## Era of Polarization Was Unyielding

The middle ground in Congress seemed all but gone in 2013. Democrats and Republicans showed by their votes that they were more deeply and emotionally divided than at any time since World War II, a gulf that had been steadily widening for the previous four decades. This divisive partisanship showed no sign of easing and brought Congress to the verge of immobility.

CQ Roll Call's annual analysis of congressional voting patterns found that nearly seven out of every 10 of the 640 votes taken in the House in 2013 had a majority of Republicans on one side and a majority of Democrats on the other. That's the fourth-highest rate in the House since Congressional Quarterly first began measuring partisanship in Congress, in 1953.

In the Senate, just as in the House, almost 70 percent of the votes in 2013 had most Democrats differing with most Republicans. The 2013 rate was the third-highest calculated and a marked increase from 2011 (51 percent) and 2012 ( 60 percent).

Although the frequency of these party unity votes in the House fell slightly in 2013 from the two previous years, it was only the second time in the history of the study that both chambers experienced such a high degree of partisan voting - typically the frequency of party unity votes would rise in one chamber and fall in the other. Partisanship had been generally increasing since the early 1970s, when the major parties were more ideologically diverse - northern and southern Democrats, for instance, didn't always see eye to eye on issues, and neither did conservative and moderate Republicans.

In the decades since, conservatives had left the Democratic Party in droves, particularly in the South, and many moderates had forsaken the GOP. What they left behind were more-monolithic parties with a deep gulf between them. That, in turn, led to victories on floor votes for Republicans who controlled the House and for Democrats who ran the Senate, though it seldom led to enactment of new laws or changes in old laws.

In the House, Republicans recovered from the party's thrashing in the 2012 election and persistently brought up proposals to unify their conference, including bills attacking President Barack Obama's health care law. The Senate's year was characterized by incessant fighting over the filibuster. On procedural fights, partisans almost entirely stuck by their leaders.

The number of instances where Senate Democrats and House Republicans voted unanimously also reached record levels in 2013.

The causes of such polarization were debated by political scientists
and political pundits, but they likely stemmed from trends decades in the making, including a greater ideological consistency in the parties - moderates who might vote across the aisle had become rare and increased competitiveness for the reins of power.

Meanwhile, increasing partisanship led to few bipartisan bill signings in the White House Rose Garden and almost relentless gridlock, with little prospect that it would change anytime soon. "It's at an all-time high," said Keith T. Poole, a University of Georgia political scientist who studied party polarization. "It doesn't look like it's slowing down." Poole dismissed what he called "partisan cant" from those in Washington who bemoaned the consequences of polarization. "This has been going on a long time," he said.

## HASTERT'S HOUSE

House Speaker John A. Boehner of Ohio was frequently the object of ridicule or pity for his struggles to manage the multifarious Republican conference, but in 2013, Boehner secured a record level of party unity. House Republicans voted with their party's majority an average of 92 percent of the time - an all-time high, and up from 90 percent in 2012. The previous all-time high average for House Republicans was 91 percent, reached in 1995, 2001, 2003 and 2011.

While there often were disagreements over strategy within the party, GOP leaders were largely able to settle those differences, if not completely behind the scenes, then before bills ever reached the floor. House Republicans seemed intent on regaining stability after Obama was re-elected and the GOP fractured during negotiations that avoided a "fiscal cliff" of tax increases and spending cuts.
"I think leadership is more unified, and that's resulted in a more unified caucus," said Rep. Mike Simpson, a veteran Republican from Idaho and a Boehner ally. "Obviously, you've got to have a majority of your members, and hopefully all of your members, on any policy."

Boehner largely abided by the "Hastert rule," named for Republican Speaker J. Dennis Hastert of Illinois, who, when he led the House from 1999 through 2006, sought to only bring bills to the floor that had the support of a majority of Republicans.

Democrats also largely stuck together in 2013. The average Democratic Party unity score in the House was 88 percent, up from 87 percent in both 2012 and 2011. The Democrats who broke with their party most frequently were, not surprisingly, the most politically vulnerable members who represented mostly Republican districts. Topping the list were Jim Matheson of Utah, who split with his party

## More Than Ever

The parties showed higher levels of party unity in both chambers. In the Senate, Democrats set a record for voting together, as did Republicans in the House. As a result, the majorities in both chambers also raised their frequency of victory on party unity votes.


## Unity Vote Frequency Up in Senate and Down in House

The number and frequency of Senate roll call votes in which a majority of Democrats opposed a majority of Republicans rose a bit in 2013 - and the frequency of these party unity votes, 69.8 percent, was the third-highest recorded since 1953. Although the frequency of unity votes fell in the House to 68.6 percent, 2011 through 2013 saw the highest degree of persistent partisanship for Congress as a whole since World War II.

## Party Unity Votes


just over 52 percent of the time, and Mike McIntyre of North Carolina, who broke with Democrats on almost 43 percent of floor votes. Both had decided to retire at the end of their terms.

Republican leaders largely shunned measures that would have divided their party, such as the immigration bill that the Senate passed, and instead brought legislation to the floor that unified Republicans and Democrats.

The House passed bills to restrict abortion rights and permit construction of the Keystone XL oil pipeline from Canada. A series of bills were passed to roll back the Dodd-Frank financial regulatory overhaul. And Republicans continued their assault on Obama's health care overhaul, passing a slew of bills to delay pieces of the law or repeal it outright. In all these instances and more, Republicans used their majority to triumph over the objections of Democrats.

Of floor votes in which a majority of one party voted against a majority of the other, Republicans won almost 89 percent - up from 86 percent in 2012 and the second-highest House Republican victory percentage since CQ began measuring this statistic in 1960.

