



Senator John Kennedy (R-LA)

<https://www.kennedy.senate.gov/>

Capitol Address:

437 Russell Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510
(202) 224-4623 (phone)
(202) 228-0447 (fax)

District Address:

500 Poydras St Ste 364
New Orleans, LA 70130
(504) 581-6190 (phone)

Biography:

Religion : Methodist; Family : Rebecca (Becky) Ann Stulb and 1 child; Date of Birth : 11/21/1951; Birthplace : Centreville, MS; Home : Madisonville, LA; Education : Bachelor of Civil Law, Oxford University (England) (1979); Doctor of Jurisprudence, University of Virginia School of Law (1977); Bachelor of Arts, Vanderbilt University (TN) (1973); Occupation : Secretary, LA Department of Revenue (1996-1999); Secretary, LA Governor's Cabinet (1990-1992); Special Counsel, Office of Governor Buddy Roemer (1988-1992); Volunteer Substitute Teacher, East Baton Rouge Parish Public Schools (CURR); Adjunct Professor, LA State University Law School (CURR); Partner, Attorney, Chafee, McCall, Phillips, Toler & Sarpy, LLP; Assumed Office : 1/3/2017;

Score: 100%

2023-2024 Regular Session (118th)



Result	Description	Vote	
Failed	S.J.Res. 10, sponsored by Sen. Tuberville (R-Al), employed the Congressional Review Act to nullify the September 9, 2022 Biden Administration Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) rule that provides abortion services through the taxpayer-funded VA health care system by providing for unlimited abortions for undefined "health reasons." On this roll call vote, no. 90, on April 19, 2023, the vote failed 48 -51. All Democrats voted no except for Sen. Manchin (D-Wv.).	Y	✓
Failed	Federal law (10 U.S.C. § 1093) has long prevented the Department of Defense (DOD) from using funds to perform elective abortions and prevented the DOD from using its facilities to provide abortions. On October 20, 2022, the Biden Administration's DOD published a memorandum directing the DOD to pay the travel and transportation costs for military members and dependents to travel to obtain elective abortions. The federal prohibition against DOD funding elective abortion clearly extends to funding for any item related to abortion, such as travel and transportation. The Senate considered a motion to table from Sen. Ernst (R-IA) for the purpose of making in order a vote on a motion to recommit the Conference Report to prohibit the Secretary of Defense from paying for or reimbursing expenses relating to elective abortion. On December 12, 2023 (Roll Call No. 339) 47 Republicans voted in favor of the motion. 51 Democrats and 2 Republicans voted against the resolution.	Y	✓

<p>Passed</p>	<p>S. 4381, the so-called "Right to Contraception Act" sponsored by Sen. Markey (D-MA), goes far beyond contraception (NRLC takes no position on contraception), and includes provisions related to the funding of abortion providers, and contains language that could expand the use of drugs to induce an abortion weeks or months into a pregnancy. If an abortion provider were to also provide contraception, as is the case at Planned Parenthood facilities, S.4381 would override any attempt to reduce or remove their funding. Further, laws that exclude or minimize the involvement of an abortion provider (who also provides contraception) in state or federal programs could be viewed as "singling out" an organization and therefore overridden by this legislation. The term "contraceptive" is so broadly defined that it can mean anything that COULD be used to prevent pregnancy. The chemical abortion drug, mifepristone, is used overseas as an emergency contraceptive. If something is considered a contraceptive, it could then be used not merely for contraception, but for undefined "other health needs." The sweeping clause, "other health needs" could include drugs that cause an abortion in a pregnant woman if a provider determines that a woman has a "health need" for an elective abortion weeks or months into a pregnancy. Under these definitions, state laws that protect life or regulate chemical abortion (in-person visits to date pregnancy, physician-only requirements, and so on) could be viewed as impeding access to the drug. See more here. On this roll call, no. 190, conducted on June 5, 2023, 51 senators voted to advance the measure ("invoke cloture"), and 39 senators voted to block it (the pro-life vote). Because 60 votes were required to "invoke cloture," the pro-abortion motion failed. Senator Charles Schumer (D-NY), although a supporter of S.4381, switched his vote to "nay" in order to give him the right, under Senate rules, to force a repeat vote at a time of his choosing. The measure is supported by all Democratic and independent senators, and by Republican Senators Murkowski and Susan Collins (Maine).</p>	<p>NV</p>	<p>—</p>
---------------	--	-----------	----------

