



NTU

National Taxpayers Union

Rates Congress

11th Congress, Second Session (2010)

UNITED STATES SENATE †

GRADE	SCORE	GRADE	SCORE	GRADE	SCORE	GRADE	SCORE
ALABAMA		IOWA		NEW HAMPSHIRE		TEXAS	
Sessions	A 96%	Grassley	B+ 93%	Gregg	B+ 94%	Cornyn	A 99%
Shelby	A 96%	Harkin	F 5%	Shaheen	F 12%	Hutchison	A 98%
State Average	96%	State Average	49%	State Average	52%	State Average	98%
ALASKA		KANSAS		NEW JERSEY		UTAH	
Begich	F 13%	Brownback	A 99.5%	Lautenberg	F 3%	Bennett	A 96%
Murkowski	B 89%	Roberts	A 97%	Menendez	F 7%	Hatch	A 99%
State Average	51%	State Average	98%	State Average	5%	State Average	97%
ARIZONA		KENTUCKY		NEW MEXICO		VERMONT	
Kyl	A 97%	Bunning	A 97%	Bihaman	F 3%	Leahy	F 2%
McCain	A 99.5%	McConnell	A 97%	Udall, T.	F 5%	Sanders	F 3%
State Average	98%	State Average	97%	State Average	4%	State Average	2%
ARKANSAS		LOUISIANA		NEW YORK		VIRGINIA	
Lincoln	D 39%	Landrieu	F 11%	Gillibrand	F 3%	Warner	D 19%
Pryor	D 22%	Vitter	A 95%	Schumer	F 5%	Webb	D 21%
State Average	31%	State Average	52%	State Average	4%	State Average	20%
CALIFORNIA		MAINE		NORTH CAROLINA		WASHINGTON	
Boxer	F 6%	Collins	C+ 72%	Burr	A 97%	Cantwell	F 16%
Feinstein	F 7%	Snowe	C+ 74%	Hagan	F 14%	Murray	F 6%
State Average	6%	State Average	73%	State Average	55%	State Average	11%
COLORADO		MARYLAND		NORTH DAKOTA		WEST VIRGINIA	
Bennet	D 20%	Cardin	F 5%	Conrad	F 7%	Manchin	N.A. N.A. **
Udall, M.	F 15%	Mikulski	F 6%	Dorgan	F 4%	Rockefeller	F 9%
State Average	17%	State Average	5%	State Average	6%	State Average	9%
CONNECTICUT		MASSACHUSETTS		OHIO		WISCONSIN	
Dodd	F 7%	Brown, Scott	B 84%	Brown, Sherrod	F 3%	Feingold	D 25%
Lieberman	D 19%	Kerry	F 6%	Voinovich	C+ 74%	Kohl	F 10%
State Average	13%	State Average	44%	State Average	38%	State Average	17%
DELAWARE		MICHIGAN		OKLAHOMA		WYOMING	
Carper	F 12%	Levin	F 2%	Coburn	A 96%	Barrasso	A 98%
Coons	N.A. N.A. **	Stabenow	F 7%	Inhofe	A 96%	Enzi	A 97%
State Average	12%	State Average	4%	State Average	96%	State Average	97%
FLORIDA		MINNESOTA		OREGON		SENATE KEY	
LeMieux	B+ 93%	Franken	F 5%	Merkley	F 4%	SCORE	GRADE
Nelson, Bill	F 16%	Klobuchar	F 15%	Wyden	F 5%	COMMENTS	
State Average	55%	State Average	10%	State Average	5%	95% or more	A Taxpayers' Friend
GEORGIA		MISSISSIPPI		PENNSYLVANIA		90%-94%	B+
Chambliss	A 97%	Cochran	B+ 90%	Casey	F 8%	80%-89%	B Good
Isakson	A 96%*	Wicker	B+ 94%	Specter	F 7%	76%-79%	B-
State Average	97%	State Average	92%	State Average	7%	62%-75%	C+
HAWAII		MISSOURI		RHODE ISLAND		50%-61%	C Satisfactory
Akaka	F 7%	Bond	B+ 90%	Reed	F 6%	40%-49%	C-
Inouye	F 7%	McCaskill	D 24%	Whitehouse	F 5%	19%-39%	D Poor
State Average	7%	State Average	55%	State Average	5%	18% or less	F Big Spender
IDAHO		MONTANA		SOUTH CAROLINA		*Score based on less than 75%, but more than 50%, of weighted total of votes cast.	
Crapo	A 99%	Baucus	F 9%	DeMint	A 96%	** Voted on 50% or less of weighted total of votes cast; score and grade not issued.	
Risch	A 99%	Tester	F 16%	Graham	A 97%		
State Average	99%	State Average	13%	State Average	97%		
ILLINOIS		NEBRASKA		SOUTH DAKOTA			
Durbin	F 6%	Johanns	A 95%	Johnson	F 7%		
Kirk	N.A. N.A. **	Nelson, Ben	C 52%	Thune	A 99%		
State Average	6%	State Average	73%	State Average	53%		
INDIANA		NEVADA		TENNESSEE			
Bayh	C- 43%	Ensign	B+ 94%	Alexander	B+ 93%		
Lugar	B+ 91%	Reid	F 8%	Corker	A 99%		
State Average	67%	State Average	51%	State Average	96%		