Most of the bills passed by the House went nowhere in the Senate, where they ran into sharp Democratic opposition. Divided government yielded 72 bills signed into law in the first session of the 113th Congress, the fewest ever in the postwar era. Boehner dismissed complaints about Congress' low productivity, saying, "We should not be judged on how many new laws we create. We should be judged on how many laws we repeal."

Democrats bemoaned the GOP's domination in the House, which left them almost completely sidelined. Rep. Henry A. Waxman, a liberal Democrat from California, said Republicans were "very disciplined," but he complained about "their unwillingness to talk compromise or to work with Democrats." "I think it's not the place
where we ought to be going," Waxman said. "I think we ought to be talking about how can we work together to do things in the interests of the country."

House Democrats won a paltry 11 percent of contested floor votes, the party's second-lowest victory percentage in six decades. The legislative battles they did win were notable, however. In January 2013, just 49 Republicans, along with almost every Democrat, passed a $\$ 50$ billion supplemental appropriations bill to provide relief to victims of Superstorm Sandy. The following month, a minority of House Republicans joined all Democrats in clearing a Senate bill to renew and expand the Violence Against Women Act, called VAWA.

And in one of the defining fights of the year, House Republicans were unsuccessful in trying to undermine the health care law during wrangling over financing the government and raising the debt limit in October, which caused the government to shut down for 16 days.

Ultimately, a minority of House Republicans voted with every Democrat to reopen the government and increase the debt limit before a global financial crisis could unfold. Though that was one of the few instances when the majority of the House majority lost a floor vote, the episode was also notable for how united the conference remained before and during the crisis, as GOP leaders went along with their tea-party-backed brethren.
"Leadership didn't want to shut the government down, but I think the feeling was we had to give these guys the shot," Simpson said. Moderate Republicans and those representing swing districts had opposed allowing the government to shut down.

Still, for much of the year, conservatives more than centrists dictated the GOP's path. Of the 10 House Republicans who broke most with their party in 2013, eight were from New Jersey, New York or Pennsylvania.

## Both Parties Raise Their Support Scores

House and Senate lawmakers from both parties on average voted more often with their caucus majorities in 2013 than they did in 2012. House Republicans set a record for party support, voting on average with their caucus 92 percent of the time, up from 90 percent. Likewise, Senate Democrats set a record, raising their average party unity score to 94 percent from the previous record of 92 percent.

Average party unity scores


## 'NUCLEAR WINTER'

The once-genteel Senate, meanwhile, was the site of the fiercest partisan clashes in 2013, with Democrats and Republicans engaged in constant combat over procedural matters.

In an effort to cool tensions at the outset of the 113th Congress, Democratic Majority Leader Harry Reid of Nevada and GOP Minority Leader Mitch McConnell of Kentucky agreed to a limited set of changes to Senate rules, intended to reduce the use of the 60 -votethreshold filibuster and speed up Senate action.

Over the following months, however, Republicans continued to block important nominations, leading many Democrats to decide that the agreement didn't go far enough. A GOP blockade stopped, at least temporarily, Obama's top appointments at the Pentagon, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, National Labor Relations Board, Federal Housing Finance Agency and U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit.

In November, Democrats unilaterally changed the rules so that filibusters of most nominations, but not of bills, could be ended with a simple majority vote.

The move further soured relations in the Senate, with talk of a "nuclear winter" of retribution in which almost nothing would get done, though it's unclear how the partisan divide could have gotten much worse.
Reid portrayed the move as necessary to fix a broken Senate. "To remain relevant and effective as an institution, the Senate must evolve to meet the challenges of a modern era," he said.

Republicans accused Reid of being a dictator and Democrats of blindly following him. "Whenever Harry Reid cracks the whip, it seems every Senate Democrat falls in line and votes with their party and against the American people," said Sen. Ted Cruz, a Texas Republican.

Both Senate leaders skillfully kept their caucuses together, but Reid's results were better than McConnell's.

On votes splitting the parties, Democrats voted with their party's majority 94 percent of the time on average. That was the highest ever for Senate Democrats, beating their 2012 and 2011 averages of 92 percent and the 2010 and 2009 averages of 91 percent.

The average Republican Party unity score was 86 percent, up from 80 percent in 2012 and matching the 2011 average.

Susan Collins of Maine and Lisa Murkowski of Alaska were the two main reasons the GOP's score was lower; Collins opposed her party's majority almost 56 percent of the time, and Murkowski broke with most in her party on almost 51 percent of unity votes.

## UNIFYING FORCES

Senate Democratic defections were less frequent. West Virginia's Joe Manchin III split with his party just under 26 percent of the time, the most in his caucus; Arkansas' Mark Pryor, who faced a tough re-election contest the following year, had an almost 20 percent rate of opposition.

With the parties sharply divided, Democrats won an impressive 84 percent of party unity votes in the Senate, up from almost 69 percent in 2012 and almost 73 percent in 2011.

In addition to eventually confirming most of Obama's nominees, Democrats used their majority to pass several pieces of major legislation after capturing a handful of Republican votes here and there.

A comprehensive overhaul of the nation's immigration laws was passed in June with the support of every Democrat and 14 of 46 Republicans. The same month, the Senate passed a broad rewrite of

## Majority Parties Victorious More Often in Both Chambers

The majority party's success rate on votes that split the two parties rose in both chambers in 2013. House Republicans got their way on 88.6 percent of party unity votes, up from 86.0 percent in 2012 and close to a record. Senate Democrats won 84.2 percent of the time, up from 68.7 percent in 2012 though still well below their record of 92.3 percent in 2009 , when the caucus held a 60 -vote majority.