Passed	<p>S. 4445, the so-called "Right to IVF Act" sponsored by Sen. Duckworth (D-IL), has been drafted to extend far past merely guaranteeing in vitro fertilization (IVF) as the title suggests. Fertility treatments, including IVF, are widely available and legal in every state. S.4445 includes a definition of "assisted reproductive technology" that is so expansive, it can be reasonably interpreted to impose a new right to human cloning, among other objectionable items. S.4445 would overwrite any state law which deals with the destruction of embryos, and includes provisions which run roughshod over conscience rights. The legislation creates a nationwide right to not only human cloning, but also the genetic engineering of embryos including human-animal hybrids, or chimeras. See more here. On this roll call, no. 197, conducted on June 13, 2024, 48 senators voted to advance the measure ("invoke cloture"), and 47 senators voted to block it (the pro-life vote). Sixty (60) votes were required to "invoke cloture" and the pro-abortion motion failed. Senator Charles Schumer (D-NY), although a supporter of S.4445, switched his vote to "nay" in order to give him the right, under Senate rules, to force a repeat vote at a time of his choosing. The measure is supported by all Democratic and independent senators, and by Republican Senators Murkowski (Alaska) and Susan Collins (Maine).</p>	N	✓
Passed	<p>S. 4554 expresses support for Roe, which essentially held that there were no limits on abortion AND states that Roe ought to be "built upon." This statement can be reasonably interpreted to signal support for even broader abortion-related measures such as the Women's Health Protection Act (WHPA), or even elimination of bi-partisan limits on taxpayer-funded abortion. The WHPA would enshrine into law abortion-on-demand and would overturn existing pro-life laws and prevent new protective laws from being enacted at the state and federal levels. The WHPA also seeks to strip away from elected lawmakers the ability to provide even the most minimal protections for unborn children at any stage of their pre-natal development. On this roll call, no. 211, conducted on July 10, 2024, 4 senators voted to advance the measure ("invoke cloture"), and 44 senators voted to block it (the pro-life vote). Sixty (60) votes were required to "invoke cloture" and the pro-abortion motion failed. Senator Charles Schumer (D-NY), although a supporter of S.4554, switched his vote to "nay" in order to give him the right, under Senate rules, to force a repeat vote at a time of his choosing. The measure is supported by all Democratic and independent senators, and by Republican Senators Murkowski (Alaska) and Susan Collins (Maine).</p>	N	✓
Failed	<p>S.J.Res. 4 "Equal Rights Amendment" to U.S. Constitution (4/27/2023) (4/21/2023)</p>	Against	✓

117th Congress (2021-2022)

Result	Description	Vote	
Passed	<p>The National Right to Life Committee (NRLC) opposed the COVID-19 reconciliation bill, known as the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 (H.R. 1319). The legislation addresses the Covid-19 pandemic response. However, the legislation contains numerous provisions aimed at propping up the abortion industry as well as potentially funneling millions of dollars into programs without Hyde Amendment protections. Unlike the previous COVID-19 relief packages, the current legislation fails to include Hyde protections. The absence of Hyde language means over \$414 billion taxpayer dollars can be used to pay for elective abortion or plans that cover elective abortion. The package also fails to prevent millions of taxpayer dollars from being used to pay for elective abortion overseas. The bill provides \$50 million to Title X family planning funding. Prior to the rules issued by the Trump Administration, Title X was identified as Planned Parenthood’s biggest source of discretionary funding. President Biden announced that the Title X Rule will be suspended, revised, or revoked. A letter sent to the Senate on March 4, 2021 contains with a fuller description of the abortion provisions. On this roll call, No. 110, fifty (50) Democrats voted for the measure, while forty-nine (49) Republicans opposed it (NRLC position). One Republican did not vote.</p>	N	✓
Passed	<p>Sen. Sasse’s (R-Neb.) amendment #192 to S. Con. Res. 5, the Senate Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 2021, would have created a deficit neutral reserve fund for legislation that would “include the creation of criminal and civil penalties for providers who fail to exercise the same degree of care for babies who survive an abortion or attempted abortion as would be provided to another child born at the same gestational age”. On this roll call vote, no. 23, on February 4, 2021, the vote failed 52-48 (60 were required). All Republicans plus Sens. Manchin (D-Wv.) and Casey (D-Pa.) voted yes.</p>	Y	✓

