Party Unity, 81st Congress

"Party unity," as exclusively compiled by Congressional Quarterly, is a measure of a Congressman's support of his own party against the other party. It presents the number and percentage of times a lawmaker votes, pairs or otherwise declares himself with the majority of his own party when it meets head-on with the majority of the other party.

The computation of party unity is made on the basis of only those formal roll-calls on which a majority of Democrats vote one way and a majority of Republicans the other. It excludes roll-calls on which a majority of both parties votes the same way.

PARTY STANDINGS

When it came to party-line clashes in the 81st Congress, Democrats in the Senate stood closer together politically than their GOP colleagues, but Republicans in the House of Representatives displayed more party unity regularly than the Democrats did.

This situation — with the Democrats leading in the upper chamber but the GOP having an edge in the House prevailed in both sessions of the 81st Congress: the 1949 one and the protracted second session which lasted through 1950 into 1951. (For 1949 party unity statistics exclusively, see CQ Almanac, Vol. V, pages 55 and 61.)

According to CQ's exclusive party unity figures — compiled only on the basis of roll-call votes in the 81st Congress on which a majority of Democrats voted one way and a majority of Republicans balloted exactly opposite to them — this was the overall picture, including both sessions:

Senate Average

Between Jan. 3, 1949, when the 81st Congress' first session convened and Jan. 2, 1951, when the second session formally ended, the Senate took 292 roll-call votes which were distinctly party-line ones. Over the course of these votes, the Democratic Senators achieved a "party unity" average of 81.1 per cent. That is, the average Democrat supported his party's majority 81.1 per cent of the time during its partisan clashes with the GOP.

The average Republican "party unity" achievement over these same 292 partisan roll-call votes was 76.3 per cent.

House Average

In the House of Representatives, 138 strictly party-line ballots were taken over the comparable period. Over their course, the Democrats racked up a party unity percentage of 79.84. Topping this, the Republican average was 82.04 per cent.

Previous Comparison

Breaking the cumulative 81st Congress party percentages down by sessions, this is how the Democrats and Republicans fared at the first one (1949) and at the second (1950-1.):

Senate Democrats in 1949 averaged 81.0 per cent over the course of 144 party-line record votes cast at the first session. At that time, the Democrats nosed out the GOP's average of 77.8 per cent in the Senate at the first session. At the second session, when 148 roll-calls were partisan, Senate Democrats averaged 81.6 per cent, again beating the GOP average of 75.0 per cent.

House Democrats in 1949 averaged 79.8 per cent over the course of 65 party-line tallies, trailing the GOP average of 83.4 per cent. In 1950, at the second session, the Democratic average of 79.76 over the course of 73 partisan votes again trailed the GOP average of 80.57 per cent.

INDIVIDUALS

Highest ranking members of the Senate during the full span of the 81st Congress were Sens. Claude Pepper (D Fla.) and Edward Martin (R Pa.), who led all other members of their respective parties with "party unity" percentages of 97 and 95 respectively.

Trailing all members of their respective parties were Sens. Harry F. Byrd (D Va.) and Wayne Morse (R Ore.), each of whom had a percentage of 35.

In the House of Representatives, Rep. John A. Carroll (Colo.) led all Democrats with a percentage of 100. Leading all Republicans were Reps. Errett P. Scrivner (Kan.), Daniel A. Reed (N.Y.), and Cliff Clevenger (Ohio), each with an average of 98.

Reps. Jacob K. Javits (R N. Y.) and John E. Rankin (D Miss.) trailed all members of their parties with averages of 27 and 36 respectively. PARTY UNITY FIGURES FOR ALL SENATORS ARE LISTED ON PAGE 47; FIGURES FOR REPRE-SENTATIVES ARE SET FORTH ON PAGES 48 AND 49. The charts are set up to indicate data in eight columns, as follows:

1. Times lawmaker voted with his party majority on party-line tests, 1949.

2. Times he voted against his majority, 1949.

3. Per cent of the time he supported majority, first session.

4. Times he voted with majority on party-line tests, 1950.

5. Times he voted against his majority, 1950.

6. Per cent of the time he supported majority, second session.

7. Per cent of the time he supported majority throughout 81st Congress (first and second sessions.)

8. Per cent of the time he supported majority during the previous 80th Congress (1947-48.)

(For "highs" and "lows" among Democrats and Republicans in both Senate and House in 1949 exclusively, and during the 80th Congress as well, see CQ Almanac, Vol. V, pages 55 and 61.)

Regional Factors

Virtually every Congressman's party unity percentage fluctuates from year to year—even as the cohesion of his party itself varies. The reason for the rise and fall of party unity percentages involves certain factors which shape a Congressman's attitude, but which are not always reflected by his specific votes. In one word, the factors which help shape a Congressman's approach to any issue can be described as "regional".

For example, CQ's voting surveys indicate that on some questions of public power, Western Congressmen tend to ballot as Westerners, instead of voting primarily as Democrats or Republicans. On numerous foreign policy and maritime matters, Congress also tends to split along coastalvs.-inland lines, instead of dividing into Democrat or GOP blocs.

In the agricultural field, moreover,

lawmakers often line up as representatives of rural or urban constituencies, instead of grouping along party lines. In addition, regional allegiance often supplants party regularity on such controversial measures as the FEPC or DP or reclamation projects.

All of these factors enter into the subject of a Congressman's standing in connection with party loyalty—and that is why a party's average varies from year to year even though the members of the party sitting in Congress may remain roughly the same.

