

Greenville Tea Party Legislative Scorecard 2015

INTRODUCTION

Do You Know How Your State Elected Republican Legislators Vote?

Are you aware of the new laws that your elected representatives may be working on to constrain you or your fellow South Carolinians?

If you are curious, please examine the following votes by your Republican legislators in 2015 to determine if they are working to improve your welfare or that of someone else.

Purpose of the Greenville Tea Party Legislative Scorecard

Virtually all of South Carolina Republican legislators while at home claim to be champions of the prudent spending of tax dollars. When you are listening to these often likeable and believable professionals they promise to remove government impediments to job creation, and they wail against punishing laws that stifle your personal freedoms. Not so in Columbia.

Tragically for South Carolina, many Republican legislators vote and work on behalf of their own personal interests while in Columbia.

The purpose of the Greenville Tea Party Legislative Scorecard is to verify if your Republican legislators are voting as promised at home and in accordance with the South Carolina Republican Party platform or are they voting against your interests and against the South Carolina Republican Party platform.

Therefore, the votes concentrate on issues related to jobs, spending, and freedom. The purpose of the scorecard is to distinguish between true conservatives and fakes in the upstate.

The only power that can save us from our out-of-control legislators is in the voting booth. Constituents must identify the sources of their discomfort and vote them out of office.

The Greenville Tea Party, therefore, hereby presents to you your Republican legislator's 2015 voting scorecard for the counties of Greenville, Spartanburg, Anderson, Pickens, and Oconee.

Note: Certain language in the Descriptions of the Bills was taken from the SC Policy Council's "Best and Worst 2015 Report" and the Governor's letter dated June 29, 2015 on her appropriations vetoes.

For an electronic version of this scorecard go to www.greenvilleteaparty.com

For further information on political issues in South Carolina go to www.scpolicycouncil.com

