

**SOUTH CAROLINA HOUSE** VOTE **DESCRIPTIONS** 



Club for Growth Foundation is a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization focused on educating the public about the value of free markets, pro-growth policies, and economic prosperity.

State Scorecards are created by the Club for Growth Foundation to educate the public about the voting records of the legislators who serve in state legislatures. This is part of a larger scorecard project that the Club for Growth Foundation has created to educate the public about the economic positions taken by legislators in states across the country.

# Our Mission

THE FOUNDATION **EDUCATES THE** PUBLIC ABOUT PRO-**GROWTH POLICIES.** 

THE FOUNDATION CONDUCTS **COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATIONS OF VOTING RECORDS.** 

THE FOUNDATION'S **GOAL IS TO INFORM** THE PUBLIC AND **BRING AWARENESS** TO LAWMAKERS.

# **METHODOLOGY 2023 SOUTH** CAROLINA

**SNAPSHOT** 

DESCRIPTIONS

**SNAPSHOT** 

DESCRIPTIONS

# Methodology | South Carolina 2023

Club for Growth Foundation publishes the scorecard study so the public can monitor the actions and the voting behavior of South Carolina's state lawmakers on economic growth issues.

The Foundation conducted a comprehensive examination of each lawmaker's record on votes related to pro-growth policies and computed an Economic Growth Score on a scale of 0 to 100. A score of 100 indicates the highest support for pro-growth policies.

The Foundation examines legislative votes related to the Foundation's immediate pro-economic growth policy goals, including:

- Reducing or eliminating tax rates and enacting tax reform
- Limited government through limited spending and budget reform
- Regulatory reform and deregulation
- Ending abusive lawsuits through medical malpractice and tort reform
- Expanding school choice
- Implementing term limits

Not all of these policy goals will come up for a vote in each legislative session.

The Foundation also examines votes on bills that would directly harm these goals.

This scorecard is based on selected votes of importance to the Foundation, and does not include the complete voting record of any legislator. There are inherent limitations in judging the overall qualifications of any legislator based on a selected voting record, and the Foundation does not endorse or oppose any legislator for public office.

# **2023 LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS CONSIDERED IN SOUTH CAROLINA**

The Foundation's study examined over 1,100 floor votes and, in the end, included 18 South Carolina House votes and 10 South Carolina Senate votes.

# COMPUTATION

Scores are computed on a scale of 0 to 100. Each vote or action in the rating is assigned a certain number of points depending on its relative importance. If a lawmaker casts a correct vote, the scorecard will denote it with that number. If a lawmaker casts an incorrect vote, the scorecard will denote that vote with a hyphen (-). Absences are not counted signified as an "X" on the scorecard - though the Foundation reserves the right to do so if, in its judgment, a lawmaker's position was otherwise discernible. If a lawmaker was not officially sworn into office at the time of a vote, the scorecard will denote that vote with an "I".

To provide some additional guidance concerning the scores, each lawmaker was ranked. Aside from ties, lawmakers with 0% scores are, by default, ranked #124 in the House and #46 in the Senate if all lawmakers are present. Scores and ranks cannot be directly compared between the House and Senate, as different votes were taken in each chamber. If applicable, the study also records a "Lifetime Score" for each lawmaker. This is a simple average of the scores from 2023 and all previous years where the lawmaker earned a score.

In some cases, a lawmaker was not present for enough votes for a meaningful score or ranking to be computed. In such cases "n.a." for "not applicable" appears. In computing lifetime scores, years with "n.a." listed instead of a score are not included. Comparing such scores to other members without "n.a." years may be misleading.

# **ADDITIONAL FACTORS**

A study of roll call votes on the floor of the South Carolina House and South Carolina Senate and legislative actions is just that. It cannot account for a lawmaker's work in committee, advocacy in his party's caucus meetings, and effectiveness as a leader in advocating pro-growth policies.

"Through the release of this series, the Club for Growth Foundation is looking at how state legislatures perform in terms of pro-growth policies. We believe that this scorecard will help inform citizens and entrepreneurs about who supports the policies that are good for economic prosperity."