PARTY DEFECTIONS

Party defection - the obverse of party unity -- was an important factor in the 81st Congress. It took on added significance in the second session, when many of the measures before the lawmakers were weighed against a backdrop of warfare. (Since the character of the second session was radically different from the complexion of the 1949 one, the following survey has been restricted to party defections in 1950. For data on defections in 1949 - which can be amalgamated into a picture of the 81st Congress as a whole - see CQ Almanac, Vol. V, pages 56 and 62.)

Votes cast by lawmakers who bolted their party ranks were decisive on some two - thirds of the Senate and one - half of the House party-line ballots taken in 1950. Most Democratic bolters were Southerners. GOP Senators crossed party lines often on foreign policy. The Democrats rarely did.

Senate Bolting

Of 148 Senate party - unity rollcalls during the second session, 94 were decided by bolters. The Republicans lost 61 of them because of defections from the GOP ranks. The Democrats lost 33 for the same reason.

In other words, each party would have won that number of balloting tests if some members had not crossed party lines and voted with the opposing party's majority in sufficient number to defeat the wishes of their own bloc's majority.

House Bolting

Out of 73 strictly partisan tallies in the House of Representatives during the second session, 34 were decided by members who defected from their party ranks. The Democrats lost 21 of these ballots. The Republicans lost 13.

Comparison With 1949

Comparable figures for the first session of the 81st Congress in 1949 show that out of 144 party-line tallies in the Senate, the Democrats lost 36 and the GOP lost 60 because of defections. In the House, there were 65 strictly partisan ballots. The Democrats lost 21 because of desertions, and the Republicans lost 10.

(For a description of the nature of 1949 issues settled by votes decided by bolters, see CQ Almanac, Vol. V, page 55.)

ISSUES INVOLVED

Bolters who crossed party lines during the second session settled a number of significant issues. Moreover, specific types of legislation caused defections among the same groups of lawmakers. In the Senate, for example, the Democrats lost eight partisan roll-call contests on appropriations matters because of defections. On seven of these, there were three Senators who did not fall to oppose the Democratic majority. They were Sens. Harry Flood Byrd (D Va.), Paul Douglas (Ill.) and Spessard Holland (Fla.).

On the other hand, the GOP lost 12 partisan roll-calls on appropriations because of Republican defections, which involved a recurring group of three Senators who bucked their party's majority. Nine out of 12 times Sens. Edward Thye (Minn.), H. Alexander Smith (N. J.), Wayne Morse (Ore.) and Gurney (S. D.) voted with the Democrats.

Senate

Because they had greater party unity—and consequently less of a problem from defections—Democrats in the Senate during the second session were able to win major partyline roll-call votes from the Republicans. The following are typical Democratic wins, snatched from the GOP only because a decisive number of Republicans voted with the Democrats:

Approval of \$4 million for the Office of Housing Expediter's rent control program, which the GOP majority opposed. Rejection of a Republican-backed motion to recommit the bill exempting natural gas producers from federal regulation. Rejection of a Republican-backed move to cut \$500 million from Marshall Plan authorizations. Rejection of a GOP-endorsed move to earmark S50 million of Marshall Plan funds for Spain. Approval of the Administration's "Point Four" program, which Republicans had tried to kill in favor of a substitute plan. Confirmation of Sumner Pike to be Atomic Energy Commission head, over the opposition of the Republican majority. Approval of bill continuing rent controls, which bill the GOP majority opposed.

Among the partisan contests the Republicans won from the Democrats because a decisive number of the latter bolted their party and voted with the GOP majority, these were typical issues:

Deletion of the Democratic-sponsored provision in the bill authorizing housing for middle income families that would have permitted a \$2 billion loan to housing cooperatives. Cut of \$250 million in Marshall Plan authorizations, which the Democratic majority had attempted to preserve intact. Rejection of Administration - backed plan to reorganize the National Labor Relations Board. Adoption of an amendment to the Defense Production Act, which provided that wage controls be imposed if price controls were; the Democratic majority opposed this. Approval of final version of the "basing point" bill, which the Democratic majority attacked.

House

The situation was reversed in the House during the second session. The Democrats, with less party unity than the GOP, lost more close votes because of this than the Republicans did. This is how it shaped up on the basis of typical issues:

The Democrats opposed moves to reduce the funds for public housing, to delete the \$2 billion cooperative housing loan and to adopt the socalled "natural gas" bill — but enough Democrats defected from their party's majority and voted with the GOP to override the Democratic opposition. Conversely, the Democratic majority favored recommittal of the so - called "basing point" bill, but the GOP successfully opposed recommittal with the help of dissident Democrats.

However, the Republicans lost votes too. The GOP majority, for example, opposed measures revising cotton acreage restriction, conferring statehood on Alaska and authorizing the extension of rent controls. But enough Republicans strayed from the GOP majority to enable the Democrats to pass those bills with the extra GOP voting strength.

INDIVIDUAL BOLTERS

In the Senate during the second session, Harry F. Byrd (D Va.) differed more often with his party majority than any other Democrat on the 33 party-line roll-call ballots lost by Democrats because of splits within the party. Byrd bolted 23 times. The Republican Senator differing most often with his party on the 61 roll-calls the GOP lost because of defections was Edward J. Thye (R Minn.). He bolted 40 times.

On the other hand, Sen. Frank P. Graham (D N. C.) led all other Democrats in standing firm with his party's majority on the 33 votes. Over their course, he did not bolt once. Among Republicans, Sen. Arthur H. Vandenberg (R Mich.) was the most steadfast. He did bolt once.

In the House, Rep. J. Frank Wilson (Tex.) bolted the Democratic majority 17 times out of the 21 votes settled by Democratic defections. He led all other Democrats in this respect. The Republicans who strayed most from GOP ranks over the course of 13 tests the GOP lost through defections were Reps. Dayton E. Phillips (Tenn.), and Hal Holmes (Wash.). Each bolted at least 10 times.