<p>Passed</p>	<p>Senator Lankford (R-Okla.) offered an amendment to add Hyde protections to the Health Education Labor and Pensions provisions in the COVID-19 reconciliation bill, known as the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 (H.R. 1319). H.R. 1319 contains numerous provisions aimed at propping up the abortion industry as well as potentially funneling millions of dollars into programs without Hyde Amendment protections. Unlike the previous COVID-19 relief packages, the current legislation fails to include Hyde protections. The absence of Hyde language means over \$414 billion taxpayer dollars can be used to pay for elective abortion or plans that cover elective abortion. The package also fails to prevent millions of taxpayer dollars from being used to pay for elective abortion overseas. An array of long-established laws, including the Hyde Amendment, have created a nearly uniform policy that federal programs do not pay for abortion or subsidize health plans that include coverage of abortion, with narrow exceptions. The COVID-19 reconciliation bill dramatically departs from this longstanding policy. Because the amendment was not compliant with the Senate Byrd rule, the vote threshold was set at 60. On this roll call, No. 94, fifty-two (52) Senators voted in favor of the amendment (NRLC position) including forty-nine Republicans and three Democrats. Forty-seven (47) Democrats opposed it. One Republican did not vote.</p>	<p>Y</p>	
<p>Failed</p>	<p>The Paycheck Fairness Act (H.R. 7) deals broadly with addressing potential discrimination regarding the gender pay gap, however, the legislation was amended to contain language that could be construed to require employers to cover elective abortion in their healthcare benefits. H.R. 7 states that it constitutes discrimination to provide disparate wages based on sex, and the legislation creates more opportunities to seek remedies for those challenging compensation. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) has defined equal pay under the Fair Labor Standards Act and the Equal Pay Act of 1963 to include all forms of compensation, including healthcare benefits. H.R. 7 makes definitional changes to “sex” to include “pregnancy, childbirth, or a related medical condition.” It is well established that abortion will be regarded as a “related medical condition.” Historically, when Congress has addressed discrimination based on sex, rules of construction have been added to prevent requiring funding of abortion. Since there is no rule of construction that would make this legislation abortion-neutral, it is likely that H.R. 7 could be used to sue employers for a lack of elective abortion coverage. Under H.R. 7, a person could make a claim that an employer’s failure to provide health coverage for abortion is discriminatory if an employer provides health coverage for male-specific items. The National Right to Life Committee opposed passage of H.R. 7, which failed to advance in the Senate, 49-50, on June 8, 2021 (Senate Roll Call No. 227). The bill was supported by 49 Democrats and was opposed by 50 Republicans. One (1) Democrat did not vote.</p>	<p>N</p>	