Majority party victory percentages on party unity votes

farm policy with 18 Republicans on board.
And in November, with the help of 10 Republicans, the Senate passed legislation to prohibit employers from discriminating against gays and lesbians.

A new farm bill would soon become law, but the Senate's immigration overhaul and anti-discrimination bill went nowhere in the House.

Even in the minority, Senate Republicans were able to notch some victories. Notably, they defeated gun control legislation strongly sought by Obama and most Democrats, including a proposal to expand background checks on prospective gun buyers.

Still, the GOP's success rate was just under 16 percent in the Senate, a drop from roughly 31 percent in 2012 and just over 27 percent in 2011. Senate Republicans' winning percentage was the second-lowest in the Senate since 1967 for a minority party.

A final indicator of polarization was the growing number of unanimous party unity votes in both chambers. In the House, Democrats

voted unanimously on 22 percent of the votes that split the parties in 2013. That was up from 8 percent in 2012 and 11 percent in 2011 for the party.

House Republicans voted unanimously on 35 percent of party unity votes - an all-time high for them and up from 21 percent in 2012.

Similarly in the Senate, Republicans were unanimous on 31 percent of roll call votes that divided the parties, significantly higher than the 13 percent they recorded in 2012 and the 26 percent rate they had in 2011.

Senate Democrats voted unanimously on 52 percent of the 2013 party unity votes. That was the highest ever for either party in either chamber, and a rise from 40 percent in 2012 for the caucus.

With occasional fits and starts, the rate of unanimous party voting steadily increased as time went on.

## LONGER-TERM TRENDS

Exactly why this happened was often debated, though it likely stemmed from social, political and economic trends long in the making.
"I think the strongest theories are ones that have to do with bigger, broader changes in American society," said Nolan McCarty, a Princeton University political scientist. "If you look at the data on polarization, it's really composed of very long-term trends." McCarty said partisanship was very high during the late 1900s, then declined in the 1920 s and was low for 40 years. But then, starting in the 1970s, partisanship started rising and never stopped.

One reason for the growing partisan divide that most political scientists agreed on was that voters had sorted themselves into more ideologically consistent parties. In the mid-20th century, bipartisan coalitions were built out of liberal Republicans and conservative Democrats. The political plates shifted in the wake of the civil rights era, and the realignment that moved Southern conservatives out of the Democratic Party and

## Leading Scorers: Party Unity

Support indicates those who voted most often with a majority of their party against a majority of the other party in 2013. Opposition shows those who voted most often against their party. Lawmakers who left
office or who missed half or more of the votes are not listed. Scores are reported only in this list to one decimal point; members with identical scores are listed alphabetically. (Complete scores, pp. B-23, B-24)

## SENATE

## SUPPORT

| Democrats |  | Republicans |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Cantwell, Wash. | $100.0 \%$ | Scott, S.C. | $99.5 \%$ |
| Cardin, Md. | 100.0 | Risch, Idaho | 98.5 |
| Mikulski, Md. | 100.0 | Roberts, Kan. | 98.5 |
| Schatz, Hawaii | 100.0 | Cruz, Texas | 98.4 |
| Blumenthal, Conn. | 99.5 | Barrasso, Wyo. | 98.0 |
| Boxer, Calif. | 99.5 | Enzi, Wyo. | 98.0 |
| Franken, Minn. | 99.5 | Johnson, R., Wis. | 98.0 |
| Gillibrand, N.Y. | 99.5 | Inhofe, Okla. | 97.8 |
| Hirono, Hawaii | 99.5 | Crapo, Idaho | 97.5 |
| Menendez, N.J. | 99.5 | Coburn, Okla. | 96.8 |
| Murray, Wash. | 99.5 | Grassley, lowa | 96.6 |
| Schumer, N.Y. | 99.5 | Lee, Utah | 96.5 |
| Stabenow, Mich. | 99.5 | Cornyn, Texas | 96.0 |

## OPPOSITION

| Democrats |  | Republicans |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Manchin, W.Va. | $25.8 \%$ | Collins, Maine | $55.7 \%$ |
| Pryor, Ark. | 19.7 | Murkowski, Alaska | 50.8 |
| Donnelly, Ind. | 14.8 | Kirk, III. | 28.1 |
| Hagan, N.C. | 13.8 | McCain, Ariz. | 27.3 |
| Baucus, Mont. | 11.4 | Graham, S.C. | 23.4 |
| McCaskill, Mo. | 11.2 | Flake, Ariz. | 20.5 |
| Tester, Mont. | 9.9 | Hatch, Utah | 20.1 |
| Heitkamp, N.D. | 9.6 | Ayotte, N.H. | 17.9 |
| Begich, Alaska | 9.2 | Alexander, Tenn. | 17.7 |
| Landrieu, La. | 8.6 | Corker, Tenn. | 16.9 |
| Warner, Va. | 7.6 | Isakson, Ga. | 15.3 |
| Reid, Nev. * | $6.6^{*}$ | Cochran, Miss. | 15.2 |
| Kaine, Va. | 5.5 | Wicker, Miss. | 14.6 |
| *Reid voted against his party's position  <br> seven times in 2013 to preserve his right  <br> to reconsider the vote.  <br>   |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## HOUSE