But 3 Democrats and 24 Republicans did not differ even a single time with their party majorities during the crucial party-line votes on which these lawmakers actually balloted.

Comparison With 1949

In 1949, at the first session, Byrd also was the most chronic Democratic bolter in the Senate. The Republican who strayed the most was Sen. William Langer (N.D.).

Bolting Democratic ranks in the House most often during 1949 were Reps. Thomas G. Abernethy (Miss.), James C. Davis (Ga.), W. M. (Don) Wheeler (Ga.) and John Bell Williams (Miss.). The most chronic Republican maverick was Clifford P. Case (N.J.).

(For details on the defections among Democrats and Republicans in both chambers of Congress during the first session, see CQ Alamanac, Vol. V, pages 56 and 62.)

SENATORS' "PARTY UNITY", 81st CONGRESS

Their 1949 and 1950 Records; Comparison With 80th Congress

- 1. Number of times Senator voted with the majority of his party over the course of 144 party-line ballots taken in Senate during 1949.
- 2. Number of times Senator voted against the majority of his party over course of these same 144 party-line roll-call votes in 1949.
- 3. Percentage of the time, therefore, that the Senator supported his party's majority during party-line tests in 1949.
- 4. Number of times Senator voted with the majority of his party over the course of 148 party-line ballots taken in the Senate in 1950.
- 5. Number of times Senator voted against the majority of his party over the course of these same 148 party-line ballots in 1950.
- 6. Percentage of the time, therefore, that the Senator supported his party's majority during party-line tests in 1950.
- 7. Percentage of the time the Senator supported his party's majority on party-line roll-call votes during the course of the 81st Congress; i.e.: 1949 and 1950, to date, combined.
- Percentage of the time the Senator supported his party's majority during the 80th Congress, 1947-1948.

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					_		-	-	·····	-									1.	1-			-		-	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		1	2	3	4	5	6	7			1	2	3	4	5	0	7	8
ALABAMA								0.5	MAINE		10	00	115	-	07			оню	1.10		04	1.17	10	90	00	99
	135			139					Brewster (R) Smith (R)				$\frac{115}{77}$		97	94	94	Bricker (R)	118			117				
	136	ø	90	129	5	96	90	90	1	71	69	51	11	67	22	54		Taft (R)	112	41	00	102	40	19	04	34
ARIZONA		-	~				0.		MARYLAND		0.0	-	-	4.0	05			OKLAHOMA	101	10	07	110	10	90	89	
	134			135					O'Conor (D)		30			42					121			118	13		82	077
	105	26	80	130	12	92	00		Tydings (D)		33	70	89	37	71	70		Thomas (D)	103	28	19	83	14	87	04	
ARKANSAS					- 10				MASSACHUSETTS				-					OREGON	-	40	10	112	00	80	75	82
				115					Lodge (R)		47	60		57				Cordon (R)		43			40 89		35	
McClellan (D)	64	73	47	87	56	61	54	74	Saltonstall (R)	78	60	57	92	45	67	62	81	Morse (R)		89	29	21	89	28	30	40
CALIFORNIA									MICHIGAN		<u> </u>							PENNSYLVANIA	124		0.7	122	10	92	95	96
	111		93		10									16				Martin (R)		4		1122		92 89	92	89
the second se	104	32	76	105	33	76	76	80	Vandenberg (R)	82	35	70	24	20	55	66		Myers (D)	133	8	94	118	15	98	92	03
COLORADO		-		OF.	40				MINNESOTA	101		94	115	10	00	01		RHODE ISLAND		1 0	04	121	10	00	03	
Johnson (D)	60	76	44	95	42	69	57	00	Humphrey (D) Thye (R)	131		94 62						Green (D) Leahy (D)	134 33			116				09
	118	20	80	93	31	16	19	90		04	191	04	01	28	00	01		SOUTH CAROLI		10	100	110	14	91	30	
CONNECTICUT					10	07	85		MISSISSIPPI	FF	077	80	DE.	38	00	63			124	10	00	100	20	93	86	93
Benton (D)		-	01	101				-00	Eastland (D) Stennis (D)		37.							Maybank (D)	110			110				
	112	26	81	115	27	81	81	89		101	33	75	105	40	12	14				21	84	110	18	00	80	90
DELAWARE	-	- 10	-			05	05		MISSOURI	101	1	71	110	00	-	75		SOUTH DAKOT. Gurney (R)	102	00	73		47	62	20	88
Frear (D)	79			82		65							_						113			110		04 77	79	00
	134	10	93	123	23	84	89	92		124	5	96	126	12	91	94		Mundt (R)	113	20	81	110	34	- 1 1	19	
FLORIDA							-	-	MONTANA			00	121	24	0.0	00		TENNESSEE	100	-	98	103	10	91	95	
Holland (D)		45								119					83	86		Kefauver (D) McKellar (D)	128					83		59
	135	2	99	104	5	95	97	92		126	8	94	114	15	88	91		TEXAS	118	22	84	114	40	00	04	28
GEORGIA					10		-		NEBRASKA		-	07	100	10	91	94		Connally (D)	118	1.77	077	121	15	89	88	81
George (D)				89						116				13				Johnson (D)	122			121 121	10	92	90	01
Russell (D)	. 84	45	65	197	44	ßЯ	67	82	the second s	129	10	93	122	11	92	83			124	11	00	101	10	94	90	
IDAHO	0		100	100	10	00	00	00	NEVADA Malone (R)	111	20	85	191	21	85	05		Thomas (D)	100	11	01	111	15	00	00	04
Dworshak (R)	2 122								Matone (R) McCarran (D)		35			60						H.	24	108	15	00	84	
	122	14	90	95	17	85	88	92			30	00	00	00	00	90	_	VERMONT	120	15	89	100	30	10	04	80
ILLINOIS	100	0-	80	100					NEW HAMPSHIRE	118	6	95	102	16	07	01		Aiken (R)	50	76	12	85	64	50	47	59
	_			103			74	- 00			46			39				Flanders (R)			63		44	61	62	
	132	8	94	124	11	92	93	89	Tobey (R)	04	40	97	19	38	01	04		VIRGINIA	04	40	05	10	77	01	02	
INDIANA		10	00	1.00	4 5	00		05	NEW JERSEY	110	10		119	35	70	00			20	76	24	12	76	36	35	38
				109					Hendrickson (R)		48			30 54			70	Byrd (D) Robertson (D)		50			53		62	55
	113	8	93	111	11	91	92	98	Smith (R)	\overline{u}	48	04	(9	94	28	00		and the second se	03	30	04	00	22	04	04	00
IOWA	00		05						NEW MEXICO	100	14	90	100	7	95	92		WASHINGTON	130	10	93	105	10	87	90	94
Gillette (D)		41			47			00	Anderson (D) Chavez (D)	125		88						Cain (R) Magnuson (D)				105				
Hickenlooper (R)	125	14	90	107	8	82	ar	30		93	13	88	103	_41	03	00		WEST VIRGINIA	140	15	08	144	44	00	0(08
KANSAS		\vdash		-	0.0	00	00		NEW YORK	00	58	00	0	54	62	61		Kilgore (D)	125	18	80	131	14	90	90	96
Darby (R)	101	<u> </u>	0.5		38		68		Ives (R)	00	28			24					132			132			93	
	131	7	95	109	25	81	88	<u> </u>	Lehman (D-Lib)		<u> </u>	ļ	123	44	04	04		Neely (D) WISCONSIN	134	11	90	134	14	92	83	
KENTUCKY	110	-	70	100	01	70	70					92	100	6	95	93		and the second	110	24	82	07	29	75	79	95
				108					Graham (D)	91		<u>92</u> 69						Wiley (R)	110		84 81	01	33	74	77	90
Withers (D)	109	19	92	1 85	15	85	89		Hoey (D)	95	43	09	100	40		-10	04		08	41	<u>01</u>	-90	.00	12		- 21
LOUISIANA		1	1	1.05	00	100		07	NORTH DAKOTA	0.	100	45	71	EE	50	50	42	WYOMING Hunt (D)	104	15	87	112	16	88	87	
Ellende, (D)				107				67	Langer (R)		76							O'Mahoney (D)	104	10	01				90	01
Long (D)	µ10	31	78	99	12	89	83		Young (R)	93	46	107	12	40	64	00	03	U Manoney (D)	144	1.4	90	140	1.4	90	90	91