Failed	<p>The so-called "For the People Act of 2021" is intended to make it as difficult as possible for corporations (including nonprofit, issue-oriented corporations such as NRLC) to spend money to communicate with the public about the actions of federal officeholders, by applying an array of restrictions on ads, as well as requirements that violate the privacy rights of donors. NRLC expressed its strong opposition to the bill in a letter sent to members of the Senate on June 21, 2021. NRLC said that the overriding purpose of the legislation is "to discourage, as much as possible, disfavored groups (such as NRLC) from communicating about officeholders, by exposing citizens who support such efforts to harassment and intimidation, and by smothering organizations in layer on layer of record keeping and reporting requirements, all backed by the threat of civil and criminal sanctions." Additionally, S.2093 would destroy the FEC's long-standing bipartisan structure. Proponents claim that the provision is aimed at ending "frequent deadlocks," but this is a sham argument leading down a dangerous road. On June 22, 2021, the Senate conducted a key procedural roll call on S. 2093, with 60 votes being required to "invoke cloture" and take up the bill. The roll call was 50 in favor of taking the bill up and 50 opposed. All Democrats voted in favor of taking up the bill. All Republicans voted against taking up the bill. Roll call no. 246.</p>	N	✓
Failed	<p>Sen. John Kennedy (R-LA) offered an amendment to the FY2022 budget resolution (S.Con.Res. 14) to indicate support for legislation that would prohibit abortions after 20 weeks, at which point an unborn child is capable of feeling pain. On this roll call vote, no. 348, on August 11, 2021, the vote failed 48-51. 47 Republicans plus Sen. Manchin (D-Wv.) voted yes. One Republican did not vote.</p>	Y	✓
Passed	<p>Sen. James Lankford (R-OK) offered an amendment to the FY2022 budget resolution (S.Con.Res. 14) to indicate support for the Hyde Amendment (no funding for abortion) and the Weldon Amendment (prohibiting discrimination against those who object to participating in abortion). On this roll call vote, no. 336, on August 11, 2021, the measure was adopted by a vote of 50-49. 49 Republicans plus Sen. Manchin (D-Wv.) voted yes. One Republican did not vote.</p>	Y	✓
Failed	<p>Sen. Inhofe (R-Okla.) offered an amendment to the FY2022 budget resolution (S.Con.Res. 14) to indicate support for legislation that would protect unborn children with Down syndrome or other chromosomal conditions from abortion. On this roll call vote, no. 350, on August 11, 2021, the vote failed 49-50. 48 Republicans plus Sen. Manchin (D-Wv.) voted yes. One Republican did not vote.</p>	Y	✓

Failed	<p>The so-called "Freedom to Vote Act" is intended to make it as difficult as possible for corporations (including nonprofit, issue-oriented corporations such as NRLC) to spend money to communicate with the public about the actions of federal officeholders, by applying an array of restrictions on ads, as well as requirements that violate the privacy rights of donors. NRLC expressed its strong opposition to the bill in a letter sent to members of the Senate on January 19, 2022. NRLC said that the overriding purpose of the legislation is "to discourage, as much as possible, disfavored groups (such as NRLC) from communicating about officeholders, by exposing citizens who support such efforts to harassment and intimidation, and by smothering organizations in layer on layer of record keeping and reporting requirements, all backed by the threat of civil and criminal sanctions." National Right to Life Committee opposed passage of H.R. 5746, which passed the House, 220-203, on January 13, 2022 (House Roll Call No. 9) with no Republican support. On January 19, the U.S. Senate conducted a roll call vote on whether to advance this legislation. Forty-nine (49) senators voted to take up the bill, but 60 votes were required, so the bill did not advance. The bill was supported by 49 Democrats and no Republicans. Sen. Schumer (D-NY) voted "no" for procedural reasons. Fifty-one (51) senators voted against advancing the bill. Senate roll call no. 59.</p>	N	✓
Failed	<p>H.R. 3755 would enshrine into law abortion-on-demand and would overturn existing pro-life laws and prevent new protective laws from being enacted at the state and federal levels. This bill seeks to strip away from elected lawmakers the ability to provide even the most minimal protections for unborn children, at any stage of their pre-natal development. H.R. 3755 would invalidate nearly all existing state limitations on abortion and prohibit states from adopting new limitations in the future, including various types of laws specifically upheld as constitutionally permissible by the U.S. Supreme Court. Among the protective laws that the bill would nullify:- Nearly all Federal limits on taxpayer funding of abortion;- Conscience protection laws allowing medical professionals to opt-out of providing abortions;- Requirements to provide women seeking abortion with specific information on their unborn child;- Laws providing reflection periods (waiting periods);- Laws requiring parental consent or notification for minors seeking an abortion;- Laws limiting the performance of abortions to licensed physicians;- Bans on elective abortion when an unborn child is capable of feeling pain;- Requirements to provide women with information on alternatives to abortion;- Bans on the use of abortion as a method of sex selection, and abortions done based on a diagnosis of a disability, including Down Syndrome. On this Roll Call No. 65 on February 28, 2022, 47 Republicans and 1 Democrat voted no, and 46 Democrats voted yes. Six (6) Senators did not vote.</p>	NV	—

