



THE CLUB FOR GROWTH FOUNDATION'S

Congressional Scorecard **2022**

2022 SCORECARD METHODOLOGY

Club for Growth publishes the Club for Growth Foundation's scorecard study so our members and the public can monitor the actions and the voting behavior of Members of Congress on economic growth issues.

The Foundation conducted a comprehensive examination of each lawmaker's record on votes related to pro-growth policies and computed an Economic Growth Score on a scale of 0 to 100. A score of 100 indicates the highest support for pro-growth policies. Those lawmakers scoring 90 or higher in 2022 – and who also have a lifetime score of 90 or higher – receive the Defender of Economic Freedom award from the Club.

The Foundation examines legislative votes related to the Club's immediate pro-economic growth policy goals, including:

- Reducing income tax rates
- Death tax repeal
- Limited government through reduced spending and budget reform, including a Balanced Budget Amendment to the United States Constitution
- Social Security reform with personal retirement accounts for younger workers
- Expanding trade freedom (free trade)
- Ending abusive lawsuits through medical malpractice and tort reform
- Replacing the current tax code (flat tax, fair tax)
- Expanding school choice
- Implementing Term Limits
- Regulatory reform and deregulation

Not all of these policies will come up for a vote in each session of Congress.



The Foundation also examines votes on bills that would directly harm these goals.

Whenever possible the Club sends a "key vote" alert to Capitol Hill prior to an expected roll call vote or pending legislative action important to the Club's goals. Notwithstanding the Club's "key vote" alerts, the Foundation reserves the right to include any vote or action in the study.

