees, including Priscilla Owen, Dennis Shedd, Janice Rogers Brown, Miguel Estrada, and William Pryor – nominees whose records strongly suggested they would undermine federal civil and human rights protections. Kavanaugh’s aggressive support for such nominees raises troubling questions about his own legal philosophy. In addition, LCCR was also troubled by Kavanaugh’s lack of legal experience. Of the ten most significant “litigated” matters he reported to the Senate Judiciary Committee, two consisted only of filing friend-of-the-court briefs, and several others did not even involve a court appearance. He has less legal experience than virtually any Republican or Democratic

nominee to the D.C. Circuit in more than 30 years. In short, Kavanaugh’s record displays only the strident workings of a political operative, not the legal experience and judgment necessary to serve as a judge on the nation’s second most important court.

The Senate confirmed the nomination of Brett M. Kavanaugh (57-36). A vote against confirmation was counted as a + vote. Second Session Roll Call Vote No. 159 (5/26/2006).

Confirmation of Samuel A. Alito, Jr.

The Senate leadership moved to invoke cloture and thereby proceed to a vote on confirmation of President Bush’s nomination of Judge Samuel A. Alito of New Jersey to be Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

As explained below in further detail, LCCR opposed the confirmation of Judge Alito because his record revealed a history of troubling decisions in the areas of civil rights, civil liberties, and fundamental freedoms. After only three days of debate on the Senate floor, the Senate leadership moved to cut off all further consideration and proceed to a final vote (“invoke cloture”) on confirmation. Sen. John Kerry, D. Mass., announced he would attempt to prolong debate through a parliamentary tactic known as a filibuster. LCCR supported this filibuster and opposed the motion to invoke cloture because prematurely cutting off debate would unfairly deny the American people their right to fully understand Judge Alito’s record and to communicate with senators. Because Supreme Court justices are appointed for life, the stakes were simply far too high to rush the process.

The Senate invoked cloture on the Alito nomination (72-25). A vote against cloture was counted as a + vote. Second Session Roll Call No. 1 (1/30/06).

Confirmation of Samuel A. Alito, Jr.

The Senate confirmed President Bush's nomination of Judge Samuel A. Alito of New Jersey to be Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

LCCR opposed the confirmation of Judge Alito because his record revealed a history of troubling decisions in the areas of civil rights, civil liberties, and fundamental freedoms, decisions that undermine the power of the Constitution and of Congress to protect the civil and human rights of all Americans. His record raised doubts that he would vigorously uphold our nation's civil rights and labor laws, as his decisions show a pattern of narrowly interpreting such laws and placing greater burdens on civil rights plaintiffs to prove discrimination, thereby making it harder for Congress to protect workers. In cases involving criminal justice, he showed an excessive tendency to defer to police and prosecutors, often at the expense of the constitutional rights of individual Americans, which raises concerns about whether Judge Alito would help enable governmental abuses of power. He showed the same excessive deference to the government in cases involving the rights of immigrants. He also demonstrated a strong tendency to favor "states' rights" over the rights of ordinary Americans, by engaging in an excessively narrow reading of the Commerce Clause and an overly broad reading of state sovereign immunity under the 11th Amendment, undercutting Congress' ability to protect Americans. Finally, his rulings in Establishment Clause cases indicated that he would not fully protect the religious liberties of a very diverse America.

The Senate confirmed the nomination of Judge Samuel A. Alito, Jr. (58-42). A vote against confirmation was counted as a + vote. Second Session Roll Call Vote No. 2 (1/31/2006).

Confirmation of John G. Roberts

The Senate confirmed President Bush's nomination of Judge John G. Roberts of Maryland to be Chief Justice of the United States.

