



2007-2008 House Scorecard

www.SCClubforGrowth.com

**PO Box 11909
Columbia, SC 29211
(803) 454-1134**

Paid for by SC Club for Growth. Not authorized by any candidate or candidate's committee.



2007-2008 House Scorecard

					2007 Budget				2007 DOT Restructuring			2007 School Choice	2007 Judicial		2007 Treasurer		2008 Restructuring					2008 Budget					2008 Retirement
					Vote #	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
Name	Score	Grade	District	Location	Party	Day 1	Day 2	Day 3	LARD LIST	Gas Tax	Ott Am.	Edge Am.	EOS	Beatty	Williams	Adjourn	Ryberg	Agr	Joint Gov/Lt Gov	Edu	Final	Amendments	Earmark Discl.	Comp. Grants	Budget Vetoes	Adjourn	Leg. Pay Raise
						Out of 6	Out of 12	Out of 10	Out of 50											Out of 5				Out of 10			
Mitchell	5.0	F-	31	Spartanburg	D	0	3	0						X					✓		✓				0		
Brown, Robert	4.2	F-	116	Charleston	D	0	0	0		✓				X					✓			1			0		
Sellers	3.2	F-	90	Bamberg	D	0	2	1		✓				X					✓			2			0		
Hosey	2.7	F-	91	Barnwell	D	0	1	0						X					✓			1	✓		0		
Whipper	2.7	F-	113	Charleston	D	0	1	0						X					✓			1	✓		0		
Alexander, Terry	2.5	F-	59	Florence	D	0	0	0						X					✓			1	✓		0		
Branham	2.5	F-	61	Florence	D	0	0	0						X					✓			1	✓		0		
Rutherford	2.5	F-	74	Richland	D	0	0	1						X					✓				✓		0		
Howard	2.5	F-	76	Richland	D	0	2	0						X							✓				0		
Neal, JH	1.4	F-	70	Richland	D	0	4	0						X								1	✓		0		
Smith, Fletcher	1.0	F-	23	Greenville	D	0	0	0						X								2	✓		1		
Harvin	0.7	F-	64	Clarendon	D	0	2	0						X									✓		0		
Mack	0.7	F-	109	Charleston	D	0	0	0						X								2	✓		0		
Breeland	0.2	F-	111	Charleston	D	0	0	0						X									✓		0		
Moody-Lawrence *	Inc.	Inc.	49	York	D	0	0	0						X											0		
Smith, James *	Inc.	Inc.	72	Richland	D	0	0	0														1	✓		0	✓	
Daning *	Inc.	Inc.	92	Berkeley	R																		✓		1		

✓ - pro growth vote
 X - anti growth vote

* incomplete (Inc.)
 ** based on 2007 record
 *** based on 2008 record
 **** based on combined 2007 House and 2008 Senate record

Scoring Guide

Vote 1 – March 13, 2007, H. 3620, SC CFG scored six votes on pork budget items/pet projects offered by House Democrats. “Yes” votes on the motions to defeat the amendments were the pro-growth votes. Those pork items are:

- Amendment 60 – \$80,000,000 increase to Child Development Early Education Program
- Amendment 72 – \$2,500,000 to SCSU I-95 Corridor Initiative
- Amendment 195 – \$1,000,000 to Northeastern Technical College Operating Fund
- Amendment 148 – \$6,000,000 to Allied Health Initiative
- Amendment 149 – \$27,000,000 to Health and Human Services
- Amendment 102 – \$4,000,000 to AIDS Drug Assistance Program

http://www.scstatehouse.net/sess117_2007-2008/hj07/20070313.htm

Vote 2 – March 14, 2007, H. 3620, SC CFG scored twelve votes on budget amendments. The first five were pork/pet spending projects, the next four would have stripped the \$81,000,000 income tax cut, the next two would have increased legislators pay and the last would have moved money from the Dept. of Education bureaucracy and into classrooms. On the first eleven votes, “YES” votes on the motions to defeat the amendments were the pro-growth votes. On the last vote, a “YES” vote for passing the education reform amendment was the pro-growth vote. Those items are:

- Amendment 12 – \$1,000,000 to Allendale County Economic Development
- Amendment 13 – \$1,500,000 to Barnwell County Economic Development
- Amendment 59 – \$2,500,000 to the SC Conservation Bank
- Amendment 196 – \$20,400,000 to the SC Conservation Bank
- Amendment 50 – \$100,000 to the Allendale County Transportation-Scooter
- Amendment 137 – \$81,000,000 in to Councils of Government
- Amendment 8 – \$81,000,000 to county transportation funds
- Amendment 152 – \$81,000,000 to county transportation funds
- Amendment 52 – \$239,000 in pay increases for SC Senators
- Amendment 54 – \$645,000 in pay increases for SC Representatives
- Amendment 265 – \$81,000,000 to Special Economic Development Grants Fund
- Amendment 210 – Amendment to move new hire money away from DOE bureaucracy

http://www.scstatehouse.net/sess117_2007-2008/hj07/20070314.htm

Vote 3 – March 15, 2007, H. 3620, SC CFG scored ten votes on budget amendments. Two first two were pork spending projects and the last eight were Democrats’ attempts strip out the income tax and spend the money on pork projects instead. In each case, “Yes” votes on the motions to defeat the amendments were the pro-growth votes. Those items are:

- Amendment 76 – \$2,500,000 to SCSU I-95 Corridor Initiative
- Amendment 3 – \$3,000,000 to Barnwell Dist. 29 -Williston-Elko Expansion/Renovation
- Amendment 224 – Attempt to remove income tax cut
- Amendment 123 – Attempt to remove income tax cut
- Amendment 178 – Attempt to remove income tax cut
- Amendment 239 – Attempt to remove income tax cut
- Amendment 274 – Attempt to remove income tax cut
- Amendment 280 – Attempt to remove income tax cut
- Amendment 312 – Attempt to remove income tax cut
- Amendment 83 – Attempt to remove income tax cut

http://www.scstatehouse.net/sess117_2007-2008/hj07/20070315.htm

Vote 4 – June 28-29, 2007, H. 3620, “Lard List - Top 50 Budget Vetoes” – Fifty budget veto overrides of items in the 2007 SC Club for Growth House “Lard List.” Voting “No” to uphold these overrides was the pro-growth vote.

<http://www.SCClubforGrowth.org/pdf/2007LardList.pdf> (view description of projects)

<http://www.SCClubforGrowth.org/pdf/House2007Lard.pdf> (view individual votes)

http://www.scstatehouse.net/sess117_2007-2008/hj07/20070628.htm

http://www.scstatehouse.net/sess117_2007-2008/hj07/20070629.htm

Click here to view Governor Sanford’s 2007 veto message:

http://www.scgovernor.com/news/releases/june_07/june_27_07-02.htm

Vote 5 – March 27, 2007, H. 3575, Amendment 7, “Gas Tax Increase” – A “Yes” vote on the motion to defeat the amendment was the pro-growth vote. The amendment would have raised the state gasoline tax by 5 cents.

http://www.scstatehouse.net/sess117_2007-2008/hj07/20070327.htm

Vote 6 – March 27, 2007, H. 3575, Amendment 15, “Ott Amendment - DOT Reform” – A “Yes” vote on the motion to defeat the amendment was the pro-growth vote. The amendment would have stripped executive branch authority from the DOT Commission.

http://www.scstatehouse.net/sess117_2007-2008/hj07/20070327.htm

Vote 7 – March 27, 2007, H. 3575, Amendment 23, “Edge Amendment - DOT Reform” – A “No” vote on the motion to defeat the amendment was the pro-growth vote. The amendment would have moved the DOT entirely under Executive Branch authority rather than leave a quasi-legislative agency in charge.

http://www.scstatehouse.net/sess117_2007-2008/hj07/20070327.htm

Vote 8 – March 29, 2007, H. 3124, Amendment 8, “Educational Opportunity Scholarships” – A “No” vote on the motion to defeat the amendment was the pro-growth vote. The amendment would have allowed a student in a failing school (under certain conditions) to receive state funds that “follow” them to a better public or independent school. http://www.scstatehouse.net/sess117_2007-2008/hj07/20070329.htm

Vote 9 – May 23, 2007, “SC Supreme Court Seat 5 Election” – Representatives chose between candidates Kaye Hearn, Don Beatty and Bruce Williams. A vote for Williams was the pro-growth vote.

http://www.scstatehouse.net/sess117_2007-2008/hj07/20070523.htm

Vote 10 – August 3, 2007, “Motion to Adjourn” – A “Yes” vote to adjourn was the pro-growth vote. Anti-reformers in the House and Senate were pushing to elect Converse Chellis, while fiscal conservatives attempted to block the action by adjourning.

http://www.scstatehouse.net/sess117_2007-2008/hj07/20070803.htm

Vote 11 – August 3, 2007, “State Treasurer Election” – A “Yes” vote for Senator Greg Ryberg was the pro-growth vote.

http://www.scstatehouse.net/sess117_2007-2008/hj07/20070803.htm

Vote 12 – March 5, 2008, H. 4620, Amendment 6, “Appoint Commissioner of Agriculture” – A “Yes” vote to prevent anti-reformers from not allowing the governor to appoint the state’s Commissioner of Agriculture was the pro-growth vote.

http://www.scstatehouse.net/sess117_2007-2008/hj08/20080305.htm

Vote 13 – March 5, 2008, H. 4620, Amendment 9, “Gov and Lt. Gov on same ticket” – A “Yes” vote to allow the governor and lieutenant governor to run on the same ticket was the pro-growth vote.