- DAVID McINTOSH PRESIDENT, CLUB FOR GROWTH FOUNDATION

**METHODOLOGY 2023 SOUTH** CAROLINA

**SNAPSHOT** 

**SNAPSHOT** 

DESCRIPTIONS



**46 MEMBERS** 

# South Carolina Senate Snapshot

**30 Republicans** 

15 Democrats

1 Independent

**O Vacancies** 

**Average Republican Score: 28%** 

(Down from 45% in 2022)

**Average Democrat Score: 2%** 

(Down from 27% in 2022)



HIGHEST-RATED REPUBLICAN

Senator Thomas Corbin (SD-5) | 49%



LOWEST-RATED REPUBLICANS

Senator Rex Rice (SD-2) | 14% Senator Sandra Senn (SD-41) | 14%



HIGHEST-RATED DEMOCRAT

Senator Darrell Jackson (SD-21) | 13%



**LOWEST-RATED DEMOCRATS** 

Multiple Senators | 0%

ABOUT THE FOUNDATION

METHODOLOGY 2023 SOUTH CAROLINA

SOUTH CAROLINA SENATE SNAPSHOT

SOUTH CAROLINA SENATE VOTES

SOUTH CAROLINA
SENATE
VOTE
DESCRIPTIONS

SOUTH CAROLINA HOUSE SNAPSHOT

SOUTH CAROLINA HOUSE VOTES

HOUSE
VOTE
DESCRIPTIONS

# South Carolina 2023 | Senate Scorecard

Name	District	Party	Score	Life- score	H3604	H3726	H4115	H4300	80039	S0241	S0284	50285	80604	80739	Rank
PRO-GROWTH POSITION					N	N	N	N	Υ	N	N	Υ	N	N	
POINTS					15	4	6	20	12	6	10	12	10	5	
Adams, Brian	SD-44	R	29%	38%	-	-	-	-	12	х	-	12	х	-	10
Alexander, Thomas	SD-01	R	24%	31%	-	-	-	-	12	-	-	12	-	-	16
Allen, Karl	SD-07	D	0%	11%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	32
Bennett, Sean	SD-38	R	24%	35%	-	-	-	-	12	-	-	12	-	-	16
Campsen, George	SD-43	R	25%	32%	-	-	-	-	12	-	-	12	-	х	14
Cash, Richard	SD-03	R	43%	46%	15	4	-	-	12	-	-	12	-	-	3
Climer, Wes	SD-15	R	30%	46%	-	-	-	-	12	6	-	12	-	-	7
Corbin, Thomas	SD-05	R	49%	53%	15	4	-	-	12	6	-	12	-	-	1
Cromer, Ronnie	SD-18	R	32%	38%	X	-	-	-	12	-	Х	12	-	-	6
Davis, Thomas	SD-46	R	24%	31%	-	-	-	-	12	-	-	12	-	-	16
Fanning, Michael	SD-17	D	0%	21%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	32
Gambrell, Michael	SD-04	R	16%	31%	Х	-	-	-	12	-	-	Х	-	-	27
Garrett, Billy	SD-10	R	24%	35%	-	-	-	-	12	-	-	12	-	-	16
Goldfinch, Stephen	SD-34	R	n/a	25%	X	Х	Х	Х	12	-	Х	Х	Х	х	
Grooms, Lawrence	SD-37	R	24%	27%	-	-	-	-	12	-	-	12	-	-	16
Gustafson, Penry	SD-27	R	24%	38%	-	-	-	-	12	-	-	12	-	-	16
Harpootlian, Richard	SD-20	D	0%	20%	-	-	х	-	х	-	-	х	-	-	32
Hembree, Greg	SD-28	R	27%	33%	-	-	-	-	12	-	-	12	х	-	11
Hutto, C. Bradley	SD-40	D	0%	13%	-	Х	-	-	-	-	-	х	-	-	32
Jackson, Darrell	SD-21	D	13%	21%	-	Х	-	-	-	-	-	12	-	-	30