LCCR opposed the confirmation of Judge Roberts because during the course of his professional career, Judge Roberts took an extremely narrow and rigid view of our nation's civil rights laws and consistently demonstrated a clear hostility to broad civil rights protections at odds with mainstream jurisprudence. Specifically, Judge Roberts' background revealed serious efforts to limit the scope of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, including attempts to weaken the law in a manner that would have made it virtually impossible to eliminate discriminatory practices and would have brought voting rights litigation to a grinding halt. Judge Roberts also demonstrated hostility to affirmative action, endorsed views that make it more difficult for the federal government to aid those who are disabled, and argued for narrow interpretations of laws that protect women, minorities and those who have had their federal rights violated. Judge Roberts' record showed an aggressive approach to limiting Congressional authority, troubling views on immigrant rights, and support for court stripping legislation that would make it more difficult for courts to protect vital constitutional rights. Judge Roberts also had a very troubling and dismissive view toward gender discrimination, as indicated by his writings that seemed to deny that gender-based discrimination even existed, his attempts to limit the scope of Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, and his positions that raised serious questions about his willingness to protect women from discrimination. In short, Judge Roberts failed to demonstrate a commitment to protecting individual rights and putting our freedoms, civil rights, and liberties above any political agenda.

The Senate confirmed the nomination of Judge John G. Roberts (78-22). A vote against the confirmation of John G. Roberts was counted as a + vote. Roll Call Vote No. 245 (9/29/2005).

Confirmation of Thomas Griffith

The Senate confirmed President Bush's nomination of Thomas Griffith of Utah to be a judge on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

LCCR opposed the confirmation of Thomas Griffith because of his extremely troubling views on educational equity for women and girls and the implications those views had for the continued vigorous enforcement of our nation's civil rights laws. While serving on the Commission on Opportunity in Athletics ("Title IX Commission"), Griffith supported a series of recommendations that would have seriously weakened Title IX. He made a recommendation to the Title IX Commission that would have abolished a vital component of the law that guarantees that male and female students are provided with equal opportunities. If successful, Mr. Griffith's proposal would have eliminated the critical tool schools use to make sure that male and female athletes are getting athletic opportunities in proportion to their representation in the student body. Mr. Griffith's approach and opposition to numeric measures raised serious concerns about what actions, if any, he would find appropriate to remedy and prevent discrimination.

The Senate confirmed the nomination of Thomas Griffith (73-24). A vote against the confirmation of Thomas Griffith was counted as a + vote. Roll Call No. 136 (6/14/2005).

Confirmation of Alberto R. Gonzales

The Senate confirmed President Bush's nomination of White House Counsel Alberto R. Gonzales to be Attorney General.

LCCR opposed Alberto Gonzales' confirmation as Attorney General for several reasons. First, even though serious concerns had been raised about Gonzales' handling of death penalty cases while he served as counsel to then-Governor Bush, Gonzales failed to assure the Senate that he would administer death penalty cases

fairly and in accordance with the law. Second, Gonzales failed to fully answer a wide range of questions regarding civil rights and liberties issues, suggesting that such issues would be low on his list of priorities. Finally, he failed to clarify his role or release important documents related to the administration's policy on torture, detention, and interrogation in the war on terror, a policy that appears to have paved the way for the horrific incidents at Abu Ghraib and Guantanamo.

The Senate confirmed the nomination of Alberto R. Gonzales (60-36). A vote against the confirmation of Alberto R. Gonzales was counted as a + vote. Roll Call No. 3 (2/3/2005).

Confirmation of Priscilla R. Owen

The Senate confirmed President Bush's nomination of Priscilla R. Owen of Texas to be a judge for the U.S. Court of Appeals on the Fifth Circuit.

LCCR opposed the nomination of Priscilla Owen because her record on the Texas Supreme Court revealed her to be an extremely conservative judicial activist with a particularly troubling record and extreme views on important civil rights, workers' rights, consumer rights, and women's rights issues that are outside the mainstream of judicial thought. Owen's immoderate positions and tendency toward conservative judicial activism should have disqualified Priscilla Owen from serious consideration for any federal court, much less the important Fifth Circuit. The Fifth Circuit, composed of Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas, has the largest percentage of African Americans and Hispanics of any federal circuit court in the country. It has also, in recent years, become one of the two most conservative federal circuit courts in the country and has issued many of the most extreme anti-civil rights rulings in the country.

The Senate confirmed the nomination of Priscilla R. Owen (55-43). A vote against the confirmation of Priscilla R. Owen was counted as a + vote. Roll Call No. 128 (5/25/05).