Copyright, 1950, Congressional Quarterly News Features

Congressional Quarterly Almanac, 1950

REPRESENTATIVES' "PARTY UNITY", 81st CONGRESS

Their 1949 and 1950 Records; Comparison With 80th Congress

- 1. Number of times Member voted with the majority of his party over the course of 65 party-line ballots taken in House during 1949.
- 2. Number of times Member voted against the majority of his party over the course of these same 65 party-line roll-call votes in 1949.
- 3. Percentage of the time, therefore, that the Member supported his party's majority during party-line tests in 1949.
- 4. Number of times Member voted with the majority of his party over the course of 73 party-line ballots taken in the House in 1950.
- 5. Number of times Member voted against the majority of his party over the course of these same 73 party-line ballots in 1950.
- Percentage of the time, therefore, that the Member supported his party's majority during party-line tests in 1950.
- 7. Percentage of the time the Member supported his party's majority on party-line roll-call votes during the course of the 81st Congress; i.e.: 1949 and 1950, to date, combined.
- 8. Percentage of the time the Member supported his party's majority during the 80th Congress, 1947-1948.

,	-	-	-		-	-	-		r	1		3	4	5	F	7	8	/	1	2	3		5	6	7	8
ALABAMA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	GEORGIA		2	3	•	3	0	-	8	4 Rees (R)	61	1		61			94	
3 Andrews (D)	40	25	62	46	26	64	63	89		44	21	68	58	14	81	74	78	2 Scrivner (R)	64	$\frac{1}{1}$	_				98	
9 Battle (D)			65							41			45						62	3		53			93	
1 Boykin (D)			51						2 Cox (D)	28	32	47	33	26	56	51		KENTUCKY								
6 deGraffenried (D)			72			87			5 Davis (D)	22	41	35	33	40	45	40		8 Bates (D)	49	8	86		9		86	
7 Elliott (D)	50	14	78	61	6	91	85		7 Lanham (D)	49			62					4 Chelf (D)		10			7		87	81
2 Grant (D)			69						3 Pace (D)	41	14		46					9 Golden (R)	43		78	52	16			
4 Hobbs (D)			62					85	1 Preston (D)	43			53	17				1 Gregory (D)	39	9		53				
8 Jones (D)			75				83		6 Vinson (D)	44			42	5	89	83		3 Morton (R)	34	15		42		65	67	71
5 Rains (D)	41	12	77	58	9	87	83	91		29			22					7 Perkins (D)	61	3			3		95	- 04
ARIZONA	1	<u> </u>	1	1	<u> </u>				9 Wood (D)	23	29	44	25	34	42	43	71	5 Spence (D) 6 Underwood (D)	62 48	37		66 63				34
AL Murdock (D)	49		92			94		90	IDAHO	51	7	88	55	- 0	97	88	03	2 Whitaker (D)	33						88	95
AL Patten (D)	54	1-1	89	55	117	76	82			$\frac{31}{31}$				15			00	LOUISIANA	33		00	121		-01		
ARKANSAS I Gathings (D)	20	20	52	119	197	81	57	47	ILLINOIS		15	10	40	10	00			8 Allen (D)	40	18	69	42	14	75	72	69
7 Harris (D)			64		22	86	85	21	16 Allen (R)	56	2	97	53	5	91	94	100		49	9		54				
5 Hays (D)			77			89	83	87	17 Arends (R)	62		98			89	93		4 Brooks (D)	44			44			78	
2 Mills (D)	46	110	71	159	114	81	76	79	26 Bishop (R)	57						82		1 Hebert (D)	25			40				
6 Norrell (D)	27		46			54	50	60	19 Chiperfield (R)	60	0	100			88			7 Larcade (D)	26		46	41	19	68		64
4 Tackett (D)	33		52						23 Jentson (R)	54	1		54					6 Morrison (D)	44	5	90	53	4		92	81
3 Trimble (D)	55		87			93		93	21 Mack (D)	51		98		10		91		5 Passman (D)	35	30	54	35	34	51	52	63
CALIFORNIA	100	1	+	1	<u>†</u>					46		84		4	94	89		3 Willis (D)	37	21	64	43	15	74	69	
7 Allen (R)	60	4	94	49	22	69	81	93	22 McMillen (R)	52	6	90	39	8				MAINE		L		L	h	h		
8 Anderson (R)	52	7	88	49	15	77	82	90		60			68	4				3 Fellows (R)	47	2		58	4			
11 Bramblett (R)	57	1			14					60			57		81			1 Hale (R)	48	9		59				84
2 Engle (D)	40	19	68			87	78	74	20 Simpson (R)	62	3		58	14	81	88		2 Nelson (R)	42	16	72	53	15	1 78	75	<u> </u>
4 Havenner (D)	62			65				96	18 Velde (R)	55	5	92 97	58	11	84	88	- 00	MARYLAND	55	8	87	1 64	10	84	96	97
3 Johnson (R)	44				19			83	24 Vursell (R)	60	2	97	54	6	90	93	96	6 Beall (R) 2 Bolton (D)	34		57					