2022 SENATE RATINGS

Members of the Senate with annual scores AND lifetime scores of 90% or higher

MEMBER	RANK	SCORE	LIFE SCORE	MEMBER	RANK	SCORE	LIFE SCORE	MEMBER	RANK	SCORE	LIFE SCORE	MEMBER	RANK	SCORE	LIFE SCORE	MEMBER	RANK	SCORE	LIFE SCORE
ALASKA				HAWAII				MAINE				NEW JERSEY				SOUTH DAKOTA			
Murkowski, Lisa	49	41%	50%	Hirono, Mazie	64	0%	3%	Collins, Susan	50	27%	32%	Booker, Cory	64	0%	8%	Rounds, Mike	38	63%	61%
Sullivan, Dan	31	72%	65%	Schatz, Brian	64	0%	1%	King, Angus	55	7%	3%	Menendez, Robert	64	0%	10%	Thune, John	30	74%	72%
ALABAMA				IOWA				MICHIGAN				NEW MEXICO				TENNESSEE			
Shelby, Richard	36	67%	73%	Ernst, Joni	21	89%	73%	Peters, Gary	64	0%	5%	Heinrich, Martin	64	0%	3%	Blackburn, Marsha	1	100%	89%
Tuberville, Tommy	12	95%	98%	Grassley, Chuck	25	85%	77%	Stabenow, Debbie	64	0%	9%	Lujan, Ben	64	0%	7%	Hagerty, Bill	28	79%	82%
ARKANSAS				IDAHO				MINNESOTA				NEVADA				TEXAS			
Boozman, John	32	69%	70%	Crapo, Mike	20	90%	80%	Klobuchar, Amy	55	7%	6%	Cortez Masto, Catherine	55	7%	3%	Cornyn, John	32	69%	78%
Cotton, Tom	32	69%	81%	Risch, Jim	9	97%	87%	Smith, Tina	64	0%	1%	Rosen, Jacky	52	8%	5%	Cruz, Ted	1	100%	92%
ARIZONA				ILLINOIS				MISSOURI				NEW YORK				UTAH			
Kelly, Mark	64	0%	0%	Duckworth, Tammy	64	0%	2%	Blunt, Roy	48	43%	65%	Gillibrand, Kirsten	64	0%	7%	Lee, Mike	1	100%	99%
Sinema, Krysten	55	7%	10%	Durbin, Richard	64	0%	2%	Hawley, Josh	12	95%	87%	Schumer, Chuck	64	0%	3%	Romney, Mitt	40	59%	56%
CALIFORNIA				INDIANA				MISSISSIPPI				OHIO				VIRGINIA			
Feinstein, Dianne	64	0%	5%	Braun, Mike	1	100%	94%	Hyde-Smith, Cindy	26	80%	66%	Brown, Sherrod	64	0%	3%	Kaine, Tim	55	7%	3%
Padilla, Alex	64	0%	0%	Young, Todd	44	53%	66%	Wicker, Roger	46	46%	65%	Portman, Rob	40	59%	62%	Warner, Mark	55	7%	7%
COLORADO				KANSAS				MONTANA				OKLAHOMA				VERMONT			
Bennet, Michael	64	0%	8%	Marshall, Roger	12	95%	75%	Daines, Steve	12	95%	83%	Inhofe, James	29	76%	86%	Leahy, Patrick	64	0%	2%
Hickenlooper, John	55	7%	4%	Moran, Jerry	42	54%	71%	Tester, Jon	51	12%	11%	Lankford, James	1	100%	88%	Sanders, Bernie	52	8%	8%
CONNECTICUT				KENTUCKY				NORTH CAROLINA				OREGON				WASHINGTON			
Blumenthal, Richard	64	0%	4%	McConnell, Mitch	42	54%	71%	Burr, Richard	35	68%	72%	Merkley, Jeff	64	0%	6%	Cantwell, Maria	64	0%	8%
Murphy, Christopher	55	7%	5%	Paul, Rand	1	100%	96%	Tillis, Thom	36	67%	65%	Wyden, Ron	64	0%	8%	Murray, Patty	64	0%	4%
DELAWARE				LOUISIANA				NORTH DAKOTA				PENNSYLVANIA				WISCONSIN			
Carper, Thomas	64	0%	10%	Cassidy, Bill	39	62%	70%	Cramer, Kevin	18	91%	58%	Casey, Bob	64	0%	4%	Baldwin, Tammy	64	0%	3%
Coons, Christopher	64	0%	4%	Kennedy, John	26	80%	81%	Hoeven, John	17	92%	61%	Toomey, Pat	1	100%	93%	Johnson, Ron	1	100%	89%
FLORIDA				MASSACHUSETTS				NEBRASKA				RHODE ISLAND				WEST VIRGINIA			
Rubio, Marco	21	89%	86%	Markey, Edward	64	0%	8%	Fischer, Deb	12	95%	74%	Reed, Jack	64	0%	5%	Capito, Shelley Moore	45	51%	51%
Scott, Rick	9	97%	88%	Warren, Elizabeth	64	0%	9%	Sasse, Ben	18	91%	92%	Whitehouse, Sheldon	64	0%	5%	Manchin, Joe	52	8%	18%
GEORGIA				MARYLAND				NEW HAMPSHIRE				SOUTH CAROLINA				WYOMING			
Ossoff, Thomas	64	0%	0%	Cardin, Benjamin	64	0%	3%	Hassan, Maggie	64	0%	2%	Graham, Lindsey	47	44%	65%	Barrasso, John	24	88%	81%
Warnock, Raphael	64	0%	0%	Van Hollen, Chris	64	0%	7%	Shaheen, Jeanne	55	7%	5%	Scott, Tim	9	97%	86%	Lummis, Cynthia	21	89%	85%

LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS CONSIDERED IN 2022:

COMPUTATION

Scores are computed on a scale of 0 to 100. Each vote or action in the rating is assigned a certain number of points depending on its relative importance. Absences are not counted, though the Foundation reserves the right to do so if, in its judgment, a Member's position was otherwise discernible.

To provide some additional guidance concerning the scores, each lawmaker was ranked. Members with 0% scores are, by default, ranked #435 in

The Foundation's study examined all 970 floor votes in the House (549) and Senate (421) and, in the end, included 14 House votes and 17 Senate votes.

the House and #100 in the Senate. Scores and ranks cannot be directly compared between the House and Senate, as different votes were taken in each chamber. The study also records a "Lifetime Score" for each Member of Congress. This is a simple average of the scores from all previous years where the lawmaker earned a score in the Club's scorecards.

In some cases a lawmaker was not present for enough votes for a meaningful score or ranking to be computed. In such cases "n.a." for "not applicable" appears. In computing lifetime

scores, years with "n.a." listed instead of a score are not included. Comparing such scores to other members without "n.a." years may be misleading.

ADDITIONAL FACTORS

A study of roll call votes on the floor of the House and Senate and legislative actions is just that. It cannot account for a lawmaker's work in committee, advocacy in his party's caucus meetings, and effectiveness as a leader in advocating pro-growth policies.