Confirmation of Janice Rogers Brown

The Senate confirmed President Bush's nomination of Janice Rogers Brown to be a judge on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

LCCR opposed the nomination of Janice Rogers Brown because her record as a California Supreme Court justice demonstrated a strong, persistent, and disturbing hostility toward affirmative action, civil rights, the rights of individuals with disabilities, workers' rights, and the fairness of the criminal justice system. Her views were so far out of the judicial mainstream that she was not fit for a lifetime appointment to the federal bench. Her record demonstrated an inability to dispassionately review cases, and her opinions were based on her extremist ideology that ignored judicial precedent, even that set by the United States Supreme Court.

The Senate confirmed the nomination of Janice Rogers Brown (56-43). A vote against the confirmation of Janice Rogers Brown was counted as a + vote. Roll Call No. 131 (6/8/05).

Confirmation of William H. Pryor, Jr.

The Senate confirmed President Bush's nomination of William H. Pryor, Jr. of Alabama to be a judge on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 11th Circuit.

LCCR opposed the nomination of William H. Pryor, Jr. because his record revealed him to be an ultra-conservative legal activist whose record disqualified him from a lifetime appointment to the federal judiciary. Pryor's record of hostility to important civil rights principles, including his leadership in the so-called "states' rights" movement that seeks to take away Congress' power to enact legislation protecting the rights of individuals to be free from discrimination, was sufficient to reject his confirmation to the Eleventh Circuit.

The Senate confirmed the nomination of William H. Pryor, Jr. (53-45). A vote against the confirmation of William H. Pryor, Jr. was counted as a + vote. Roll Call No. 133 (6/9/05).

Labor/Working Families**Amendment to Increase the Minimum Wage (S. 2766)**

Senator Kennedy, D. Mass, proposed an amendment to the fiscal 2007 Defense Authorization bill (S. 2766) to raise the minimum wage to \$6.55 per hour 12 months later and to \$7.25 per hour the following year.

LCCR supported the Kennedy amendment because our nation's workers are long overdue for an increase in the minimum wage. When adjusted for inflation, the current minimum wage of \$5.15 per hour is the second lowest minimum wage in 45 years. As such, full time workers who earn the current minimum wage – who are disproportionately women, racial and ethnic minorities and older Americans – are likely to remain locked below the poverty line. A meaningful increase in the minimum wage is critical to the long term economic health and stability of millions of American families.

The Senate rejected the Kennedy amendment (52-46). Note: By unanimous consent, the Senate agreed to raise the majority requirement for adoption of the Kennedy amendment to 60 votes. A vote in favor of the Kennedy amendment was counted as a + vote. Roll Call No. 179. (6/21/2006).

Class Action Overhaul-Civil Rights and Labor Exemption (S. 5)

Senators Kennedy, D. Mass., and Cantwell, D. Wash., proposed an amendment to the Class Action Fairness Act (S. 5) that would have exempted civil rights and wage-and-hour state law cases from the provisions of the bill that would limit the ability of plaintiffs to bring class action lawsuits in state court.

LCCR supported the amendment because it would have protected the rights of workers and victims of discrimination to effectively vindicate their claims. By allowing dozens of individuals to bring one lawsuit together, class action lawsuits are frequently the only means for low wage workers and victims of discrimination to obtain relief. Class actions level the playing field between individuals and those with more power and resources, and permit courts to decide cases more efficiently. Requiring state law class action suits to be heard in already-overburdened federal courts, as S. 5 will do, will delay and often deny justice for working men and women and victims of discrimination.

The Senate rejected the Kennedy motion (40-59). A vote in favor of the motion was counted as a + vote. Roll Call No. 6 (2/9/2005).

Poverty/Welfare

Additional Funding for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (S. Con. Res. 83)

Senator Jack Reed, D. RI, sponsored an amendment to the Fiscal 2007 Budget Resolution that would raise the discretionary spending limit by \$3.3 billion to allow an increase in funding for the Low Income Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP). The increase would be offset by eliminating certain corporate tax breaks.