| HOUSE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SUPPORT |  |  |  | OPPOSITION |  |  |  |
| Democrats |  | Republicans |  | Democrats |  | Republicans |  |
| Pocan, Wis. | 98.9\% | Latta, Ohio | 99.3\% | Matheson, Utah | 52.4\% | Gibson, N.Y. | 27.8\% |
| Becerra, Calif. | 98.6 | Bucshon, Ind. | 98.6 | McIntyre, N.C. | 42.8 | Jones, N.C. | 27.7 |
| Chu, Calif. | 98.6 | Campbell, Calif. | 98.6 | Barrow, Ga. | 42.1 | Fitzpatrick, Pa. | 16.2 |
| McGovern, Mass. | 98.6 | Neugebauer, Texas | 98.6 | Barber, Ariz. | 35.4 | Grimm, N.Y. | 15.7 |
| Hastings, A., Fla. | 98.2 | Williams, Texas | 98.6 | Peterson, Minn. | 35.1 | LoBiondo, N.J. | 15.5 |
| Holt, N.J. | 98.2 | Smith, J., Mo. | 98.5 | Owens, N.Y. | 34.4 | King, P., N.Y. | 14.8 |
| Sánchez, Linda, Calif. | 98.2 | Hensarling, Texas | 98.4 | Cuellar, Texas | 31.0 | Amash, Mich. | 14.2 |
| Schakowsky, III. | 98.2 | Holding, N.C. | 98.4 | Costa, Calif. | 29.9 | Runyan, N.J. | 14.0 |
| Nadler, N.Y. | 98.1 | Long, Mo. | 98.4 | Gallego, Texas | 28.0 | Hanna, N.Y. | 13.3 |
| Wilson, F., Fla. | 98.1 | Olson, Texas | 98.4 | Sinema, Ariz. | 27.0 | Smith, C., N.J. | 13.3 |
| Bass, Calif. | 98.0 | Wagner, Mo. | 98.4 | Maffei, N.Y. | 26.0 | Herrera Beutler, Wa | 12.7 |
| Lewis, Ga. | 98.0 | McCaul, Texas | 98.2 | Maloney, S., N.Y. | 25.2 | Duncan, Tenn. | 11.9 |
| Ellison, Minn. | 97.9 | Messer, Ind. | 98.2 | Rahall, W.Va. | 25.2 | Massie, Ky. | 11.7 |
| Kennedy, Mass. | 97.9 | Weber, Texas | 98.2 | Murphy, P. Fla. | 23.2 | Lance, N.J. | 11.6 |
| Lowenthal, Calif. | 97.9 | Flores, Texas | 98.1 | Ruiz, Calif. | 22.6 | Young, D., Alaska | 10.8 |
| Pallone, N.J. | 97.9 | Johnson, S., Texas | 98.1 | Garcia, Fla. | 21.6 | Dent, Pa. | 10.3 |
| Pingree, Maine | 97.9 | Pompeo, Kan. | 98.1 | Peters, S., Calif. | 20.9 | Frelinghuysen, N.J. | 10.3 |
| Roybal-Allard, Calif. | 97.9 | Rokita, Ind. | 98.0 | Vela, Texas | 20.6 | Broun, Ga. | 10.1 |

ushered liberals out of the GOP was by then virtually complete.
With each party pushing a more coherent ideological agenda, lawmakers were far less likely to cross the aisle on a piece of legislation than they were a generation before.

Scholars also increasingly weighed the relationship between partisanship and the country's increasing economic inequality. "We find that these trends move in tandem," said Poole, who co-wrote a muchpraised 2006 book, "Polarized America: The Dance of Ideology and Unequal Riches," with McCarty and New York University political scientist Howard Rosenthal.

While some political observers pointed to the rise of the tea party or polarizing presidents like Obama and George W. Bush as reasons for high partisanship, evidence was strong that partisanship had been trending higher for decades. "The big picture is still this long-term change rather than ephemeral political moments," said Frances E. Lee, a political scientist at the University of Maryland. But another piece of the story, Lee said, was the heightened competition for control of Congress in recent years: "Every election seems to hold out the prospect of a significant shift in power. This fuels a more confrontational political style."

## Party Unity Background

Roll call votes used for the party unity study were all those on which a majority of Democrats opposed a majority of Republicans. Support indicates the percentage of the time that members voted in agreement with the majority of their party on such party unity votes. Opposition indicates the percentage of the time that members voted against the
majority of their party. In calculations of average scores by party and chamber, a member's failure to vote lowers the score for the group. The tables below also show the number of party unity votes on which each party was victorious and the number of instances in which either party voted unanimously.

## Average Party Unity Scores by Chamber

SUPPORT
OPPOSITION

| HOUSE |  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Democrats | $88 \%$ | $87 \%$ | $\mathbf{8 \%}$ | $8 \%$ |
|  | Republicans | 92 | 90 | 5 | 7 |
| SENATE | Democrats | 94 | 92 | 4 | 7 |
|  | Republicans | 86 | 80 | 11 | 16 |
| CONGRESS | Democrats | 89 | 87 | 8 | 8 |
|  | Republicans | 91 | 89 | 6 | 7 |