Failed	<p>S.J.Res.41 employs the Congressional Review Act to nullify the Biden Administration’s 2021 Final Rule on the Title X Family Planning Program. On March 24, 2019, the Trump Administration published a final rule known as the “Protect Life Rule,” which requires rigorous physical and financial separation of family planning from abortion, and prohibits the performance of, referral for, or promotion of abortion. The Biden Administration 2021 Final Rule on Title X eliminates the requirement that Title X recipients maintain a physical and financial separation of family planning from abortion activities. This allows Title X recipients to co-locate with abortion facilities. Permitting Title X recipients to financially integrate family planning services with their abortion facilities allows Federal support for abortion as a method of family planning. Since money is not clearly required to be separately dedicated under the Biden Rule, Title X funds may be used interchangeably to improve infrastructure and operating costs of abortion services that are plainly prohibited by the law. On this roll call vote, No. 140 on April 27, 2021, the motion failed by a vote of 49-49. One Democrat and 48 Republicans supported the measure, 47 Democrats and two Republicans opposed it.</p>	Y	✓
Failed	<p>H.R. 4132 would enshrine into law abortion-on-demand and would overturn existing pro-life laws and prevent new protective laws from being enacted at the state and federal levels. This bill seeks to strip away from elected lawmakers the ability to provide even the most minimal protections for unborn children, at any stage of their pre-natal development. H.R. 4132 would invalidate nearly all existing state limitations on abortion and prohibit states from adopting new limitations in the future, including various types of laws specifically upheld as constitutionally permissible by the U.S. Supreme Court. Among the protective laws that the bill would nullify:-Nearly all Federal limits on taxpayer funding of abortion;- Conscience protection laws allowing medical professionals to opt-out of providing abortions;-Requirements to provide women seeking abortion with specific information on their unborn child;- Laws providing reflection periods (waiting periods);-Laws requiring parental consent or notification for minors seeking an abortion;- Laws limiting the performance of abortions to licensed physicians;-Bans on elective abortion when an unborn child is capable of feeling pain;-Requirements to provide women with information on alternatives to abortion;-Bans on the use of abortion as a method of sex selection, and abortions done based on a diagnosis of a disability, including Down Syndrome. On May 11, 2022, on this Roll Call No. 170, 50 Republicans and 1 Democrat voted no, and 49 Democrats voted yes.</p>	N	✓

116th Congress (2019-2020)

Result	Description	Vote	
Passed	<p>The No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act (S. 109) is sponsored by Senator Roger Wicker (R-Ms.). The bill would establish a permanent, government-wide prohibition on federal subsidies for abortion and for health plans that cover abortion (with narrow exceptions). This policy would apply both to longstanding federal programs and to the new programs created by the 2010 Obamacare law. The bill also would close certain loopholes that give tax-preferred status to abortion. The National Right to Life Committee strongly supports S. 109. On January 17th, forty-eight (48) senators voted to take up the bill (pro-life), but 60 votes were required, so the bill did not advance. The bill was supported by 46 Republicans and two Democrats. Forty-seven (47) senators voted against advancing the bill (two Republicans and 45 Democrats). Five Republicans were absent. The House companion bill is H.R. 20, sponsored by Congressman Chris Smith (R-NJ).</p>	Y	✓
Passed	<p>The Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act (S. 311), sponsored by Senator Ben Sasse (R-Ne.), would enact an explicit requirement that a baby born alive during an abortion must be afforded “the same degree” of care that would apply “to any other child born alive at the same gestational age,” including transportation to a hospital. In addition, the bill applies the existing penalties of 18 U.S.C. Sec. 1111 (the federal murder statute) to anyone who performs “an overt act that kills a child born alive.” The bill also empowers women with a right to sue their abortionists and others for harm caused by violations of the act.</p> <p>On February 25, fifty-three (53) senators voted to take up the bill (pro-life), but 60 votes were required, so the bill did not advance. The bill was supported by 50 Republicans and three Democrats. Forty-four (44) senators voted against advancing the bill (two Republicans and 45 Democrats). Three Republicans were absent. The House companion bill is H.R. 926, sponsored by Congresswoman Ann Wagner (R-Mo.).</p>	Y	✓