LCCR supported the Reed amendment because without adequate funding for LIHEAP, many low-income and older Americans will be at risk in the winter. Many LIHEAP recipients are “working poor” or older Americans who do not receive any other public assistance, such as food stamps or subsidized housing. The LIHEAP program provides vital assistance to these individuals and families, particularly as the cost of fuel to heat homes has increased dramatically in recent years. Low-income and older Americans are more likely to live in older, poorly insulated homes and are therefore at a higher risk of hypothermia. Among

low-income households, the proportion of income expended for energy is 3-4 times that spent by households generally.

The Senate adopted the Reed amendment (51-49). A vote in favor of the amendment was counted as a + vote. Roll Call No. 57 (3/16/2006).

The Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act (S. 256)

This bill makes it more difficult for families who are facing economic catastrophe to discharge their debts and start over with a clean slate. As such, it poses significant concerns for the economic self-sufficiency of all working people – particularly racial and ethnic minorities, the elderly and women, who are more likely to face financial hardships that lead to bankruptcy. In addition, hundreds of thousands of women and children who are owed child support or alimony will be harmed under S. 256, as it forces them to compete with credit card issuers for the assets of an individual who has filed for bankruptcy protection. Finally, the bill also fails to address one of the key reasons that bankruptcy filings have increased in recent years: the aggressive marketing of credit cards to our most financially vulnerable citizens, including women, students, seniors, and the working poor.

LCCR opposed S.256 because it will radically alter the bankruptcy system in a way that imposes hardships particularly on the most vulnerable populations. Supporters claim that S. 256 is necessary to prevent the abuse of bankruptcy laws. Yet most people who file are not abusing the system; rather, they have experienced financial catastrophe. For too many people, S. 256 would make starting over virtually impossible.

The Senate passed S. 256 (74-25), which became law on April 20, 2005. A vote against final passage was counted as a + vote. Roll Call No. 44 (3/10/2005).

Amendment to Deter Predatory Lending Practices (S. 256)

During consideration of the Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act (S. 256), Senator Richard Durbin, D. Ill., added an amendment that would prohibit high cost mortgage lenders from collecting on their claims in bankruptcy court if they extend credit in violation of the Truth in Lending Act.

LCCR supported the Durbin amendment because predatory lending is one of the greatest threats to many Americans who are on the road to financial security. Victims of abusive lending practices are much more likely to be minority and lower-income borrowers, female single heads of households, and the elderly. By trapping these individuals into unfair mortgages and other loan agreements, predatory lenders deprive many low-income and minority Americans of the opportunity to own and enjoy a home of their own.

The Senate defeated the Durbin amendment (40-58). A vote in favor of the amendment was counted as a + vote. Roll Call No. 22 (3/3/2005).

Social Security

Fiscal 2006 Budget Resolution -- Social Security (S. Con. Res. 18)

Senator Bill Nelson, D. Fla., proposed an amendment to the budget that would express the sense of the Senate that Congress should reject any Social Security plan that requires deep benefit cuts or a massive increase in the federal debt. It also would urge Congress to take action to address Social Security solvency.

LCCR supported the amendment to the budget resolution because of our opposition to the deep cuts in Social Security's guaranteed benefits that have been proposed by the administration and in Congress. We oppose both the cuts to guaranteed benefits that would accompany any plan to privatize

Social Security and the vast cuts to working class and middle class benefits that would result from various price-indexing proposals. LCCR also strongly opposes Social Security proposals that would create huge increases in the federal debt, particularly those caused by financing private accounts, because they would create enormous fiscal pressure on other crucial social programs, particularly Medicaid.

The Senate rejected the amendment to the budget resolution (50-50). A vote in favor of the amendment was counted as a + vote. Roll Call No. 49 (03/15/2005).

Voting Rights

Voting Rights Act Reauthorization and Amendments Act (H.R. 9) – Final Passage

Passage of the bill that would extend expiring provisions of the 1965 Voting Rights Act for 25 years, including a requirement that states with a history of voter discrimination pre-clear any voting law changes with the federal government and a requirement that states provide language assistance to citizens who need it.