23 McKinnon (D)	55	8			11				Chicago-Cook Coun			00	=	-	07	88		4 Fallon (D)	39		62		26			
6 Miller (D)	57	1		58		94	96	95	4 Buckley (D)	55	10	90				81		3 Garmatz (D)	53	7						87
22 Phillips (R)	48			64		93			11 Chesney (D) 13 Vacancy	54	10	04	194	10	10	01		1 Miller (R)	53						94	
1 Scudder (R)	57	1 8	88				87		1 Dawson (D)	60	1	08	46	2	94	96	95	5 Sasscer (D)				46	17	73	74	
5 Shelley (D) 21 Sheppard (D)	44	-	94	57		84	89	75		56		90	58	10	85	88	92	MASSACHUSETTS			1			1		
10 Werdel (R)	61		95			82			10 Hoffman (R)	40			52					6 Bates (R)	51	13	80	53	8	87	83	\square
9 White (D)	52	10	84	144	19	60	77	<u>├</u> ──	12 Jonas (R)		10					81		4 Donohue (D)	41	12	77	57	12	83	80	81
Los Angeles County	194	110	107	134	1.0	100	╎╍	t	5 Vacancy			1	†*=	1			1	2 Furcolo (D)	51	4						
14 Douglas (D)	60	11	98	49	4	92	96	93		51	6	89	59	12	83	86		8 Goodwin (R)	57	4				96		94
18 Doyle (D)	59			61		94		1	6 O'Brien (D)	57	6	90	56	15	79	84	82		49	13	79	57	14	80	80	91
20 Hinshaw (R)	49		84					88	2 O'Hara (D)	54	7	89	61	11	85	86	<u> </u>	1 Heselton (R)	40		62	44	29	60	61	84
19 Holifield (D)	59					92		94	7 Sabath (D)	50			42		93	92	92	11 Kennedy (D)	48	5	91	42	13	176	83	94
16 Jackson (R)	50	8	86	56	8	88	87	89	9 Yates (D)	62	L O	100	63	7	90	95	Ļ	7 Lane (D)	55	5		67			<u>93</u> 89	01
17 King (D)	58			64		93			INDIANA		I				-	-	 	14 Martin (R)	51	7		59		91		93
15 McDonough (R)	49	16	75							63						97		12 McCormack (D)	56	7						89
12 Nixon (R)	47	14	77	34	15	69	74	91	8 Denton (D)	58			63	4	94	93	99	9 Nicholson (R) 3 Philbin (D)	63 41			53		80		72
13 Poulson (R)	34	10	77	49	14	178	78	79	2 Halleck (R)	55		93	58					5 Rogers (R)	52				18	74	82	92
COLORADO	1-0	+	1.0	+	+	1	-	{	6 Harden (R) 10 Harvey (R)	54 49					70	83	95	13 Wigglesworth (R)				59				96
4 Aspinall (D)	58		91		3	96	93	101	11 Jacobs (D)	57		89						MICHIGAN	100		1.00	1-00		+	100	
1 Carroll (D)	65 57	 8	100	1 54	14	78	100	붱	4 Kruse (D)	53		83			83	83	1	12 Bennett (R)	49	14	78	45	26	63	70	88
2 Hill (R) 3 Marsalis (D)	58	1 7	89	65	3	96	92	100	1 Madden (D)	59		92					91		49							99
CONNECTICUT	100	+	+**	100	Ť	100	100	+	7 Noland (D)	59								8 Crawford (R)	45	12	79	57	14	80	80	90
4 Lodge (R)	40	18	69	34	23	60	64	82		51						93		9 Engel (R)	42			3 23) 53	61	94
3 McGuire (D)	57					86			9 Wilson (R)	50			56			88	92	5 Ford (R)	52					2 83		
5 Patterson (R)	44		76						IOWA									4 Hoffman (R)	60							89
1 Ribicoff (D)	52				20			1	5 Cunningham (R)	53	10	84	52	20	72	78	81	2 Michener (R)	56							
AL Sadlak (R)	48		84							54	7	89	48	15	76	82	87	11 Potter (R)	53	10	84	57	10	85	85	
2 Woodhouse (D)			98						3 Gross (R)	41	22	65	44	27	1 62	63		3 Shafer (R)	56	1 5	9	4 62	1-4	1.94	93 293	91
DELAWARE	1	-				1.	1		8 Hoeven (R)	55	6	90	63	9	88	89	81	7 Wolcott (R)	56							
AL Boggs (R)	54	10	84	45	14	76	80	93	7 Jensen (R)	60	1 2	1 05	1 60	110	LRF	u ar	1 91	(IU Woodruii (R)	56	4-3	1 9:	7 22	11	4.89	89	1-24
FLORIDA	1	1					+	4	4 LeCompte (R)	54	10	84	155	13	181	1 83	38 18	Detroit-Wayne Count 15 Dingell (D)	140	-	0	39	<u> </u> _,		93	04
2 Bennett (D)	48	15	5 76	42	27	61	68	4	1 Martin (R)		1 5	191	1 22	+10	80	80	1 67	15 Dingen (D) 17 Dondero (R)	60		0	66	1-3		95	07
5 Herlong (D)	30	24	56	41	124	63	60	4	2 Talle (R)	57	4-1	109	1 22	+#	100	100	1-00	16 Vacancy	100	†	+ "	+ 00	+	1-3	+	۳4
1 Peterson (D)	138	112	167	64		189	179	479	KANSAS	58	1-	106	50	11	1 21	87	7 80	13 O'Brien (D)	47	A	80	51	1	8	87	
8 Rogers (D)	136	26	158	42	122	66	1 62	174	1 Cole (R)	55	1-8	1 86	53	115	7	1 82	2 84	14 Rabaut (D)	61	3	9	5 56	1 8	8 88	91	
3 Sikes (D)	139	417	470	146	120	170	70	0	5 Hope (R) 3 George (R) *	1-1-2	' "	+00	100		110	0100	3	1 Sadowski (D)	47	112	8	31	13	79	80	88
4 Smathers (D)	1 21	110	1 04	143	111	109	1.10	199	1 0 GEORGE (IN) T	ł				4-4	110	4.40	<u>د</u> ل	the state of the s	العمد		4.84					