† Based on every roll call vote affecting fiscal policy; see back page for methodology.

UNITED STATES HOUSE

	GRADE	SCORE
ALABAMA		
Aderholt	B	85%
Bachus	B	85%
Bonner	B	85%
Bright	C+	70%
Davis, A.	D	34%*
Griffith	B+	87%
Rogers, Michael D.	B	85%
State Average		77%

ALASKA		
Young, D.	C+	74%

ARIZONA		
Flake	A	97%
Franks	A	90%
Giffords	D	24%
Grijalva	F	7%
Kirkpatrick	D	26%
Mitchell	D	34%
Pastor	F	10%
Shadegg	A	90%
State Average		47%

ARKANSAS		
Berry	C-	41%
Boozman	B	86%
Ross	D	39%
Snyder	F	10%
State Average		44%

CALIFORNIA		
Baca	F	5%
Becerra	F	6%
Berman	F	6%
Billbray	B-	78%
Bono Mack	B-	82%
Calvert	B	86%
Campbell	A	93%
Capps	F	5%
Cardoza	F	10%
Chu	F	5%
Costa	F	16%
Davis, S.	F	5%
Dreier	B+	89%
Eshoo	F	6%
Farr	F	7%
Filner	F	9%
Gallegly	B+	87%
Garamendi	F	5%
Harman	F	7%
Herger	A	94%
Honda	F	6%
Hunter	B+	89%
Issa	A	90%
Lee, B.	F	8%
Lewis, Jerry	B+	89%
Lofgren	F	7%
Lungren	B	84%
Matsui	F	6%
McCarthy, K.	B	86%
McClintock	A	94%
McKeon	B	85%
McNerney	F	11%
Miller, Gary	B+	89%
Miller, George	F	6%
Napolitano	F	6%
Nunes	A	90%
Pelosi	N.A.	N.A.**
Radanovich	B+	88%*
Richardson	F	7%
Rohrabacher	A	91%
Roybal-Allard	F	2%

Royce	A	90%
Sánchez, Linda	F	5%
Sanchez, Loretta	F	4%
Schiff	F	6%
Sherman	F	5%
Speier	F	5%
Stark	F	9%
Thompson, M.	F	9%
Waters	F	6%
Watson	F	3%
Waxman	F	9%
Woolsey	F	6%
State Average		36%

COLORADO		
Coffman	A	90%
DeGette	F	3%
Lamborn	A	91%
Markey, B.	F	18%
Perlmutter	F	4%
Polis	F	14%
Salazar	F	15%
State Average		34%

CONNECTICUT		
Courtney	F	10%
DeLauro	F	5%
Himes	F	13%
Larson	F	5%
Murphy, C.	F	8%
State Average		8%

DELAWARE		
Castle	C	59%

FLORIDA		
Bilirakis	B-	79%
Boyd	F	14%
Brown, C.	F	5%
Brown-Waite	B-	82%
Buchanan	B	84%
Castor	F	7%
Crenshaw	B	84%
Deutch	F	8%*
Diaz-Balart, L.	B-	77%
Diaz-Balart, M.	B-	79%
Grayson	F	8%
Hastings, A.	F	6%
Klein	F	9%
Kosmas	F	13%
Mack	A	90%
Meek	F	7%
Mica	B	85%
Miller, J.	B+	89%
Posey	B-	81%
Putnam	B	84%
Rooney	B+	88%
Ros-Lehtinen	B-	79%
Stearns	B+	89%
Wasserman Schultz	F	4%
Young, B.	B-	80%*
State Average		54%

