




James C. Ramos

Assembly Democrat District HD-045

Contact: (916) 319-2045
10350 Commerce Center Drive, Suite A-200,
Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730



View Online

This legislator voted constitutionally on **0%** of the votes shown below.

CPH: Estimated cost per household.

★ Pro-liberty ✗ Anti-liberty ? Did not Vote CPH Vote

1. SJR7 Article V Convention: Gun Control (passed 53 to 17 on 9/14/2023). Applies to Congress to call an Article V convention for the purpose of proposing a constitutional amendment on “firearms regulations and prohibitions.” **Yes** ✗

2. AB1406 Firearm Purchase Waiting Periods (passed 67 to 9 on 9/11/2023). Allows the California Department of Justice to delay a firearms background check up to 30 days if “additional research” is required or by “emergency” order of the Attorney General. **Yes** ✗

3. AB957 "Gender Identity" Affirmation for Child Custody (passed 61 to 16 on 9/8/2023). Would include a parent’s affirmation of the child’s “gender identity or gender expression” as part of the “health, safety, and welfare” factors used to determine the “best interests of the child” for the purposes of deciding custody. **Yes** ✗

4. SB385 Aspiration Abortions by Physician Assistants (passed 58 to 15 on 8/24/2023). Expands aspiration abortion training for physician assistants and permits them to perform aspiration abortions without the presence of a supervising physician and surgeon. **Yes** ✗

5. AB408 “Climate-Resilient” Bond Act of 2024 (passed 67 to 9 on 5/31/2023). Would authorize \$3.4 billion in general bond obligations to finance programs related to “climate change,” “food insecurity,” and an “equitable economy.” **\$518** **Yes** ✗

6. AB1034 Ban on Biometric Police Bodycam Surveillance (passed 41 to 17 on 5/15/2023). Would prohibit a law enforcement officer or agency from using any biometric surveillance system in connection with a law enforcement agency’s body-worn camera or data collected from an officer camera. **--** ?



CALIFORNIA LEGISLATIVE **SCORECARD** BASED ON THE U.S. CONSTITUTION

Rep. James C. Ramos

Lifetime Score: 0%

CA Scorecard 2023

2023 Regular Session Score 0%

The Legislative Scorecard is a nationwide educational program of The John Birch Society. Its purpose is to create an informed electorate on how state legislators are voting. The Scorecard is nonpartisan; it does not promote any candidate or political party. Bills are selected for their constitutional implications and cost to the taxpayers.

Please share this Scorecard in your district to inform people about your legislator's record on key votes.

U.S. Constitution, Amendment I --- 11 C.F.R. §114(4)(c)(4) --- 616 F.2d 45 (2d Cir. 1980)

The following scorecard lists several key votes in the California State Legislature in 2023 and ranks state assemblymen and senators based on their fidelity to (U.S.) constitutional and limited-government principles.

This is our second state-level Scorecard; the selected votes may not be reflective of legislators' overall records. Their cumulative scores will change as we add more votes. Please check regularly for updates.



Get Alerts

Scan to view and subscribe to legislative action alerts.

The Constitution

Learn more about the U.S. Constitution and our founding principles.



Bill Descriptions for the Votes that Affect You

1. Article V Convention: Gun Control

SJR7 applies to Congress to call an Article V convention for the purpose of proposing a constitutional amendment on “firearms regulations and prohibitions.”

Article V of the U.S. Constitution was designed to correct potential errors or defects in the Constitution—not to misconstrue or abuse its powers. The Second Amendment protects an individual’s God-given and unalienable right to self-defense, which is not subject to redefinition or a vote from government. Instead of failing to uphold their oath of office, legislators in California should “support and defend the Constitution” by acting to immediately nullify all unconstitutional federal laws, including those on firearms.

2. Firearm Purchase Waiting Periods

AB1406 allows the California Department of Justice to delay a firearms background check up to 30 days if “additional research” is required or by “emergency” order of the Attorney General.

This bill is just another example of California disparaging the rights of law-abiding citizens by hindering their ability to freely purchase and receive a firearm—without the burden of providing probable cause or proof of criminal activity. Nevertheless, the Bill of Rights and 14th Amendment prevent “any State” from depriving or denying “any person” of their right to “keep and Bear Arms,” without “due process of law,” regardless of an “emergency.”

3. "Gender Identity" Affirmation for Child Custody

AB957 would include a parent’s affirmation of the child’s “gender identity or gender expression” as part of the “health, safety, and welfare” factors used to determine the “best interests of the child” for the purposes of deciding custody.

No person has a right to abuse a child using the pretext of LGBTQ+ ideology, nor should any parent ever be compelled to acquiesce to it under the threat of losing custody. On the contrary, ‘child grooming’—whether it involves indoctrinating a child with cruel and fictional “gender identity” constructs or violating their right to life and limb through the grotesque practice of sex mutilation—should be considered illegal in California and be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law. The U.S. Constitution’s Bill of Rights and 14th Amendment protect both the basic humanity of children and the fundamental rights of parents from being unjustly deprived, denied, or disparaged.

4. Aspiration Abortions by Physician Assistants

SB385 expands aspiration abortion training for physician assistants and permits physician assistants to perform aspiration abortions without the personal presence of a supervising physician and surgeon.

The care of human life—not its destruction—is the greatest responsibility of government. As such, California ought to forbid the gruesome procedure of aspiration abortion, along with all other methods of abortion, and secure the right to life for every pre-born child. The right to life is the most fundamental, God-given, and unalienable right asserted in the Declaration of Independence and protected by the Fifth and 14th Amendments to the U.S. Constitution.

5. “Climate-Resilient” Bond Act of 2024

AB408 establishes the “Climate-resilient Farms, Sustainable Healthy Food Access, and Farmworker Protection Bond Act of 2024,” which, if approved by voters, would authorize \$3.4 billion in general bond obligations to finance programs related to “climate change,” “food insecurity,” and an “equitable economy.”

This United Nations Agenda 2030-inspired “sustainable development” bill is part of a global war on farmers and threatens to further tax Californians for a variety of ‘woke’ state bond-funded projects geared towards “socially disadvantaged” and “historically underserved communities.” None of its socialist scheme, which relies upon forms of wealth distribution, is constitutional, let alone environmentally beneficial or moral. The Bill of Rights and the 14th Amendment protect against undue deprivations or disparagements of a person’s “property,” such as government-imposed theft disguised as taxation, as well as guarantee “equal protection of the laws” for all Americans—in order to promote the “general Welfare.” The people of California, not to mention the state’s legislators and local officials, must choose freedom and stop implementation of this detrimental and costly act.

6. Ban on Biometric Police Bodycam Surveillance

AB1034 would prohibit a law enforcement officer or agency from using any biometric surveillance system in connection with a law enforcement agency’s body-worn camera or data collected from an officer camera.

The widespread use of biometric surveillance, such as facial recognition technology, on police body cameras would be tantamount to requiring every person in California to show their photo ID to every police officer—a mass and warrantless form of ‘secret search.’ It would be a dangerous, direct, and continual violation of the personal privacy provisions of the Fourth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, which protects the right of the people to be secure against “unreasonable searches.”