*George (R Kan.) sworn in 11/27/50.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		1	2		4	5		7 8		1	2	3	4	5	6	78
7 Andersen (R)	61			-			- 0.1	70	9 Keogh (D) 19 Klein (D)	47	5		58		89 9 95 9		Philadelphia	40	-	01	E 1	-	89 1	
1 Andresen (R)	56		82		$\frac{14}{11}$	81 84				56 45	27		61 54		84 8			48 48	2	91 96	51 57			93
8 Blatnik (D)	48	7	87	62	3	95	92	94	23 Lynch (D)	58	2	97	.59	8	88 9	2 9	2 Granahan (D)	48	5	91	56	6	90	90
9 Hagen (R) 5 Judd (R)			62 56			58	60 60		18 Marcantonio ALP 26 McGrath (D)	43				16	74 7	15	5 Green (D) 3 Scott, Hardie (R)	45	3	94	55		89	91 80 94
6 Marshall (D)	49		84		40	86		10	14 Multer (D)	54 57	4	93 100			90 9									82 94
4 McCarthy (D)	57	4	93	56	7	89	91		16 Murphy (D)	52		98		6	90 9	¥	RHODE ISLAND							
2 O'Hara (R) 3 Wier (D)	57 54		88					86	13 O'Toole (D) 8 Pfeifer, J.L. (D)	52 40		90			80 8 88 9		2 Fogarty (D) 1 Forand (D)	56 63	4		56 67	_5		93 8' 95 9
MISSISSIPPI	04	0	01	00	10	00	00		22 Powell (D)	39		81		10			SOUTH CAROLINA	03	4	91	0/	- 5	93	30 31
4 Abernethy (D)			38				42		5 Quinn (D)	46	7	87	24	11	69	30	4 Bryson (D)					20		65 8
6 Colmer (D) 1 Rankin (D)			35				39 36		12 Rooney (D) 20 Roosevelt (D-Lib)	59 29		95 100		10 4	86 94	8 06	3 Hare (D) 6 McMillan (D)	30	34	47	23	18	56	50 60 7
2 Whitten (D)			46				45	70	NORTH CAROLINA								5 Richards (D)	20	17	54	49	11	82	71 9
3 Whittington (D)	31	31	50	45	22	67	59	67	3 Barden (D)						52 8									40 6
7 Williams (D) 5 Winstead (D)	21	36	33	29	$\frac{31}{29}$	48	40	79 80	1 Bonner (D) 11 Jones, W. (D)*	32	21	60			69 (100 1		SOUTH DAKOTA	61	1	98	58	3	95	97
MISSOURI	1		100						7 Carlyle (D)	34	20	63	35	27	56	59	2 Case (R)	52						82 8
5 Bolling (D)	61			64		93			5 Chatham (D)						61 (1 Lovre (R)	48	6	89	59	10	86	87
9 Cannon (D) 8 Carnahan (D)	57 56		89	52 84	15	78 94	83 92	85	4 Cooley (D) 8 Deane (D)	43 49		89			71 7 91 9		9 Cooper (D)	53	12	82	55	12	82	82 92
6 Christopher (D)	52		91			89			9 Doughton (D)	36				30			10 Davis (D)							67 7
4 Irving (D)	44	5	90	49	9	84	87		6 Durham (D)	39	18	68	40	16	71 7					77		7	89	83 9
10 Jones (D) 12 Karst (D)	53 65		87		14	79 96	83		10 Jones, H. (D) 2 Kerr (D)	43		73		21	71 7	2 7 18 5		50 44		78	50	13	79	79 81 9
13 Karsten (D)	65		100		5	93	96	93	12 Redden (D)	31	21	60	38	16	70 (5 6		48			47			86 8
1 Magee (D)	58	5	92	51	9	85	89		NORTH DAKOTA	1							8 Murray (D)	27	34	44	36	27	57	51 7:
2 Moulder (D) 7 Short (R)	55 56	1 5	92 95	155		87 88	89 91	85	AL Burdick (R) AL Vacancy	133	31	52	22	40	35 4	4	1 Phillips (R) 6 Priest (D)	<u>31</u> 55			18 58			48 71 91 9
11 Sullivan (D)	64	1	98	70	3	96	97		OHIO			<u>t</u>					7 Sutton (D)					15		
3 Welch (D)	59		95			90			22 Bolton (R)	37							TEXAS							
2 D'Ewart (R)	56	R I	88	51	15	77	82	90	3 Breen (D) 11 Brehm (R)	51 46		89 81			86 8 91 8		3 Beckworth (D) 15 Bentsen (D)		11		63 47	9 14		85 93 75