<p>Passed</p>	<p>The Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act (S. 311), sponsored by Senator Ben Sasse (R-Ne.), would enact an explicit requirement that a baby born alive during an abortion must be afforded “the same degree” of care that would apply “to any other child born alive at the same gestational age,” including transportation to a hospital. In addition, the bill applies the existing penalties of 18 U.S.C. Sec. 1111 (the federal murder statute) to anyone who performs “an overt act that kills a child born alive.” The bill also empowers women with a right to sue their abortionists and others for harm caused by violations of the act.</p> <p>On February 25, 2020, fifty-six (56) senators voted to take up the bill (pro-life), but 60 votes were required, so the bill did not advance. The bill was supported by all 53 Republicans and three Democrats. Forty-one (41) senators voted against advancing the bill. Three Democrats were absent. Senate roll call no. 58 . The House companion bill is H.R. 926, sponsored by Congresswoman Ann Wagner (R-Mo.).</p>	<p>Y</p>	
<p>Passed</p>	<p>The Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act (S. 3275), sponsored by Senator Lindsey Graham (R-SC), is a bill to generally prohibit abortion after 20 weeks fetal age, with certain exceptions. The bill also contains substantial new protections for infants born alive during abortions. (This bill was developed from model legislation developed by National Right to Life in 2010 and enacted by a number of states.) On February 25, 2020, the U.S. Senate conducted a roll call vote on whether to advance this legislation. Fifty-three (53) senators voted to take up the bill (pro-life), but 60 votes were required, so the bill did not advance. The bill was supported by 51 Republicans and two Democrats. Forty-four (44) senators voted against advancing the bill (two Republicans and 42 Democrats). Three Democrats were absent. Senate roll call no. 57.</p>	<p>Y</p>	

115th Congress (2017-2018)

Result	Description	Vote	
Failed	<p>Title X of the Public Health Service Act is a major federal "family planning" program, currently funded at about \$286 million annually. In 2016, the Obama Administration issued a regulation to prevent individual states from redirecting funds away from Title X away from providers deemed unsuitable, such as Planned Parenthood. Under a law called the Congressional Review Act, Congress has the power to nullify such agency regulations under certain circumstances. H.J.Res. 43, sponsored by Rep. Diane Black (R-Tn.) and supported by National Right to Life, employed this Congressional Review Act authority to nullify the Obama Title X regulation, and thereby restore the previous authority of states to direct Title X funds to the providers that they deem suitable. (A companion resolution, S.J.Res. 13, was introduced by pro-life Sen. Joni Ernst, R-Iowa.) On February 16, 2017, H.J. Res. 43 passed the House of Representatives (see the House roll call here.) Six weeks later, the Senate passed the pro-life resolution on a roll call vote of 51-50, with Vice President Mike Pence breaking a tie to pass the resolution; the roll call is shown in column #1 in this scorecard. The pro-life resolution was supported by 50 Republican senators, plus Pence; it was opposed by all 48 Senate Democrats and by two Republican senators, Lisa Murkowski (R-Ak.) and Susan Collins (R-Maine). (March 30, 2017, Senate roll call no. 101.) President Trump signed the resolution into law on April 13, 2017.</p>	Y	