http://www.scstatehouse.net/sess117_2007-2008/hj08/20080305.htm

Vote 14 – March 5, 2008, H. 4620, Amendment 13, “Appoint Secretary of Education” – A “Yes” vote to prevent anti-reformers from not allowing the governor to appoint the state’s Secretary of Education was the pro-growth vote.

http://www.scstatehouse.net/sess117_2007-2008/hj08/20080305.htm

Vote 15 – March 5, 2008, H. 4620, 2nd Reading, “Restructuring – Appointment of Constitutional Officers” – A “Yes” vote to allow the governor to appoint some constitutional officers was the pro-growth vote.

http://www.scstatehouse.net/sess117_2007-2008/hj08/20080305.htm

Vote 16 – March 11-12, 2008, H. 4800, “Budget Amendments” – SC CFG scored five votes on budget items. Amendments were chosen for scoring due to their impact on the state budget and for their good government principles. Those items are (with pro-growth following):

- Amendment 23 – Palmetto Early Graduation Reward Program (“No” to defeat)
- Amendment 99 – \$200,000 for SC Community Enterprise Center (“Yes” to defeat)
- Amendment 116 – No state funds for school board association dues (“Yes” to pass)
- Amendment 167 – Salary supplements for only 10 years (“Yes” to pass)
- Amendment 198 – Funding for Center for Ethical Leadership (“Yes” to defeat)

<http://www.SCClubforGrowth.org/pdf/House2008Amendments.pdf> (view individual votes)

http://www.scstatehouse.net/sess117_2007-2008/hj08/20080311.htm

http://www.scstatehouse.net/sess117_2007-2008/hj08/20080312.htm

Vote 17 – April 30, 2008, H. 4346, 2nd Reading, “Earmark Disclosure Reform” – This bill requires disclosure of information regarding earmark projects or programs requested by individual members of the legislature for inclusion in an appropriations bill. A “Yes” vote was the pro-growth vote.

http://www.scstatehouse.net/sess117_2007-2008/hj08/20080430.htm

Vote 18 – June 4, 2008, H. 4800, Override of Amendment 51 “Competitive Grants Carry Forward” – A “No” vote to uphold Governor Sanford’s veto of the so-called “Competitive Grants Program” was the pro-growth vote. This “legislative slush fund,” with \$18.5 million in cash, was continued despite projections that state revenues were lower than anticipated and agencies would have to prioritize spending.

http://www.scstatehouse.net/sess117_2007-2008/hj08/20080603.htm

Vote 19 – June 4, 2008, H. 4800, “Top 10 Budget Vetoes” – Voting “No” to uphold the governor’s veto of each of these ten egregious spending items was the pro-growth vote. Those items are:

- Veto 15 – H.L Hunley Security (should be left to private groups)
- Veto 34 – State Park Privatization Approval (anti-government efficiency)
- Veto 38 – Economic Development Organizations (anti-government efficiency)
- Veto 44 – Compensation/Agency Head Salary (anti-good government)
- Veto 46 – Competitive Grants Program (legislative slush fund)
- Veto 47 – Competitive Grants Program (legislative slush fund)
- Veto 48 – Competitive Grants Program (legislative slush fund)
- Veto 49 – Competitive Grants Program (legislative slush fund)
- Veto 50 – Competitive Grants Program (legislative slush fund)
- Veto 55 – Lt. Governor Security Detail (unnecessary)

<http://www.SCClubforGrowth.org/pdf/House2008Budget.pdf> (view individual votes)
http://www.scstatehouse.net/sess117_2007-2008/hj08/20080604.htm

Click here to view Governor Sanford’s 2008 veto message:

http://www.scgovernor.com/news/releases/news_release_may08_05-30-08.htm

Vote 20 – May 29, 2008, “Adjourn for the Day” – After some House members succeeded in upholding the governor’s vetoes on multiple spending items, anti-reformers quickly moved to adjourn, with the intent of using the weekend to change members’ votes. Voting “No” to adjourn was the pro-growth vote.

http://www.scstatehouse.net/sess117_2007-2008/hj08/20080529.htm

Vote 21 – April 8, 2008, H. 4673, “Backdoor Legislative Pay Increase - Motion to table motion to reconsider 2nd reading” – SC CFG scored a vote dealing with a measure hidden inside a larger bill, which would have increased the state’s unfunded liabilities and increased legislators’ pensions by 2% each year one day after the state’s Board of Economic Advisors cut state revenue estimates by \$180 million over the next two years. The legislative pension system is already three times more generous than the regular state employee system - and the regular system is reportedly more generous than 90% of similar public plans around the country according to a study done by the state Chamber of Commerce. Voting “No” to defeat the bill was the pro-growth vote.

http://www.scstatehouse.net/sess117_2007-2008/hj08/20080408.htm

Click here to view SC Club for Growth’s press release on the legislative pay increase:

<http://www.scclubforgrowth.com/news/details.asp?keyID=31>