1 Mansfield (D)	52	5	91	66	3	96	94	91	7 Brown (R)	61	1	98	66	5	93	95 9	17 Burleson (D)		24					57 8
NEBRASKA									9 Burke (D)	51	0	100	67		99	99 8	2 Combs (D)			85	60	2	97	91 9
1 Curtis (R) 4 Miller (R)	55 53		98	61 59		90 86	94 88	77	5 Clevenger (R) 21 Crosser (D)	45		100	67 62		97 95		5 21 Ftsher (D) 0 13 Gossett (D)		33		26 33	40 27	39	43 6 50 7
2 O'Sullivan (D)	58	4	94	65	4	94	94		1 Elston (R)	53	3	95	68	5			3 20 Kilday (D)		25		37	25	60	60 6
3 Stefan (R)	50	9	85	57	11	84	84	81	20 Feighan (D)	50		86	66	5	93		3 12 Lucas (D)	31	27	53				47 7
AL Baring (D)	51	- 2	96	62	+ ,	90	02		18 Hays (D) 14 Huber (D)	50 55	7		51 57		75		14 Lyle (D) 2 19 Mahon (D)		18		39 48			75 9 69 8
NEW HAMPSHIRE	101		100	02	+ ·	30	<i>a</i> u		10 Jenkins (R)	61	1					95 9		57				3	95	93 9
2 Cotton (R)	54		86						19 Kirwan (D)	56		95	58	7	89	22 8	7 Pickett (D)		33	47	23	38	38	42 8
1 Merrow (R) NEW JERSEY	40	14	74	43	20	68	71	80	4 McCulloch (R) 17 McGregor (R)	59	3	95 91	67	4	94	95 9 92 9	2 <u>11 Poage (D)</u> 3 4 Rayburn (D)	<u>38</u> -	17	-	35		_	60 8
11 Addonizio (D)	61	3	95	65	8	89	92		16 McSweeney (D)	49 43	9		63		93 93	<u>92 9</u> 88	16 Regan (D)		27	- 53		- 19		54 7
3 Auchincloss (R)	48	14	77	57	15	79	78	95	6 Polk (D)	54	11	83	55	15	79	81	6 Teague (D)	33	27	55	27	31	47	51 8
8 Canfield (R) 6 Case (R)			52 48						15 Secrest (D) 8 Smith (R)	38					45		8 Thomas (D) 9 Thompson (D)	55 49				21		78 9 79 8
5 Eaton (R)	41								12 Vorys (R)	21	$\frac{2}{7}$		49 55	14	98 80	B4 9		53						88
2 Hand (R)		18	68	46	20	70	69	87	2 Wagner (D)	59		91	53	16	77	B4	5 Wilson (D)				32	40	44	46 6
14 Hart (D) 4 Howell (D)	54 59	5	92	60	10	86	88	79	13 Weichel (R) AL Young (D)	48	6	89	64	8 12	89	89 9 84	0 18 Guill (R)		+	-	25	- 7	78	78
12 Kean (R)			74					89	OKLAHOMA	104	1 0	00	1.00	-	- 24		2 Bosone (D)	45	9	83	63	6	91	87
13 Norton (D)	45		88			95	92	93	3 Albert (D)		16		65				5 1 Granger (D)	56		92	52			89 8
10 Rodino (D) 7 Widnall (R)	62	1	98		8	89			1 Gilmer (D) 5 Monroney (D)	37	8 12		39 45			78	VERMONT OAL Plumley (R)	42	-	88	50	5	01	89 9
9 Towe (R)	47	9	84	60	6	91	88	93	6 Morris (D)										· · ·			-	-	_
1 Wolverton (R)	35	22	61	40	29	58	60	85	4 Steed (D)	48	13	62	52	10	84	81	4 Abbitt (D)	27	17	61				62 75
NEW MEXICO AL Fernandez (D)	47	177	73	51	114	70	78	02	2 Stigler (D) 7 Wickersham (D)			77			89			49	10	70	18	14 20	56	56
AL Miles (D)			75					03	8 Wilson (D)	48	16	75	57	10	90 85	80	9 Fugate (D)	48	12	80	40	13	80	80
NEW YORK			T						OREGON		!			1 1	· ·		3 Gary (D)	38	17	69	41	22	65	80 67 7(
32 Byrne (D) 39 Cole (R)	46		92 89							140	21 0	86	34 57	29	54 (86 1	50 B 36 R	2 Hardy (D) 7 Harrison (D)	45	18	171 89	35	19 94	73	72 8 56 7
35 Davies (D)	43	5	90	41	11	79	84		1 Norblad (R)	39	10	80	49	15	77	18 7	8 Smith (D)	21	31	40	28	39	42	41 7'
28 Gamble (R)	50	8	86	60	17	90	88	94	2 Stockman (R)	54	8	87	47	16	75 8	31 8	5 Stanley (D)	31	21	60	26	34	43	51 6
