

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 | | | | | | | | | | REFORM | REGULATION | | TAXES | MARRIAGE | % 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*