GEORGIA		
Barrow	D	32%
Bishop, S.	F	9%
Broun	A	94%
Gingrey	A	91%
Graves, T.	B+	89%*
Johnson, H.	F	8%
Kingston	B+	89%
Lewis, John	F	7%
Linder	A	92%
Marshall	C-	48%

Price, T.	A	93%
Scott, D.	F	5%
Westmoreland	A	92%
State Average		56%

HAWAII		
Djou	C+	69%*
Hirono	F	6%
State Average		29%

IDAHO		
Minnick	C+	62%
Simpson	B-	83%
State Average		73%

ILLINOIS		
Bean	F	17%
Biggert	B-	77%
Costello	F	10%
Davis, D.	F	8%
Foster	F	10%
Gutierrez	F	7%
Halvorson	F	11%
Hare	F	8%
Jackson	F	7%
Johnson, T.	B-	78%
Kirk	C+	68%
Lipinski	F	19%
Manzullo	B	84%
Quigley	F	7%
Roskam	B+	89%
Rush	F	7%
Schakowsky	F	5%
Schock	B	84%
Shimkus	B+	87%
State Average		36%

INDIANA		
Burton	A	90%
Buyer	B+	87%
Carson	F	4%
Donnelly	F	17%
Ellsworth	F	13%
Hill	F	14%
Pence	B+	89%
Stutzman	N.A.	N.A.**
Visclosky	F	8%
State Average		39%

IOWA		
Boswell	F	7%
Bralley	F	4%
King, S.	B+	89%
Latham	B	84%
Loeb sack	F	6%
State Average		38%

KANSAS		
Jenkins	A	90%
Moore, D.	F	6%
Moran, Jerry	A	90%
Tiahrt	A	92%
State Average		68%

KENTUCKY		
Chandler	D	32%
Davis, G.	B+	87%
Guthrie	B	85%
Rogers, H.	B	85%
Whitfield	B-	78%
Yarmuth	F	3%
State Average		61%

LOUISIANA		
Alexander	B+	89%
Boustany	B+	89%
Cao	C	53%

Cassidy	B	85%
Fleming	B+	88%
Melancon	D	33%
Scalise	B+	89%
State Average		76%

MAINE		
Michaud	F	12%
Pingree	F	7%
State Average		10%

MARYLAND		
Bartlett	B	86%
Cummings	F	5%
Edwards, D.	F	7%
Hoyer	F	5%
Kratovil	C-	41%
Ruppersberger	F	6%
Sarbanes	F	4%
Van Hollen	F	4%
State Average		20%

MASSACHUSETTS		
Capuano	F	7%
Delahunt	F	6%*
Frank	F	4%
Lynch	F	12%
Markey, E.	F	3%
McGovern	F	5%
Neal	F	6%
Olver	F	6%
Tierney	F	6%
Tsongas	F	6%
State Average		6%

MICHIGAN		
Camp	B+	88%
Conyers	F	8%
Dingell	F	4%
Ehlers	C+	70%
Hoekstra	B+	88%*
Kildee	F	5%
Kilpatrick	F	5%
Levin	F	4%
McCotter	B-	78%
Miller, C.	B	84%
Peters	F	16%
Rogers, Michael J.	B	85%
Schauer	F	9%
Stupak	F	7%
Upton	B	86%
State Average		42%

MINNESOTA		
Bachmann	B+	87%
Ellison	F	6%
Kline	B+	88%
McCollum	F	6%
Oberstar	F	7%
Paulsen	B+	89%
Peterson	C-	41%
Walz	F	9%
State Average		41%

MISSISSIPPI		
Childers	C-	48%
Harper	B+	88%
Taylor	C	58%
Thompson, B.	F	5%
State Average		50%

MISSOURI		
Akin	B+	89%

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES †

	GRADE	SCORE
Blunt.....	B+	88%
Carnahan.....	F	6%
Clay.....	F	8%
Cleaver.....	F	4%
Emerson.....	B-	83%
Graves, S.....	B+	89%
Luetkemeyer.....	B+	87%
Skelton.....	D	35%
State Average		53%