2015 UPSTATE REPUBLICAN REPRESENTATIVES LEGISLATIVE SCORECARD

Category-->		SPENDING										R E F O R M	REGULATION		T A X E S	M A R R E T	% Good Votes (1)	GRADES		
Bill/Veto Designation #'s -->		H3701 Veto 14-19	H3701 Veto 24	H3701 Veto 25	H3701 Veto 30	H3701 Veto 33	H3701 Veto 37	H3701 Veto 41	H3701 Veto 51	H3701 Veto 81	S11	H3430	S407	S170	S389	2015		2014	2013	
House Vote # -->	County	H806 - H811	H816	H817	H822	H825	H828	H831	H842	H872	H734	H555	H750	NO VOTE	H645					
Chumley, Bill	Greenville & Spartanburg	35	GOOD	NV	NV	NV	GOOD	NV	GOOD	GOOD	GOOD	GOOD	NV		NV	100%	A	B	B	
Hill, Jonathan	Anderson	8	GOOD	GOOD	GOOD	GOOD	GOOD	GOOD	NV	GOOD	GOOD	NV	GOOD	GOOD		GOOD	100%	A	N/A	N/A
Putnam, Joshua	Gmvl, Andrsn, Pckns	10	GOOD	GOOD	GOOD	GOOD	GOOD	GOOD	GOOD	E	E	NV	GOOD	NV		NV	100%	A	N/A	C
Thayer, Anne	Anderson	9	GOOD	GOOD	GOOD	GOOD	GOOD	GOOD	GOOD	NV	GOOD	GOOD	GOOD	GOOD		NV	100%	A	C	C
Bedingfield, Eric	Greenville	28	BAD	GOOD	GOOD	GOOD	GOOD	GOOD	GOOD	NV	GOOD	GOOD	GOOD	GOOD		E	91%	A	A	C
Nanney, Wendy	Greenville	22	GOOD	GOOD	BAD	GOOD	GOOD	GOOD	GOOD	GOOD	GOOD	E	E	E		E	89%	B	A	C
Stringer, Tommy	Greenville	18	BAD	GOOD	NV	GOOD	GOOD	GOOD	GOOD	NV	GOOD	NV	GOOD	NV		NV	88%	B	B	D
Willis, Mark	Greenville	16	BAD	GOOD	BAD	GOOD	GOOD	GOOD	GOOD	GOOD	GOOD	GOOD	GOOD	GOOD		E	83%	B	D	F
Hamilton, Daniel	Greenville	20	BAD	GOOD	BAD	GOOD	GOOD	GOOD	GOOD	NV	GOOD	GOOD	E	GOOD		NV	80%	B	B	C
Collins, Neal	Pickens	5	GOOD	GOOD	GOOD	NV	GOOD	BAD	GOOD	GOOD	GOOD	GOOD	BAD	GOOD		BAD	75%	C	N/A	N/A
Brannon, Doug	Spartanburg	38	NV	NV	NV	NV	NV	NV	GOOD	BAD	BAD	GOOD	GOOD	GOOD		NV	67%	D	F	F
Hiott, David ⁽²⁾	Pickens	4	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	GOOD	NV	GOOD		BAD	67%	N/A	D	F
Burns, Mike	Greenville	17	BAD	GOOD	BAD	NV	BAD	BAD	GOOD	GOOD	GOOD	GOOD	GOOD	GOOD		BAD	58%	F	F	F
Hicks, Donna	Spartanburg	37	BAD	GOOD	GOOD	GOOD	NV	BAD	GOOD	BAD	BAD	GOOD	GOOD	GOOD		BAD	58%	F	F	D
Allison, Rita	Greenville & Spartanburg	36	BAD	GOOD	BAD	GOOD	GOOD	GOOD	GOOD	BAD	BAD	GOOD	BAD	GOOD		BAD	54%	F	B	D
Forrester, Mike	Spartanburg	34	BAD	GOOD	GOOD	GOOD	GOOD	BAD	GOOD	BAD	BAD	GOOD	BAD	GOOD		BAD	54%	F	B	F
Bannister, Bruce	Greenville	24	BAD	NV	NV	NV	E	E	E	NV	NV	GOOD	NV	GOOD		BAD	50%	F	F	F
Henderson, Phyllis	Greenville	21	BAD	GOOD	BAD	NV	NV	GOOD	GOOD	NV	BAD	GOOD	BAD	GOOD		BAD	50%	F	F	F
Tallon, Eddie	Spartanburg	33	BAD	GOOD	GOOD	GOOD	BAD	BAD	GOOD	BAD	NV	GOOD	BAD	GOOD		BAD	50%	F	D	F
Smith, Garry	Greenville	27	BAD	BAD	BAD	GOOD	GOOD	BAD	GOOD	BAD	GOOD	GOOD	BAD	GOOD		BAD	46%	F	B	F
Loftis, Dwight	Greenville	19	BAD	BAD	BAD	GOOD	BAD	NV	GOOD	NV	BAD	GOOD	GOOD	GOOD		BAD	45%	F	F	F
Sandifer, William	Oconee & Pickens	2	BAD	BAD	BAD	GOOD	BAD	BAD	GOOD	NV	GOOD	GOOD	BAD	GOOD		BAD	42%	F	F	F
Cole, Derham	Spartanburg	32	BAD	GOOD	BAD	GOOD	BAD	BAD	GOOD	BAD	BAD	GOOD	BAD	GOOD		BAD	38%	F	D	F
Whitmire, William	Oconee	1	BAD	BAD	BAD	GOOD	BAD	BAD	GOOD	BAD	GOOD	GOOD	BAD	GOOD		BAD	38%	F	F	F
Gagnon, Craig	Anderson	11	BAD	BAD	BAD	GOOD	BAD	BAD	GOOD	BAD	BAD	GOOD	BAD	GOOD		BAD	31%	F	D	F
Clary, Gary	Pickens	3	BAD	BAD	BAD	GOOD	NV	BAD	BAD	E	BAD	GOOD	BAD	GOOD		BAD	27%	F	N/A	N/A
Gambrell, Michael	Anderson	7	BAD	BAD	BAD	NV	BAD	BAD	GOOD	BAD	BAD	GOOD	BAD	GOOD		NV	27%	F	F	F
White, Brian	Anderson	6	BAD	BAD	BAD	GOOD	BAD	BAD	GOOD	BAD	BAD	NV	BAD	NV		BAD	18%	F	F	F

Note (1): Base for computation does not include abstentions, excused absences, recusals or present but not voting (NV)

