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Roll Call Votes: VotevieW
Roll call votes are not a panacea (this is discussed below). But they often tell us interesting things about an
issue or a point in time.
Many issues we might consider conservative or liberal today were not ideological or at least differed years ago.
Roll call votes can help us characterize the ideology of an issue or vote. Comparing two votes on the same or a
similar issue can tell us how attitudes have shifted.

| For example, the figure on the left is a Senate vote on the assault weapons ban in 1993. It passed $57-43$. The |
| :--- |
| red triangles pointed up represent the 10 Republican votes in support. The blue triangles pointed down are the |
| nine Democrats who voted no. |
| The figure on the right is a Senate vote on the assault weapons ban twenty years later. It failed 41-60. Only one |
| Senate Republican voted yes. 15 Democrats voted no. These figures suggest that the Senate has gotten more |
| conservative on this issue. |
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For example, the figure on the left is a Senate vote on the assautt weapons ban in 1993. It passed 57-43. The nine

The figure on the right is a Senate vote on the assault weapons ban twenty years later. It failed 41-60. Only one Senate Republican voted yes. 15 Democrats voted no. These figures suggest that the Senate has gotten mor
conservative on this issue.
Roll Call Votes: Voteview
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How do you find votes using Voteview? First, don't hesitate to use links if I
$\qquad$ provided them. Second, go to www.Voteview.com

## Roll Call Votes: Voteview



Roll Call Votes: Voteview


Clicking on the vote, we immediately see the vote description, party breakdown and a graph of the regional breakdown. As we might expect, this looks like the bill fell largely down geographic, not party lines.

The most northern Democratic no vote came from a member representing Missouri.
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| The amending process on the |
| :--- |
| Senate floor is crazy. |
| Individual members have a great <br> deal of leverage, so we see a large <br> number of amendments offered and <br> voted on in the Senate. <br> Most are of the position-taking <br> variety. Why do this? <br> Some will be bills offered "as <br> amendments." |
| Can be offered as motions to strike, strike and insert, etc....A major job for <br> staffers and interns is summarizing amendments and writing vote <br> recommendations for their members. Unlike bills, where members have a <br> great deal of notice and information from committee mark-ups, introductory <br> speeches, lobbyists and party leaders, amendments are often offered with no <br> supplemental information and very little time to process. |

amendments that members offe amendments that members off recognized to offer their mendments, members can off nu fro blo amendme to vote
As a general rule, a measure being considered on the House or Senate floor is open to
amendment in only two degrees.
Amendment trees are the graphic ways of depicting these possible situations.
One such tree is presented in the adjacent Figure

$\qquad$
NewS__Filling the Amendment Tree
Roll Call 10/27/14- Senate Majority Leader Harry
Reid's decision to avoid tough votes this year has
backfired in one respect - it gave his vulnerable
incumbents few opportunities to show off any
independence from President Barack Obama.
As senior writer Shawn Zeller writes in this week's
CQ Weekly cover story, Democrats who have
been distancing themselves from Obama on the
campaign trail not in votes on the Senate floor -
whether it be Mark Udall of Colorado, Mark Pryor
of Arkansas or Mary L. Landrieu of Louisiana:
Udall disagreed just once, on a Pennsylvania state judge's nomination to a federal district
court. Pryor parted with Obama three times, and Landrieu four, but only one of those
votes was on a policy matter. In July, Landrieu voted against Obama's request for $\$ 2.7$
billion to deal with the surge of Latin American children entering the U.S. illegally.
Indeed, all of the most vulnerable Democrats voted with President Obama at least 96
percent of the time on the 120 votes on which Obama has urged a "yes" or "no" vote.
Reid clamped down on amendments more than ever this year and the bills he brought to
the floor were aimed at unifying Democrats and putting Republicans on defense - like a
minimum wage hike, an unemployment extension, pay equity or refinancing student loans

- rather than bills that would lead to Democratic defections.



## Staff and The Vitter Amendment

- Effectively barred the federal government from making contributions and sparked an acrimonious debate over the role of congressional staff
- "...a special bailout for Washington, to ensure Washington doesn't have to live by the same rules, in this case with regard to Obama Care and the exchanges, that all of America does..."
- Summing up many staffers attitudes, a
 former Republican staffer referred to the proposal as a "big middle finger to folks who give up their entire lives for what is now a very crappy job."