H.R. 9 is a direct response to the evidence of discrimination that was gathered by the House Judiciary Subcommittee on the Constitution during 10 oversight hearings. The bill addresses this compelling record by renewing the Voting Rights Act's temporary provisions for 25 years; restoring the ability of the Attorney General, under Section 5 of the Act, to block implementation of voting changes motivated by a discriminatory purpose; clarifying that Section 5 is intended to protect the ability of minority citizens to elect their candidates of choice; and authorizing recovery of expert witness fees in lawsuits brought to enforce the Voting Rights Act.

LCCR supported passage of H.R. 9 because the right to vote is the foundation of our democracy and the

Voting Rights Act provides the legal basis to protect this right for all Americans.

*The Senate passed H.R. 9 (98-0). A vote in favor of the bill was counted as a + vote.
Roll Call No. 212 (07/20/2006)*

House Votes

	All	Report	IMM	REL. PREF	NASA	HATE CRIMES	HEAD START	GSE	LABOR HHS	BUDGET	BORDER	PEACEKEEPING	ELECTION	HIGHER ED	DEM. SUBSTITUTE	HOMELAND SEC	VRA PRE CLEAR	VRA REAUTH PERIOD	BILINGUAL VOTING	PRE CLEAR LIST	VRA PASSAGE	SAME SEX	PLEDGE	VOTER ID	PERA		
	Positions	Total																									
Alabama																											
Aderholt (R)	4%	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Bachus, S. (R)	9%	9%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Bonner (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Cramer (D)	65%	65%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Davis, A. (D)	91%	87%	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	X	-	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	-	
Everett (R)	4%	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Rogers, Mike D. (R)	22%	22%	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Alaska																											
Young, D. (R)	27%	26%	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	X	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	-	-	
Arizona																											
Flake (R)	17%	17%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	-	
Franks, T. (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Grijalva (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
Hayworth (R)	9%	9%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Kobe (R)	35%	35%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	(+)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Pastor (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
Renzi (R)	35%	35%	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
Shadegg (R)	9%	9%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Arkansas																											
Berry (D)	70%	70%	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	
Boozman (R)	18%	17%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	X	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Ross (D)	74%	74%	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	
Snyder (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
California																											
Baca (D)	100%	96%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	X	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
Becerra (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	

House Votes

	All	Report	IMM	REL. PREF	NASA	HATE CRIMES	HEAD START	GSE	LABOR HHS	BUDGET	BORDER	PEACEKEEPING	ELECTION	HIGHER ED	DEM. SUBSTITUTE	HOMELAND SEC	VRA PRE CLEAR	VRA REAUTH PERIOD	BILINGUAL VOTING	PRE CLEAR LIST	VRA PASSAGE	SAME SEX	PLEDGE	VOTER ID	PERA
	Positions	Total																							
Matsui, D. (D)	100%	91%	1	1	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
McKeon (R)	9%	9%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Millender-McDonald (D)	95%	87%	+	X	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	X
Miller, George (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Miller, Gary (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Napolitano (D)	100%	91%	+	X	+	+	+	+	+	+	X	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Nunes (R)	23%	22%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	X	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
Pelosi (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Pombo (R)	27%	26%	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	(-)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	X
Radanovich (R)	18%	17%	-	-	X	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	-
Rohrabacher (R)	4%	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Roybal-Allard (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Royce (R)	5%	4%	-	-	-	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sanchez, Linda (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Sanchez, Loretta (D)	95%	91%	X	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Schiff (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Sherman (D)	100%	96%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	X	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Soles (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Stark (D)	100%	96%	+	+	X	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Tauscher (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Thomas, B. (R)	29%	26%	-	-	X	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
Thompson, M. (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Waters (D)	100%	96%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Watson (D)	100%	91%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	X	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Waxman (D)	100%	96%	+	+	X	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Woolsey (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	(+)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