MONTANA

Rehberg.....	B	85%
--------------	----------	-----

NEBRASKA

Fortenberry.....	B-	80%
Smith, Adrian.....	A	90%
Terry.....	B	85%
State Average		85%

NEVADA

Berkley.....	F	7%
Heller.....	B	84%
Titus.....	F	12%
State Average		34%

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Hodes.....	F	16%
Shea-Porter.....	F	6%
State Average		11%

NEW JERSEY

Adler.....	C-	40%
Andrews.....	F	5%
Frelinghuysen.....	B	85%
Garrett.....	A	91%
Holt.....	F	5%
Lance.....	B	84%
LoBiondo.....	C+	71%
Pallone.....	F	7%
Pascrell.....	F	6%
Payne.....	F	7%
Rothman.....	F	4%
Sires.....	F	4%
Smith, C.....	C+	70%
State Average		37%

NEW MEXICO

Heinrich.....	F	6%
Luján.....	F	4%
Teague.....	D	33%
State Average		14%

NEW YORK

Ackerman.....	F	2%
Arcuri.....	D	31%
Bishop, T.....	F	6%
Clarke.....	F	6%
Crowley.....	F	7%
Engel.....	F	4%
Hall, J.....	F	7%
Higgins.....	F	4%
Hinchey.....	F	5%
Israel.....	F	6%
King, P.....	B-	81%
Lee, C.....	B-	79%
Lowe.....	F	6%
Maffei.....	F	13%
Maloney.....	F	8%
McCarthy, C.....	F	5%
McMahon.....	D	37%
Meeks.....	F	7%
Murphy, S.....	F	17%
Nadler.....	F	6%

	GRADE	SCORE
Owens.....	F	17%
Rangel.....	F	4%
Reed.....	N.A.	N.A.**
Serrano.....	F	5%
Slaughter.....	F	4%
Tonko.....	F	4%
Towns.....	F	5%
Velázquez.....	F	5%
Weiner.....	F	6%
State Average		14%

NORTH CAROLINA

Butterfield.....	F	4%
Coble.....	B+	88%
Etheridge.....	F	5%
Foxx.....	B+	88%
Jones.....	C+	71%
Kissell.....	D	26%
McHenry.....	B+	89%
McIntyre.....	C-	49%
Miller, B.....	F	3%
Myrick.....	A	90%
Price, D.....	F	4%
Shuler.....	C-	44%
Watt.....	F	11%
State Average		44%

NORTH DAKOTA

Pomeroy.....	F	10%
--------------	----------	-----

OHIO

Austria.....	B+	87%
Boccieri.....	F	12%
Boehner.....	A	92%
Driehaus.....	F	12%
Fudge.....	F	5%
Jordan.....	A	91%
Kaptur.....	F	6%
Kilroy.....	F	4%
Kucinich.....	F	13%
LaTourette.....	C+	71%
Latta.....	A	90%
Ryan, T.....	F	5%
Schmidt.....	B+	88%
Space.....	D	34%
Sutton.....	F	6%
Tiberi.....	B	85%
Turner.....	B-	79%
Wilson, C.....	F	7%
State Average		44%

OKLAHOMA

Boren.....	C-	46%
Cole.....	B	84%
Fallin.....	A	90%*
Lucas.....	B	86%
Sullivan.....	B+	89%
State Average		79%

OREGON

Blumenauer.....	F	7%
DeFazio.....	F	12%
Schrader.....	F	13%
Walden.....	B+	88%
Wu.....	F	10%
State Average		27%

PENNSYLVANIA

Altmire.....	D	33%
Brady, R.....	F	5%
Carney.....	F	14%
Critz.....	F	15%*
Dahlkemper.....	F	13%
Dent.....	C+	68%
Doyle.....	F	7%

	GRADE	SCORE
Fattah.....	F	7%
Gerlach.....	C+	68%
Holden.....	D	35%
Kanjorski.....	F	3%
Murphy, P.....	F	8%
Murphy, T.....	C+	69%
Pitts.....	B+	88%
Platts.....	C+	73%
Schwartz.....	F	6%
Sestak.....	F	5%
Shuster.....	B+	88%
Thompson, G.....	B	86%
State Average		37%

RHODE ISLAND

Kennedy.....	F	4%
Langevin.....	F	7%
State Average		6%

SOUTH CAROLINA

Barrett.....	A	91%*
Brown, H.....	B	86%
Clyburn.....	F	2%
Inglis.....	A	90%
Spratt.....	F	6%
Wilson, J.....	B	86%
State Average		57%