| Victories in Party Unity Votes |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | HOUSE |  | SENATE |  | CONGRESS |  |
| YEAR | Democrats | Republicans | Democrats | Republicans | Democrats | Republicans |
| 2013 | 50 | 389 | 171 | 32 | 221 | 421 |
| 2012 | 67 | 411 | 103 | 47 | 170 | 458 |
| 2011 | 82 | 634 | 87 | 33 | 169 | 667 |
| 2010 | 236 | 28 | 196 | 39 | 432 | 67 |
| 2009 | 473 | 29 | 264 | 22 | 737 | 51 |
| 2008 | 342 | 25 | 60 | 51 | 402 | 76 |
| 2007 | 658 | 72 | 179 | 87 | 837 | 159 |
| 2006 | 59 | 236 | 53 | 107 | 112 | 343 |
| 2005 | 50 | 278 | 47 | 182 | 97 | 460 |
| 2004 | 42 | 213 | 28 | 85 | 70 | 298 |
| 2003 | 39 | 310 | 56 | 250 | 95 | 560 |
| 2002 | 39 | 170 | 42 | 73 | 81 | 243 |
| 2001 | 27 | 177 | 95 | 115 | 122 | 292 |
| 2000 | 77 | 182 | 31 | 114 | 108 | 296 |
| 1999 | 58 | 177 | 77 | 211 | 135 | 388 |
| 1998 | 80 | 216 | 61 | 114 | 141 | 330 |
| 1997 | 58 | 261 | 46 | 104 | 104 | 365 |
| 1996 | 48 | 208 | 59 | 132 | 107 | 340 |
| Unanimous Voting by Parties |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | HOUSE |  | SENATE |  | CONGRESS |  |
| Year | Democrats | Republicans | Democrats | Republicans | Democrats | Republicans |
| 2013 | 97 | 152 | 106 | 62 | 203 | 214 |
| 2012 | 40 | 99 | 60 | 19 | 100 | 118 |
| 2011 | 76 | 209 | 55 | 31 | 131 | 240 |
| 2010 | 10 | 91 | 67 | 106 | 77 | 197 |
| 2009 | 29 | 144 | 79 | 74 | 108 | 218 |
| 2008 | 66 | 96 | 30 | 19 | 96 | 115 |
| 2007 | 170 | 177 | 102 | 35 | 272 | 212 |
| 2006 | 70 | 62 | 34 | 30 | 104 | 92 |
| 2005 | 82 | 91 | 69 | 59 | 151 | 150 |
| 2004 | 70 | 77 | 3 | 31 | 73 | 108 |
| 2003 | 94 | 109 | 32 | 130 | 126 | 239 |
| 2002 | 37 | 54 | 12 | 23 | 49 | 77 |
| 2001 | 1 | 66 | 37 | 55 | 38 | 121 |
| 2000 | 1 | 67 | 52 | 19 | 53 | 86 |
| 1999 | 11 | 59 | 100 | 63 | 111 | 122 |
| 1998 | 8 | 42 | 46 | 33 | 54 | 75 |
| 1997 | 11 | 63 | 35 | 38 | 46 | 101 |
| 1996 | 10 | 32 | 35 | 47 | 45 | 79 |

## Party Unity History

The table below on the left shows how frequently during roll call votes a majority of Democrats aligned against a majority of Republicans. The tables in the center and at right show the average party unity support score for each party in each chamber.

| YEAR | Freque! | ity Votes | House Average Scores |  | Senate Average Scores |  | Tallying Party Unity Votes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | House | Senate | Democrats | Republicans | Democrats | Republicans |  |
| 2013 | 68.6\% | 69.8\% | 88 | 92 | 94 | 86 |  |
| 2012 | 72.8 | 59.8 | 87 | 90 | 92 | 80 |  |

In the House in 2013, the two parties aligned against each other on 439 of 640 roll call votes, or 68.6 percent of the time - the fourth-highest frequency of unity votes ever for the chamber, down somewhat from 2012. In the Senate, the parties opposed each other on 203 of 291 roll calls, or 69.8 percent of the time - an increase from 2012 and the third-highest frequency for the chamber. A list of roll call votes that pitted majorities of the two parties against each other is available upon request from CQ Roll Call.

Calculations of average scores by chamber and party are based on all eligible "yea" or "nay" votes, whether or not all members participated. Under this methodology, average support and opposition scores are reduced when members choose not to vote. Because individual member scores are based on the number of votes cast, party and chamber averages are not strictly comparable to individual member scores. (Complete member scores, pp. B-23, B-24)

Also, in the member score tables, Sens. Angus King, I-Maine, and Bernard Sanders, I-Vt., were treated as if they were Democrats when calculating their support and opposition scores. Their votes were not used to determine which roll calls were party unity votes, however, and they are not included in the Democratic Party averages for the Senate.

## SENATE

1. Party Unity. Percentage of recorded party unity votes in 2013 on which a senator voted "yea" or "nay" in agreement with a majority of his or her party. (Party unity votes are those on which a majority of voting Democrats opposed a majority of voting Republicans.) Percentages are based on votes cast; thus, failure to vote does not lower a member's score.
2. Party Opposition. Percentage of recorded party unity votes in 2013 on which a senator voted "yea" or "nay" in disagreement with a majority of his or her party. Percentages are based on votes cast; thus, failure to vote does not lower a member's score.
3. Participation in Party Unity Votes. Percentage of the Senate party unity votes in 2013 for which a senator was eligible and present and voted "yea" or "nay." There were a total of 203 such recorded votes.
${ }^{1}$ Sen. Edward J. Markey, D-Mass., was sworn in July 16, 2013, to fill the seat vacated by the Feb. 1 resignation of Democrat John Kerry. The seat was filled in the interim by Democrat William "Mo" Cowan, who was sworn in Feb. 7 and resigned July 16. Kerry was eligible for seven party unity votes in 2013; Cowan was eligible for 109 party unity votes; Markey was eligible for 87 party unity votes.
${ }^{2}$ Sen. Cory Booker, D-N.J., was sworn in Oct. 31, 2013, to fill the seat vacated by the June 3 death of Democrat Frank R. Lautenberg. The seat was filled in the interim by Republican Jeff Chiesa, who was sworn in June 10 and resigned Oct. 31. Lautenberg was eligible for 95 party unity votes in 2013; Chiesa was eligible for 51 party unity votes; Booker was eligible for 55 party unity votes.