House Votes

	All	Report	IMM	REL. PREF	NASA	HATE CRIMES	HEAD START	GSE	LABOR HHS	BUDGET	BORDER	PEACEKEEPING	ELECTION	HIGHER ED	DEM. SUBSTITUTE	HOMELAND SEC	VRA PRE CLEAR	VRA REAUTH PERIOD	BILINGUAL VOTING	PRE CLEAR LIST	VRA PASSAGE	SAME SEX	PLEDGE	VOTER ID	PERA		
	Positions	Total																									
Harris (R)	15%	13%	-	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	X	+	-	X	+	-	-	-	-		
Hastings, A. (D)	100%	87%	+	+	X	+	+	+	+	+	+	X	X	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		
Keller (R)	5%	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	X	-		
Mack (R)	9%	9%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Meek, K. (D)	100%	96%	+	+	+	+	+	X	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		
Mica (R)	17%	17%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-		
Miller, J. (R)	18%	17%	-	-	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	(-)	(+)	+	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-		
Putnam (R)	4%	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Ros-Lehtinen (R)	50%	48%	+	-	-	+	-	X	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	-		
Shaw (R)	23%	22%	-	-	-	-	-	X	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-		
Stearns (R)	9%	9%	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Wasserman-Schultz (D)	100%	96%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	X	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		
Weldon, D. (R)	5%	4%	-	-	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Wekler (D)	100%	91%	+	+	X	+	+	X	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		
Young, C.W. (R)	14%	13%	-	-	X	-	-	-	-	-	X	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-		
Georgia																											
Barrow (D)	61%	61%	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		
Bishop, S. (D)	86%	83%	-	+	+	+	+	X	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		
Deal (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Gingrey (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Kingston (R)	5%	4%	-	-	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Lewis, John (D)	100%	96%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	X		
Linder (R)	4%	4%	-	-	(-)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Marshal (D)	55%	52%	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	X	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-		
Mckinney (D)	100%	91%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		
Norwood (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		

House Votes

	All	Report	IMM	REL. PREF	NASA	HATE CRIMES	HEAD START	GSE	LABOR HHS	BUDGET	BORDER	PEACEKEEPING	ELECTION	HIGHER ED	DEM. SUBSTITUTE	HOMELAND SEC	VRA PRE CLEAR	VRA REAUTH PERIOD	BILINGUAL VOTING	PRE CLEAR LIST	VRA PASSAGE	SAME SEX	PLEDGE	VOTER ID	PERA		
	Positions	Total																									
Shinkus (R)	13%	13%	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Weller (R)	22%	22%	-	-	-	+	(-)	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Indiana																											
Burton (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Buyer (R)	23%	22%	-	-	-	-	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Carson, J. (D)	100%	96%	+	X	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
Chocola (R)	9%	9%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Hostettler (R)	9%	9%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Pence (R)	9%	9%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	(-)	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Sodrel (R)	13%	13%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Souder (R)	17%	17%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Visclosky (D)	96%	96%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
Iowa																											
Boswell (D)	89%	74%	+	+	+	+	X	X	X	X	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
King, S. (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Latham (R)	22%	22%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
Leach (R)	65%	65%	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
Nussle (R)	25%	22%	-	-	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	X	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	X	
Kansas																											
Moore, D. (D)	95%	91%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
Moran, Jerry (R)	26%	26%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
Ryun, J. (R)	4%	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Tiaht (R)	5%	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	X	X	X	X	(+)	-	-	-	-	-	
Kentucky																											
Chandler (D)	70%	70%	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
Davis, G. (R)	22%	22%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
Lewis, R. (R)	17%	17%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	

House Votes

	All	Report	IMM	REL. PREF	NASA	HATE CRIMES	HEAD START	GSE	LABOR HHS	BUDGET	BORDER	PEACEKEEPING	ELECTION	HIGHER ED	DEM. SUBSTITUTE	HOMELAND SEC	VRA PRE CLEAR	VRA REAUTH PERIOD	BILINGUAL VOTING	PRE CLEAR LIST	VRA PASSAGE	SAME SEX	PLEDGE	VOTER ID	PERA		
	Positions	Total																									
Northrup (R)	6%	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	-		
Rogers, H. (R)	13%	13%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Whitfield (R)	9%	9%	-	-	-	-	-	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Louisiana																											
Alexander, R. (R)	9%	9%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Baker (R)	5%	4%	-	-	-	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Boustany (R)	26%	26%	-	-	-	-	(-)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Jefferson (D)	95%	87%	-	-	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Jindal (R)	13%	13%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
McCrey (R)	22%	22%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Melancon (D)	73%	70%	-	-	-	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Maine																											
Allen, T. (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		
Michaud (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		
Maryland																											
Bartlett (R)	5%	4%	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Cardin (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		
Cummings (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		
Gilchrist (R)	45%	39%	-	-	-	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Hoyer (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		
Ruppersberger (D)	100%	91%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		
Van Hollen (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		
Wynn (D)	96%	96%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		
Massachusetts																											
Capuano (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		
Delahunt (D)	100%	96%	+	+	X	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		
Frank, B. (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		