SOUTH DAKOTA

Herseth Sandlin.....	C	52%
----------------------	----------	-----

TENNESSEE

Blackburn.....	A	93%
Cohen.....	F	8%
Cooper.....	D	38%
Davis, L.....	D	38%
Duncan.....	A	91%
Gordon.....	F	8%
Roe.....	B+	87%
Tanner.....	D	34%
Wamp.....	B-	82%*
State Average		52%

TEXAS

Barton.....	B+	89%
Brady, K.....	A	91%
Burgess.....	B	86%
Carter.....	A	90%
Conaway.....	A	90%
Cuellar.....	F	14%
Culberson.....	A	90%
Doggett.....	F	12%
Edwards, C.....	C-	40%
Gohmert.....	B+	89%
Gonzalez.....	F	7%
Granger.....	A	92%
Green, A.....	F	6%
Green, G.....	F	6%
Hall, R.....	B+	87%
Hensarling.....	A	94%
Hinojosa.....	F	8%
Jackson Lee.....	F	6%
Johnson, E.....	F	5%
Johnson, S.....	A	92%
Marchant.....	A	90%
McCaul.....	B	85%
Neugebauer.....	A	92%
Olson.....	A	91%
Ortiz.....	F	8%
Paul.....	A	95%
Poe.....	B+	89%
Reyes.....	F	5%
Rodriguez.....	F	8%
Sessions.....	A	91%

	GRADE	SCORE
Smith, L.....	B+	89%
Thornberry.....	A	90%
State Average		60%

UTAH

Bishop, R.....	B+	88%
Chaffetz.....	A	92%
Matheson.....	D	39%
State Average		73%

VERMONT

Welch.....	F	7%
------------	----------	----

VIRGINIA

Boucher.....	D	35%
Cantor.....	A	90%
Connolly.....	F	12%
Forbes.....	B-	83%
Goodlatte.....	B+	89%
Moran, James.....	F	8%
Nye.....	C	51%
Perriello.....	F	17%
Scott, R.....	F	6%
Wittman.....	B-	80%
Wolf.....	B-	75%
State Average		50%

WASHINGTON

Baird.....	F	19%
Dicks.....	F	6%
Hastings, D.....	A	91%
Inslee.....	F	8%
Larsen.....	F	6%
McDermott.....	F	8%
McMorris Rodgers.....	B+	89%
Reichert.....	C+	74%
Smith, Adam.....	F	8%
State Average		33%

WEST VIRGINIA

Capito.....	B-	76%
Mollohan.....	F	7%
Rahall.....	F	9%
State Average		30%

WISCONSIN

Baldwin.....	F	6%
Kagen.....	F	9%
Kind.....	F	7%
Moore, G.....	F	8%
Obey.....	F	5%
Petri.....	B	86%
Ryan, P.....	A	92%
Sensenbrenner.....	A	92%
State Average		38%

WYOMING

Lummis.....	A	91%
-------------	----------	-----

HOUSE KEY

SCORE	GRADE	COMMENTS
90% or more	A	Taxpayers' Friend
87%-89%	B+	
84%-86%	B	Good
75%-83%	B-	
62%-74%	C+	
50%-61%	C	Satisfactory
40%-49%	C-	
21%-39%	D	Poor
20% or less	F	Big Spender

* Score based on less than 75%, but more than 50%, of weighted total of votes cast.

** Voted on 50% or less of weighted total of votes cast; score and grade not issued.

† Based on every roll call vote affecting fiscal policy; see back page for methodology.

Every year National Taxpayers Union (NTU) rates U.S. Representatives and Senators on their actual votes — every vote that significantly affects taxes, spending, debt, and regulatory burdens on consumers and taxpayers. Unlike most organizations that publish ratings, we refuse to play the “rating game” of focusing on only a handful of Congressional votes on selected issues. The NTU voting study is the fairest and most accurate guide available on Congressional fiscal policies. It is a completely unbiased accounting of votes.

NTU assigned weights to the votes, reflecting the importance of each vote’s effect.*

NTU has no partisan axe to grind. All Members of Congress are treated the same regardless of political affiliation. Our only constituency is the overburdened American taxpayer. Grades are given impartially, based on the Taxpayer Score.