## House Freedom Caucus and Open Amending



One demand was a return to "regular order." Republican senators were asking for the same while they were in the minority. "Regular order" is a vague concept, but most consistently, those asking for it don't want party leaders to restrict them from offering floor amendments to bills. No one knows yet what will come of these demands. But it hasn't happened yet in the Senate, if that's any indication of what migh Ky.), has led the Senate to consider many more amendments than did his predecessor, Sen. Harry Reid (D-Nev.). But members of both parties have still criticized McConnell sharply for shutting off amendments on several important bills.

Here's the problem with calls for making it easier for members to amend bills. As we show in our recent white paper, members behave much differently than they once did when allowed the freedom to act independently on the floor. These changes make party leaders' jobs much more difficult, at a time when leaders also need to deal with increased time demands stemming from a heavier overall workload and members' need to spend more time in their districts campaigning and raising reelection

House Freedom Caucus and Open Amending


To evaluate how members behavior has changed over time, we took advantage of a new dataset on congressional amendments and roll calls from the University of Georgia Amending Project. Since 2010 53 undergraduate students and two high-school students have worked with two faculty members and eight graduate students to collect data on 29,860 amendments to 497 landmark enactments across 40 Congresses, from the 45 th ( $1877-1878$ ) through the 111 th (2009-2010). The data include information on, among other things, how an amendment was dispensed with (roll call vote, division, teller, voice
withdrawn, not voted on); whether it was offered by way of a motion to recommit; whether it was dispensed with by some other procedure (a point of order, motion to table, failed cloture vote, etc.): whether it passed or failed; what it sought to amend (i.e., the bill, another amendment); who the sponsor was; and if it was offered on behalf of a committee.
While the data are preliminary, we found substantial shifts in senators' approach to amending bills. For one thing, the number of amendments filed for each landmark bill passed has generally increased. For another, the amending process has gotten steadily more partisan. The figure shows the percentage of non-committee amendments sponsored by minority-party senators.

House Freedom Caucus and Open Amending
Most of these minority-party amendments fail on the floor - and
senators generally know that even before they're offered. So why bother? Because their real purpose is electoral messaging Perhaps the most famous recent electoral-messaging amendment was from Sen. Tom Coburn (R-Okla.) to bar
Affordable Care Act premium subsidies to plans that cove Afiordable for child molesters and rapists. Democrats dubbed it a "crass political stunt." Republicans featured the vote in electoral
ads. ads.
But in addition to forcing members to take difficult votes, such But in addition to forcing members to take difficicult votes, such
amendments also burden party leaders with far more demands on their time. That's made still worse by the rapid increase in how many amendments are now subjected to roll calls. The default voting mechanism in Congress is the unrecorded voice
 vote. Those votes usually go quickly, and no records are kept who voted how.
But there's a catch. The Constitution's Article I, Section 5 specifically states: "the yeas and nays of the members of either House on any question shall, at the desire of one fifth of those present, be entered on the
journal." In other words, any member can request a roll call vote, if supported by a sufficient second. The figure plots the percentage of Senate amendments granted floor consideration that receive roll-call votes.

Of the 17,838 Senate amendments in our dataset, 2,467 (or 13.83 percent), went to roll call votes. But during the four most recent Congresses for which we have data (the 104th, 106th, 109th and 1114), that jumps to 34.8 percent. This surge in "messaging" amendments comes alongside a spike in competitive (as opposed to legislative staffing and because of increased deference to the executive and judicial branches.

House Freedom Caucus and Open Amending Back in May, Sarah Binder warned here that
McConnell would have a hard time keeping his promise to operate the Senate according to "regu order." Her Monkey Cage post pointed out that polarization between the Democrats and Republicans
on the one hand, and deep divisions within the GOP on the one hand, and deep divisions within the GOP
on the other, would force McConnell to curb floor amendments in order to bypass filibusters and enact legislation.
Binder was right. Individual senators have strong electoral incentives to introduce floor amendments when they can. McConnell was forced to use his position as Senate majority leader to block
 amendments on several key bills. freely. For most of the much "demand" there might be waiting in the House for the ability to offer amendments freely. For most of the 20th century, the House Rules Committee has restricted amendments on controversial
bills.

But there's evidence to suggest that the pent-up demand is quite strong. A forthcoming paper from Michae S. Lynch, Anthony Madonna and Jason Roberts analyzes the demand for amendments under structured rules. Structured rules are rules issued by the Rules Committee that allow a limited set of amendments to be considered on the floor. Members must submit their amendments to the Rules Committee for review.

That's a lot of demand. Allowing House members to introduce amendments freely - and to have lengthy debates and votes, as the Senate does - would likely bring the House to a halt.
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