## HOUSE

1. Party Unity. Percentage of recorded party unity votes in 2013 on which a member voted "yea" or "nay" in agreement with a majority of his or her party. (Party unity votes are those on which a majority of voting Democrats opposed a majority of voting Republicans.) Percentages are based on votes cast; thus, failure to vote does not lower a member's score.
2. Party Opposition. Percentage of recorded party unity votes in 2013 on which a member voted "yea" or "nay" in disagreement with a majority of his or her party. Percentages are based on votes cast; thus, failure to vote does not lower a member's score.
3. Participation in Party Unity Votes. Percentage of the House party unity votes in 2013 for which a member was eligible and present, and voted "yea" or "nay." There were a total of 439 such recorded votes.

Rep. Jo Bonner, R-Ala., resigned Aug. 2, 2013. Bonner was eligible for 302 party unity votes in 2013.
${ }^{2}$ Rep. C.W. Bill Young, R-Fla., died Oct. 18, 2013. Young was eligible for 378 party unity votes in 2013.
${ }^{3}$ Rep. Robin Kelly, D-Ill., was sworn in April 11, 2013, to fill the seat vacated by the Nov. 21, 2012, resignation of Democrat Jesse L. Jackson Jr. Kelly was eligible for 383 party unity votes in 2013.
${ }^{4}$ Rep. Vance McAllister, R-La., was sworn in Nov. 21, 2013, to fill the seat vacated by Republican Rodney Alexander, who resigned Sept. 27. Alexander was eligible for 328 party unity votes in 2013; McAllister was eligible for 13 party unity votes.
${ }^{5}$ Rep. Katherine M. Clark, D-Mass., was sworn in Dec. 12, 2013, to fill the seat vacated by Democrat Edward J. Markey, who resigned July 15. Markey was eligible for 228 party unity votes in 2013; Clark was eligible for one party unity vote.
${ }^{6}$ Rep. Jason Smith, R-Mo., was sworn in June 5, 2013, to fill the seat vacated by the Jan. 22 resignation of Republican Jo Ann Emerson. Emerson was eligible for 15 party unity votes in 2013; Smith was eligible for 326 party unity votes.
${ }^{7}$ The speaker votes only at his discretion.
${ }^{8}$ Rep. Mark Sanford, R-S.C., was sworn in May 15, 2013, to fill the seat vacated by the resignation of Republican Tim Scott before the start of the 113th Congress. Sanford was eligible for 364 party unity votes in 2013.