TAXPAYER SCORE

The Taxpayer Score measures the strength of support for reducing spending and regulation and opposing higher taxes. In general, a higher score is better because it means a Member of Congress voted to lessen or limit the burden on taxpayers. The Taxpayer Score can range between 0 and 100. We do not expect anyone to score a 100, nor has any legislator ever achieved a 100 in the multi-year history of the comprehensive NTU scoring system. A high score does not mean that the Member of Congress was opposed to all spending or all programs. High-scoring Members have indicated that they would vote for many programs if the amount of spending were lower. A Member who wants to increase spending on some programs can achieve a high score if he or she votes for offsetting cuts in other programs. A zero score would indicate that the Member of Congress approved every spending proposal and opposed every pro-taxpayer reform.

NTU believes a score qualifying for a grade of “A” indicates the Member is one of the strongest supporters of responsible tax and spending policies. We are pleased to give

these Members of Congress our “Taxpayers’ Friend Award” (subject to minimum attendance criteria).

A score qualifying for a grade of “B” represents a “good” voting record on controlling spending and taxes. A “B” grade indicates that the Member voted for taxpayers most of the time, but slightly less than those who attained the grade of “A.”

A score qualifying for a grade of “C” represents a minimally acceptable voting record on controlling taxes and spending. To qualify for a grade of “C” a Member must have a Taxpayer Score of at least 50 percent. While such a score may be “satisfactory,” there is clearly room for improvement.

We are also issuing pluses and minuses for the grades of “B” and “C” in order to better recognize the differences in the voting records of Members with these grades.

A score qualifying for a grade of “D” indicates the Member has a “poor” voting record on controlling taxes and spending.

A score significantly below average qualifies for a grade of “F.” This failing grade places the Member into the “Big Spender” category.

VOTE SELECTION

We analyzed every roll call vote taken in 2010 (2nd Session of the 111th Congress) and selected all votes that could significantly affect the amounts of federal taxes, spending, debt, or regulatory impact. A total of 165 House and 142 Senate roll call votes were selected. We included votes cast on appropriations bills, authorization bills, budget target resolutions, tax bills, amendments, and certain procedural votes that could affect the burden on taxpayers. Votes that simply shifted equal amounts of spending from one area to another were excluded. Also excluded were votes where there was a significant difference of opinion on how to vote to reduce or control government and unanimous votes.

We believe the number of votes used in the analysis, the objective and nonpartisan weighting of the votes, computerized calculations, and many error checks all combine to ensure the highest possible standards of accuracy.

OTHER FACTORS

Although we believe this voting analysis is the most accurate guide available on Congressional fiscal performance, no study of roll call votes can fully evaluate a Member’s overall record. A Member’s committee work, leadership, and effectiveness with other Members also affect his or her influence on the amount of federal spending, taxes, debt, and regulatory impact. Because of the complexity of the calculations and the number of votes involved, we do not have space to reprint the votes of each Representative and Senator here. A list of votes used in the study, including the weight assigned to each, is available on our website at www.ntu.org.

* Computation

NTU’s federal budget experts assigned a weight to each vote ranging from 0 to 100. A low weight was assigned to votes that had relatively little effect, while a high weight was assigned to votes with the most significant effect on federal spending, taxes, debt, and regulation.

Weights were based solely on the relative effect of each vote on the total amount of federal spending, taxes, debt, or regulatory impact. Consideration was given to the long-term effect of a vote, even though relatively little might be immediately at issue. A vote with average importance should have a weight close to 10.

Scores were computed by dividing the weighted total of votes cast against higher spending, taxes, or regulation or for lower spending, taxes, or regulation, by the weighted total number of fiscal issues on which the Member of Congress voted. Average state scores were also computed, using the weighted total of votes cast by each delegation.

In computing these scores, we included only those votes on which the Member actually voted for or against a bill, resolution, or amendment. Paired votes, announced positions, and absences were excluded. Because some Members were absent frequently (or otherwise failed to vote yes or no), their scores and grades, based on relatively few votes, may not accurately reflect fiscal attitudes. The Members falling into this category are noted.

TAXPAYER SCORES

SENATE		HOUSE	
45%	Average	42%	
19%	Median	18%	
99.5%	High	97%	
2%	Low	2%	
PARTY SCORES			
11%	Democratic Average	12%	
7%	Democratic Median	7%	
94%	Republican Average	86%	
96%	Republican Median	88%	