House Votes

	All	Report	IMM	REL. PREF	NASA	HATE CRIMES	HEAD START	GSE	LABOR HHS	BUDGET	BORDER	PEACEKEEPING	ELECTION	HIGHER ED	DEM. SUBSTITUTE	HOMELAND SEC	VRA PRE CLEAR	VRA REAUTH PERIOD	BILINGUAL VOTING	PRE CLEAR LIST	VRA PASSAGE	SAME SEX	PLEDGE	VOTER ID	PERA	
	Positions	Total																								
North Carolina																										
Butterfield (D)	96%	96%	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
Coble (R)	4%	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Etheridge (D)	91%	91%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
Foxx (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Hayes (R)	22%	22%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Jones, W. (R)	13%	13%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
McHenry (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
McIntyre (D)	70%	70%	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
Miller, B. (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
Myrick (R)	4%	4%	-	-	(-)	(-)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Price, D. (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
Taylor, C. (R)	9%	9%	-	-	(-)	(-)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Watt (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
North Dakota																										
Pomeroy (D)	96%	96%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
Ohio																										
Boehner (R)	22%	22%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Brown, S. (D)	100%	96%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	(+)	+	+	X	
Chabot (R)	22%	22%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Gillmor (R)	14%	13%	-	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Hobson (R)	30%	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Jones, S. (D)	100%	96%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	X	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
Kaptur (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
Kucinich (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
LaTourrette (R)	26%	26%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Ney (R)	43%	39%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	X	

House Votes

	All	Report	IMM	REL. PREF	NASA	HATE CRIMES	HEAD START	GSE	LABOR HHS	BUDGET	BORDER	PEACEKEEPING	ELECTION	HIGHER ED	DEM. SUBSTITUTE	HOMELAND SEC	VRA PRE CLEAR	VRA REAUTH PERIOD	BILINGUAL VOTING	PRE CLEAR LIST	VRA PASSAGE	SAME SEX	PLEDGE	VOTER ID	PERA
	Positions	Total																							
Hall (R)	4%	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hensaring (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hinojosa (D)	86%	78%	(+)	+	X	+	X	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Jackson-Lee, S. (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Johnson, Sam (R)	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Johnson, E. (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	X	+	+	+
Marchant (R)	9%	9%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
McGaul (R)	9%	9%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Neugebauer (R)	4%	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ortiz (D)	91%	91%	+	+	+	+	(+)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-
Paul (R)	22%	22%	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Poe (R)	4%	4%	-	-	-	-	(-)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Reyes (D)	100%	91%	+	+	+	+	+	X	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	X	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Sessions, P. (R)	5%	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Smith, L. (R)	9%	9%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Thorberry (R)	4%	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Utah																									
Bishop, R. (R)	9%	9%	-	-	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cannon (R)	23%	22%	-	-	-	-	-	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Matheson (D)	74%	74%	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Vermont																									
Sanders (I)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Virginia																									
Boucher (D)	78%	78%	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Cantor (R)	4%	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Davis, Jo Ann (R)	6%	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	(-)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Davis, T. (R)	26%	26%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-