|  | - | ~ | $\infty$ |  | - | $\infty$ |  | - | $\infty$ |  |  | - | $\infty$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 16 Kinzinger | 94 | 699 | 99 | 5 Ellison | 98 | 98 | 5 Foxx | 97 | 99 | TEXAS |  |  |  |  |
| 17 Bustos | 821 | 1897 | 97 | 6 Bachmann | 96 | 95 | 6 Coble | 96 | 88 |  | Gohmert | 93 | 94 |  |
| 18 Schock | 93 | 797 | 97 | 7 Peterson | 6535 | 99 | 7 McIntyre |  | 96 |  | Poe | 94 | 96 |  |
| INDIANA |  |  |  | 8 Nolan | 94 | 98 | 8 Hudson | 98 | 97 | 3 | Johnson, S. | 98 | 97 |  |
| 1 Visclosky | 91 | 996 | 96 | MISSISSIPPI |  |  | 9 Pittenger | 98 | 94 | 4 | Hall | 95 | 99 |  |
| 2 Walorski | 97 | 399 | 99 | 1 Nunnelee | 97 | 99 | 10 McHenry | 97 | 97 |  | Hensarling | 98 | 99 |  |
| 3 Stutzman | 97 | 398 | 98 | 2 Thompson | 93 | 98 | 11 Meadows | 96 | 98 | 6 | Barton | 96 | 97 |  |
| 4 Rokita | 98 | 292 | 92 | 3 Harper | 92 | 99 | 12 Watt | 96 | 97 |  | Culberson | 96 | 91 |  |
| 5 Brooks | 97 | 3100 | 00 | 4 Palazzo | 97 | 97 | 13 Holding | 98 | 99 | 8 | Brady | 97 | 99 |  |
| 6 Messer | 98 | 299 | 99 | MISSOURI |  |  | NORTH DAKOTA |  |  | 9 | Green, A. | 92 | 98 |  |
| 7 Carson | 94 | 699 | 99 | 1 Clay | 95 | 95 | AL Cramer | 92 | 97 | 10 | McCaul | 98 | 99 |  |
| 8 Bucshon | 99 | 199 | 99 | 2 Wagner | 98 | 97 | OHIO |  |  | 11 | Conaway | 97 | 99 |  |
| 9 Young | 97 | 399 | 99 | 3 Luetkemeyer | 97 | 99 | 1 Chabot | 97 | 100 | 12 | Granger | 97 | 95 |  |
| IOWA |  |  |  | 4 Hartzler | 96 | 99 | 2 Wenstrup | 98 | 98 | 13 | Thornberry | 97 | 99 |  |
| 1 Braley | 901 | 1098 | 98 | 5 Cleaver | 95 | 91 | 3 Beatty |  | 99 | 14 | Weber | 98 | 99 |  |
| 2 Loebsack | 88 | 1299 | 99 | 6 Graves | 97 | 96 | 4 Jordan |  | 99 | 15 | Hinojosa |  | 91 |  |
| 3 Latham | 92 | 8100 | 00 | 7 Long ${ }^{8}$ Emerson ${ }^{6}$ | 98 100 | 100 | 5 Latta | 99 | 100 | 16 | O'Rourke | 94 | 99 |  |
| 4 King | 96 | 497 | 97 | 8 Emerson ${ }^{6}$ <br> 8 Smith ${ }^{6}$ | 100 98 | 33 99 | 6 Johnson | 97 | 99 | 17 | Flores | 98 | 98 |  |
| KANSAS |  |  |  | MONTANA |  |  | 8 Gibbs ${ }^{\text {B }}$ Boehner ${ }^{7}$ | 97 94 | 99 | 19 | Neugebauer | 99 | 99 |  |
| 1 Huelskamp |  |  |  | AL Daines | 95 | 99 | 9 Kaptur |  | 97 | 20 | Castro | 93 | 97 |  |
| 2 Jenkins | 96 | 499 | 99 |  |  |  | 10 Turner | 91 | 100 | 21 | Smith | 98 | 99 |  |
| 3 Yoder | 97 | 399 | 99 | 1 NEBRASKA |  |  | 11 Fudge |  | 97 | 22 | Olson | 98 | 99 |  |
| 4 Pompeo | 98 | 298 | 98 | 1 Fortenberry | 92 | 98 99 | 12 Tiberi | 96 | 99 | 23 | Gallego |  | 98 |  |
| KENTUCKY |  |  |  | 3 Smith | 98 | 99 | 13 Ryan |  | 99 | 24 | Marchant | 97 | 97 |  |
| 1 Whitfield | 94 | 697 | 97 |  |  |  | 14 Joyce |  | 99 | 25 | Williams | 99 | 99 |  |
| 2 Guthrie | 97 | 3100 | 00 | NEVADA <br> 1 Titus |  |  | 15 Stivers | 93 | 99 | 26 | Burgess | 96 | 98 |  |
| 3 Yarmuth | 97 | 395 | 95 | 1 Titus | 93 96 | 99 97 | 16 Renacci | 96 | 99 | 27 | Farenthold | 96 | 100 |  |
| 4 Massie | 88 | 1299 | 99 | 3 Heck | 93 |  | OKLAHOMA |  |  | 28 | Cuellar |  | 100 |  |
| 5 Rogers | 93 | 797 | 97 | 4 Horsford | 92 | 74 | 1 Bridenstine | 95 | 100 | 29 | Green, G. |  | 98 |  |
| 6 Barr | 97 | 399 | 99 |  |  | 74 | 2 Mullin |  | 100 | 30 | Johnson, E. | 94 | 99 |  |
| LOUISIANA |  |  |  | 1 Shea-Porter |  |  | 3 Lucas | 93 | 98 | 31 | Carter Sessions | 96 97 | 97 99 |  |
| 1 Scalise | 97 | 398 | 98 | 2 Kuster | 92 | 99 | 4 Cole |  | 94 | 33 |  | 92 | 99 |  |
| 2 Richmond | 901 | 1093 | 93 |  |  |  | 5 Lankford | 97 | 99 | 34 | Veasey |  | 99 99 |  |
| 3 Boustany | 95 | 599 | 99 | 1 NEW JERSEY |  |  | OREGON |  |  | 35 | Doggett | 94 | 99 |  |
| 4 Fleming | 97 | 3100 | 00 | 1 Andrews | 94 <br> 84 <br> 16 | 99 99 | 1 Bonamici | 97 | 100 | 36 | Stockman | 94 | 98 |  |
| 5 Alexander ${ }^{4}$ | 91 | 999 | 99 | 3 LoBiondo | 8416 8614 | 99 | 2 Walden | 94 | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 McAllister ${ }^{4}$ | 100 96 |  | $\begin{array}{r} 100 \\ 99 \end{array}$ | 4 Runyan | 8713 | 99 97 | 3 Blumenauer | 95 | 98 |  | AH Bishop | 96 | 97 |  |
| 1 Pingree | 98 | 298 | 98 | 6 Pallone | 98 | 85 | 5 Schrader |  |  | 3 | Chaffetz | 95 | 99 |  |