44 Gorski (D) 27 Gwinn (R)	59 48	3	95 94	80	3	87 95	95	95	PENNSYLVANIA 33 Buchanan (D)	58	4	94	68		94	4 9	4 Holmes (R)	43	29	86	41	32	56	61 8
37 Hall, E.A. (R)	37	14	73	38	13	75	74	97	23 Cavalcante (D)	52	7	88	42	8	84 8	36	5 Horan (R)	45	14	76	50	20	71	74 8
2 Hall, L. W. (R)	48	7	87	58	9	87	87	96	30 Corbett (R)		22	60	47	25	65 0	33 7	2 Jackson (D)	62	2	97	65	6	92	94 8
31 Kearney (R) 40 Keating (R)			74 69			85 78				62 53		97 93	57	7	93 9 89 9	20 9 91	3 Mack (R) 1 Mitchell (D)	44 60	19	70	53 61	17	76 ' 90	73 84 93
34 Kilburn (R)	43	9	83	56	15	79	80	97	32 Eberharter (D)	58	2	97	62	8	89 1	92 9	6 Tollefson (R)	27	27	49	35	32	52	51 8
30 LeFevre (R)	55	17	89	63	6	91	90	93	12 Fenton (R)	54	10	84	66	6	92 8	38 9	WEST VIRGINIA		1				[
1 Macy (R) 42 Pfetifer, W.L.(R)	151	$\frac{10}{13}$	100	43	+ 5 9	92 83	96 79	100	11 Flood (D) 31 Fulton (R)	25	27	49	62 37	29	90 56 93	31 8	3 Bailey (D) 4 Burnside (D)	51 51		91 98	55 61	4	93 86	
45 Reed (R)	51	0	100	61	2	97	98	94	19 Gavin (R)	60		95	63	5	93	4 9	6 Hedrick (D)	54	6	90	54	13	81	85 7
36 Richlman (R)	42	9	82	54	16	77]	79	97	14 Gillette (R)	62	3	95	55	1	98	97 9	1] 5 Kee (D)	49	1	98	59	3	95	96 9
29 St. George (R) 38 Taber (R)	46	4	93	68	$\frac{2}{5}$	93	93	97	25 Graham (R) 7 James (R)	62 56	5	92	67	2	99 97	95	2 Staggers (D)	51 51	1 3	98 94	46 64		87 94	
43 Tauriello (D)	48	5	93 91	55	17	78	82		28 Kearns (R)	49	9	84	55	12	82	33 10	WISCONSIN			1				
33 Taylor (R)		12	76	56	10	85	81	92	27 Kelley (D)	56	4	93	52	[7]	88	91 9	5 Biemiller (D)	61		95		9	87	91
41 Wadsworth (R) New York City	49	+"	88	191	+ 4	83	90	81	18 Kunkel (R) 8 Lichtenwalter (R)			83 82		8	87	85 9	8 Byrnes (R) 2 Davis (R)	59 51	<u>6</u> 14	91 78	66 61	6 10	92	91 9 82 8
25 Buckley (D)	32		94	40	5	89	91	92	21 Lind (D)	54	10	84	62	10	86	85	9 Hull (R)	33	32	51	35	38	48	49 4
15 Celler (D)	54	0	100	55	11	83	91	95	16 McConnell (R)	52		85		4	94	90 9	4 6 Keefe (R)	42	13	176	24	10	711	741 94
4 Clemente (D) 17 Coudert (R)	50 40	+#	93 85	55	$\frac{12}{13}$	82	87	91	24 Morgan (D) 10 O'Neill (D)	57 51		98 93	59	G A	91 91	92 92	3 7 Murray (R) 10 O'Konski (R)	45 34	13	78	41	21	66	81 8 63 6 95 8
6 Delaney (D)	55	17	89	159	12	83	86		13 Rhodes (D)	55	3	95	61	6	91	93	1 Smith (R)	58	3	95	65	4	94	<u>95 8</u>
24 Dollinger (D)	57	3	95	62	6	91	93		15 Rich (R) 26 Saylor (R)	59		97			97		3 Withrow (R)	29	(32	48	43	28	61.	55
11 Heffernan (D) 7 Heller (D)	50 45	1 3	94 100	52 61	8	91	90	93	26 Saylor (R) 17 Simpson (R)	10		91	48 4=	19	72	$\frac{74}{64}$	4 Zablocki (D)	61	3	95	62	5	93	94
21 Javits (R)			24	18	43	30	27	62	22 Van Zandt (R)	47	16	75	49	19	72	73 9	8 WYOMING OAL Barrett (R)	60	2	97	35	11	76	88 8
10 Kelly (D)		Γ		65	5	93	93		20 Walter (D)	49	4	92	59	10	86	89 7	8			_				
*Iones, W. (D N.C.) s		4.	. 11	/00	100																			

*Jones, W. (D N.C.) sworn in 11/30/50.

Copyright, 1950, Congressional Quarterly News Features