Note (2): Grade not assigned for 2015 due to numerous absences

2012
D
N/A
N/A
D
D
B
F
F
D
N/A
F
F
N/A
N/A
D
D
F
F
F
C
F
F
D
D
N/A
N/A
F
F

2015 UPSTATE REPUBLICAN SENATORS LEGISLATIVE SCORECARD

Category-->		SPENDING									R E F O R M	REGULATION		T A X E S	M A R K E T S	% Good Votes (1)	GRADES			
Bill/Veto Designation #'s -->		H3701 Veto 14-19	H3701 Veto 24	H3701 Veto 25	H3701 Veto 30	H3701 Veto 33	H3701 Veto 37	H3701 Veto 41	H3701 Veto 51	H3701 Veto 81	S11	H3430	S407	S170	S389		2015	2014	2013	2012
Senate Vote # -->	County <i>District</i>	S572, 584- 588	S591	S592	NO VOTE	S595	S596	NO VOTE	S614	S641	S451	NO VOTE	S470	S165	S460					
Bright, Lee	Greenville & Spartanburg 12	GOOD	GOOD	GOOD		GOOD	GOOD		GOOD	GOOD	GOOD		GOOD	GOOD	GOOD	100%	A	A	A	A
Bryant, Kevin	Anderson 3	GOOD	GOOD	GOOD		GOOD	GOOD		GOOD	GOOD	GOOD		GOOD	E	GOOD	100%	A	A	A	A
Corbin, Thomas ⁽²⁾	Greenville & Spartanburg 5	E	E	E		E	E		E	E	GOOD		GOOD	GOOD	GOOD	100%	N/A	B	A	N/A
Martin, Shane	Greenville & Spartanburg 13	GOOD	GOOD	GOOD		GOOD	GOOD		GOOD	GOOD	GOOD		GOOD	GOOD	BAD	91%	A	A	A	B
Verdin, Daniel	Greenville 9	GOOD	GOOD	BAD		GOOD	BAD		GOOD	GOOD	GOOD		E	BAD	BAD	60%	D	F	D	D
Fair, Mike	Greenville 6	GOOD	BAD	BAD		BAD	BAD		GOOD	GOOD	GOOD		GOOD	GOOD	BAD	55%	F	F	F	F
O'Dell, William ⁽²⁾	Anderson 4	E	E	E		E	E		E	E	GOOD		GOOD	BAD	BAD	50%	N/A	F	F	F
Turner, Ross	Greenville 8	BAD	BAD	BAD		GOOD	GOOD		GOOD	GOOD	GOOD		E	BAD	BAD	50%	F	D	F	N/A
Alexander, Thomas	Oconee & Pickens 1	BAD	BAD	BAD		BAD	BAD		GOOD	BAD	GOOD		GOOD	BAD	BAD	27%	F	F	F	F
Martin, Larry	Pickens 2	BAD	BAD	BAD		BAD	BAD		GOOD	BAD	GOOD		GOOD	BAD	BAD	27%	F	F	F	F
Peeler, Harvey	Spartanburg 14	BAD	BAD	BAD		BAD	BAD		GOOD	BAD	GOOD		GOOD	BAD	BAD	27%	F	D	F	D

Note (1): Base for computation does not include abstentions, excused absences, recusals or present but not voting (NV)

Note (2): Grade not assigned for 2015 due to numerous absences

Greenville Tea Party Legislative Scorecard 2015

Description of Bills

H.3701 – Appropriations Bill Vetoes:

#'s 14–19 - Unnecessary new administrative positions for SC Dept. of Ed. - *overridden*

24 – Temporary Proviso 117.131 – slush funds for SC colleges and universities - *overridden*

25 – Temporary Proviso 118.14(B) Item 10(a) - burdens all SC taxpayers with obligation to support the few students who attend University Center of Greenville - *overridden*

30 – Temporary Proviso 118.14(B) Item 21(e) – spending public funds for private health organizations - *House sustained*

33 – Temporary Proviso 118.14 Item 42(e) – excessive funding for Community Development Corporations which compete with private enterprise - *overridden*

37 – Temporary Proviso 118.14 Item 47 – using earmarks to create excessive spending for General Assembly expenses - *overridden*

41 – tries to fund a transportation maintenance facility found to be not viable by the SC Dept. of Ed. - *House sustained*

51 – using earmarks for old-fashioned pork for Dept. of Parks, Recreation & Tourism - *House overrode, Senate sustained*

81– Temporary Proviso 118.14(B) Item 42(d) – SC Dept. of Commerce interfering in market by picking winners and losers - *overridden*

Other Bills:

S.11 – Requires agendas for public meetings – improvement in transparency and accountability - *ratified*

H.3430 – Criminalizes installing and/or selling “unsafe” used tires – would probably eliminate the used tire industry; and other law already subjects sellers to liability for harm caused by the sale of dangerous products - *passed House, pending in Senate*

S.407 – Reforms unemployment insurance – extends to all business owners the right NOT to pay unemployment insurance tax on themselves.....since they can't claim benefits anyway ! - *ratified*

S.170 – Imposes an Internet sales tax that would damage online sales in SC - *passed Senate, referred to House Ways and Means*

S.389 – Expands activities of Business Development Corporations – if a business can't receive financing in the private market, it is not the taxpayer's place to rescue it - *ratified*