| 2 Michaud | 92 | 899 | 99 | 7 Lance | 8812 | 100 | PENNSYLVANIA |  |  |  | Matheson |  | 100 |  |
| MARYLAND |  |  |  | 9 Pascrell | 95 | 97 | $1{ }^{1}$ Brady | 97 | 96 |  | RMONT |  |  |  |
| 1 Harris | 96 | 499 | 99 | 10 Payne | 97 | 97 | 3 Kelly | 96 | 100 |  | Welch | 97 | 99 |  |
| 2 Ruppersberger | 901 | 1097 | 97 | 11 Frelinghuysen | 9010 | 99 | 4 Perry | 97 | 99 |  | RGINIA |  |  |  |
| 3 Sarbanes | 97 | 395 | 95 | 12 Holt | 98 | 78 | 5 Thompson | 94 | 99 |  | Wittman | 96 | 99 |  |
| 4 Edwards | 98 | 297 | 97 | NEW MEXICO |  |  | 6 Gerlach | 901 | 99 |  | Rigell | 94 | 99 |  |
| 5 Hoyer | 94 | 69 | 92 | 1 Lujan Grisham | 9010 | 99 | 7 Meehan | 90 | 100 |  | Scott | 97 | 99 |  |
| 6 Delaney | 901 | 1098 | 98 | 2 Pearce | 95 | 98 | 8 Fitzpatrick | 84 | 98 |  | Forbes | 95 | 99 |  |
| 7 Cummings | 97 | 397 | 97 | 3 Luján | 93 | 100 | 9 Shuster | 96 | 98 |  | Hurt | 97 | 99 |  |
| 8 Van Hollen | 94 | 699 | 99 | NEW YORK |  |  | 10 Marino | 94 | 99 |  | Goodlatte | 96 | 98 |  |
| MASSACHUSETTS |  |  |  | 1 Bishop | 93 | 100 | 11 Barletta | 93 | 96 |  | Cantor | 97 | 98 |  |
| 1 Neal | 98 | 293 | 93 | 2 King | 8515 | 98 | 12 Rothfus | 97 | 100 |  | Moran | 92 | 99 |  |
| 2 McGovern | 99 | 199 | 99 | 3 Israel | 937 | 99 | 13 Schwartz | 94 | 96 | 9 | Griffith | 92 | 99 |  |
| 3 Tsongas | 96 | 497 | 97 | 4 McCarthy | 9010 | 23 | 14 Doyle | 96 | 96 | 10 | Wolf |  | 99 |  |
| 4 Kennedy | 98 | 299 | 99 | 5 Meeks | 96 | 95 | 15 Dent | 90 | 100 |  | Connolly |  | 99 |  |
| 5 Markey ${ }^{5}$ | 98 | 245 | 45 | 6 Meng | 94 | 97 | 16 Pitts | 97 | 99 |  | ASHINGTON |  |  |  |
| 5 Clark ${ }^{5}$ | 100 | 0100 | 00 | 7 Velázquez | 97 | 98 | 17 Cartwright | 97 | 99 |  | DelBene |  | 100 |  |
| 6 Tierney | 96 | 498 | 98 | 8 Jeffries | 97 | 96 | 18 Murphy | 97 | 98 |  | Larsen | 93 | 92 |  |
| 7 Capuano | 97 | 398 | 98 | 9 Clarke | 97 | 98 | RHODE ISLAND |  |  | 3 | Herrera Beutler |  | 48 |  |
| 8 Lynch | 92 | 891 | 91 | 10 Nadler | 98 | 97 | 1 Cicilline | 97 | 99 |  | Hastings | 95 | 99 |  |
| 9 Keating | 95 | 597 | 97 | 11 Grimm | 8416 | 93 | 2 Langevin | 94 | 97 |  | McMorris Rodgers | 95 | 94 |  |
| MICHIGAN |  |  |  | 12 Maloney, C. | 97 | 97 | SOUTH CAROLINA |  |  |  | Kilmer | 90 | 100 |  |
| 1 Benishek | 93 | 799 | 99 | 13 Rangel | 95 | 95 | 1 Sanford ${ }^{8}$ |  | 98 |  | McDermott |  | 99 100 |  |
| 2 Huizenga | 96 | 499 | 99 | 15 Serrano | 98 | 99 | 2 Wilson | 97 | 100 |  | Smith |  | 100 |  |
| 3 Amash | 861 | 1499 | 99 | 16 Engel | 96 | 96 | 3 Duncan | 97 | 100 | 10 |  |  |  |  |
| 4 Camp | 95 | 599 | 99 | 17 Lowey | 94 | 99 | 4 Gowdy | 97 | 99 |  | Heck |  | 97 |  |
| 5 Kildee | 95 | 599 | 99 | 18 Maloney, S. | 7525 | 99 | 5 Mulvaney | 95 | 99 |  | EST VIRGINIA |  |  |  |
| 6 Upton | 96 | 4100 | 00 | 19 Gibson |  | 99 | 6 Clyburn | 92 | 91 |  | McKinley | 93 |  |  |
| 7 Walberg | 97 | 399 | 99 | 20 Tonko | 97 | 99 | 7 Rice | 96 | 99 |  | Capito |  | 100 |  |
| 8 Rogers | 95 | 59 | 93 | 21 Owens | 6634 | 99 | SOUTH DAKOTA |  |  |  | Rahall |  | 99 |  |
| 9 Levin | 95 | 599 | 99 | 22 Hanna | 8713 | 96 | AL Noem | 94 | 98 |  | SCONSIN |  |  |  |
| 10 Miller | 96 | 499 | 99 | 23 Reed | 91 | 96 | TENNESSEE |  |  |  | Ryan | 96 | 99 |  |
| 11 Bentivolio | 95 | 5100 | 00 | 24 Maffei | 7426 | 99 | 1 Roe | 96 | 100 |  | Pocan | 99 | 100 |  |
| 12 Dingell | 93 | 796 | 96 | 25 Slaughter | $95 \quad 5$ | 92 | 2 Duncan | 88 | 99 |  |  |  | 99 |  |
| 13 Conyers | 96 | 496 | 96 | 26 Higgins | 97 | 91 | 3 Fleischmann | 98 | 99 |  | Moore | 97 | 96 |  |
| 14 Peters | 85 | 1599 | 99 | 27 Collins | 96 | 99 | 4 DesJarlais | 97 | 99 |  | Sensenbrenner | 93 | 97 |  |
| MINNESOTA |  |  |  | NORTH CAROLINA |  |  | 5 Cooper |  | 98 |  | Petri | 91 |  |  |
| 1 Walz | 891 | 1199 | 99 | 1 Butterfield | 93 | 98 | 6 Black | 98 | 99 |  | Duffy | 95 | 98 |  |
| 2 Kline | 96 | 499 | 99 | 2 Ellmers | 96 | 99 | 7 Blackburn | 97 | 99 |  | Ribble |  | 99 |  |
| 3 Paulsen | 95 | 599 | 99 | 3 Jones | 7228 | 94 | 8 Fincher | 96 | 95 |  | YOMING |  |  |  |
| 4 McCollum | 92 | 8100 | 00 | 4 Price | 95 | 100 | 9 Cohen | 97 | 98 |  | Lummis | 93 | 95 |  |