House Votes

	All	Report	IMM	REL. PREF	NASA	HATE CRIMES	HEAD START	GSE	LABOR HHS	BUDGET	BORDER	PEACEKEEPING	ELECTION	HIGHER ED	DEM. SUBSTITUTE	HOMELAND SEC	VRA PRE CLEAR	VRA REAUTH PERIOD	BILINGUAL VOTING	PRE CLEAR LIST	VRA PASSAGE	SAME SEX	PLEDGE	VOTER ID	PERA	
	Positions	Total																								
Drake (R)	22%	22%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Forbes (R)	30%	30%	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Goode (R)	4%	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Goodlatte (R)	9%	9%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Moran, James (D)	100%	96%	+	+	+	+	+	X	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Scott, R. (D)	100%	96%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	(+)	+	+	X	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Wolf (R)	22%	22%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Washington																										
Baird (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Dicks (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Hastings, D. (R)	9%	9%	-	-	-	-	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Inslee (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Larsen, R. (D)	96%	96%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
McDermott (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
McMorris (R)	5%	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Reichert (R)	43%	43%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Smith, A. (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
West Virginia																										
Capito (R)	22%	22%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mollohan (D)	83%	83%	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Rahall (D)	83%	83%	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Wisconsin																										
Baldwin (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Green, M. (R)	26%	26%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kind (D)	100%	91%	+	+	+	+	X	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Moore, G. (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Obay (D)	100%	100%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

Senate Votes

	All Positions	Report Total	Gonzales	Class Action	Predatory Lending	Bankruptcy	Education Funding I	Social Security	Education Funding II	Approps	Owen	Brown	Pryor	Griffith	Roberts	Alito Cloture	Alito Confirmation	Education Funding III	LIHEAP	Title I Grants	After School	Voter ID	Kavanaugh	Same Sex	Estate Tax	Native Hawaiians	Min Wage	VRA	Holmes
Alabama																													
Sessions, J. (R)	4%	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Shelby (R)	4%	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	X	-	-	
Alaska																													
Murkowski (R)	8%	7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stevens (R)	8%	7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Arizona																													
Kyl (R)	7%	7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
McCain (R)	15%	15%	-	-	-	-	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Arkansas																													
Lincoln (D)	78%	78%	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
Pryor (D)	78%	78%	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
California																													
Boxer (D)	100%	96%	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	X	+	+	+	+	+	+
Feinstein (D)	88%	85%	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	X
Colorado																													
Allard (R)	4%	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Salazar, K. (D)	81%	81%	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	(+)	+	+	+	+	+	+
Connecticut																													
Dodd (D)	88%	85%	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	X	+	+	+	+	+
Lieberman (D)	85%	81%	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	X
Delaware																													
Biden (D)	89%	89%	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Carper (D)	67%	67%	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Florida																													
Martinez (R)	7%	7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nelson, Bill (D)	78%	78%	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

Senate Votes

	All	Report		
	Positions	Total		
			Gonzales	
			Class Action	
			Predatory Lending	
			Bankruptcy	
			Education Funding I	
			Social Security	
			Education Funding II	
			Approps	
			Owen	
			Brown	
			Pryor	
			Griffith	
			Roberts	
			Alito Cloture	
			Alito Confirmation	
			Education Funding III	
			LIHEAP	
			Title I Grants	
			After School	
			Voter ID	
			Kavanaugh	
			Same Sex	
			Estate Tax	
			Native Hawaiians	
			Min Wage	
			VRA	
			Holmes	
Nevada				
Ensign (R)	4%	4%	-	-
Reid, H. (D)	93%	93%	+	+
New Hampshire				
Gregg (R)	7%	7%	-	-
Sununu (R)	12%	11%	-	X
New Jersey				
Corzine (D)	100%	44%	+	+
Lautenberg (D)	100%	100%	+	+
Mendez (D)	100%	52%	-	-
New Mexico				
Bingaman (D)	81%	81%	+	+
Domenici (R)	11%	11%	-	-
New York				
Clinton (D)	100%	93%	+	+
Schumer (D)	96%	89%	+	+
North Carolina				
Burr (R)	4%	4%	-	-
Dole (R)	4%	4%	-	-
North Dakota				
Conrad (D)	72%	67%	X	+
Dorgan (D)	81%	81%	+	+
Ohio				
DeWine (R)	37%	37%	-	-
Voinovich (R)	15%	15%	-	-
Oklahoma				
Coburn (R)	4%	4%	-	-



Leadership Conference on
Civil Rights
1629 K Street NW, 10th Floor
Washington DC, 20006

www.civilrights.org