**SOUTH CAROLINA** SENATE **VOTES** 

Name	District	Party	Score	Life- score	H3604	H3726	H4115	H4300	80039	S0241	S0284	S0285	80604	80739	Rank
PRO-GROWTH POSITION					N	N	N	N	Υ	N	N	Υ	N	N	
POINTS					15	4	6	20	12	6	10	12	10	5	
Johnson, Kevin	SD-36	D	0%	12%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Х	-	-	32
Johnson, Michael	SD-16	R	30%	40%	-	-	-	-	12	6	-	12	-	-	7
Kimbrell, Joshua	SD-11	R	30%	40%	-	-	-	-	12	6	-	12	-	-	7
Kimpson, Marlon	SD-42	D	0%	0%	Х	-	-	X	-	-	-	X	X	-	32
Loftis, Dwight	SD-06	R	24%	37%	-	-	-	-	12	-	-	12	-	-	16
Malloy, Gerald	SD-29	D	12%	21%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12	-	-	31
Martin, Shane	SD-13	R	27%	31%	15	-	-	-	-	-	-	12	-	-	11
Massey, A. Shane	SD-25	R	40%	57%	-	-	-	-	12	6	10	12	-	-	4
Matthews, Margie	SD-45	D	0%	9%	-	-	Х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	32
McElveen, Thomas	SD-35	D	0%	12%	-	-	-	-	Х	-	-	-	-	-	32
McLeod, Mia	SD-22	I	0%	3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	32
Peeler, Harvey	SD-14	R	24%	33%	-	-	-	-	12	-	-	12	-	-	16
Rankin, Luke	SD-33	R	25%	31%	-	-	-	-	12	-	-	12	-	х	14
Reichenbach, Mike	SD-31	R	47%	47%	X	-	-	-	12	6	10	12	-	-	2
Rice, Rex	SD-02	R	14%	32%	-	-	-	-	Х	-	-	12	-	-	28
Sabb, Ronnie	SD-32	D	0%	11%	-	-	Х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	32
Scott, John	SD-19	D	0%	15%	-	-	-	Х	-	-	-	-	Х	-	32
Senn, Sandra	SD-41	R	14%	28%	-	-	-	-	12	-	-	х	-	-	28
Setzler, Nikki	SD-26	D	0%	13%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	х	-	-	32
Shealy, Katrina	SD-23	R	24%	26%	-	-	-	-	12	-	-	12	-	-	16

**SOUTH CAROLINA** SENATE **VOTES** 

Name	District	Party	Score	Life- score	H3604	H3726	H4115	H4300	62003	S0241	S0284	S0285	80604	80739	Rank
PRO-GROWTH POSITION					N	N	N	N	Υ	N	N	Y	N	N	
POINTS					15	4	6	20	12	6	10	12	10	5	
Stephens, Vernon	SD-39	D	0%	11%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	32
Talley, Scott	SD-12	R	19%	36%	Х	-	-	-	12	-	-	х	Х	-	26
Turner, Ross	SD-08	R	27%	33%	-	-	-	-	12	-	Х	12	-	-	11
Verdin, Danny	SD-09	R	39%	42%	15	-	-	-	12	-	-	12	-	-	5
Williams, Kent	SD-30	D	0%	11%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	32
Young, Thomas	SD-24	R	24%	33%	-	-	-	-	12	-	-	12	-	-	16

**SOUTH CAROLINA** SENATE **VOTES** 

### H. 3604

# SCOUT MOTORS SWEETHEART DEAL (CFGF OPPOSES)

This bill appropriates an exorbitant amount of taxpayer money for Project Connect. Specifically, the legislation provides a \$1.3 billion taxpayer-funded sweetheart deal for Scout Motors through the construction of a rail spur and other infrastructure to launch an electric vehicle manufacturing facility for Scout Motors in Richland County. This is flagrant corporate welfare and is a textbook case of the government putting the interests of well-connected companies above those of hardworking citizens. The South Carolina House passed the bill, 101-14, on January 19, 2023. The South Carolina Senate passed it, 36-4, on March 14, 2023.

## H. 3726

# NEW WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

#### (CFGF OPPOSES)

This bill creates a new state government agency. Specifically, the legislation transfers workforce development powers out of the Department of Commerce, creates the Office of Statewide Workforce Development (OWSD) within the Department of Employment and Workforce to centrally plan job development within the Palmetto State, and gives the Governor control over the director of OWSD. Instead of allowing job creation to flow from the needs of the market, this bill empowers the government to shape it in directions that will benefit politically well-connected industries. The South Carolina House passed the bill, 108-5, on March 9, 2023. The South Carolina Senate passed it, 41-2, on May 10, 2023.

## H. 4115

# EXPANDED CONTRACTORS LICENSING SCHEME

#### (CFGF OPPOSES)

This bill increases the licensing and regulatory scheme for contractors. Specifically, the legislation empowers the Contractor's Licensing Board to further regulate and fine contractors with increased income requirements, net worth requirements, and bid constraints for tiered groups of contractors. These types of onerous regulatory schemes serve as barriers to entry, serve only to perpetuate the continuance of the Board bureaucracy, and disproportionately impact lower-income households. The South Carolina House passed the bill, 90-15, on April 5, 2023. The South Carolina Senate passed it, 42-0, on May 10, 2023.

ABOUT THE FOUNDATION

METHODOLOGY 2023 SOUTH CAROLINA

SOUTH CAROLINA SENATE SNAPSHOT

SOUTH CAROLINA SENATE VOTES

SOUTH CAROLINA
SENATE
VOTE
DESCRIPTIONS

SOUTH CAROLINA HOUSE SNAPSHOT

SOUTH CAROLINA HOUSE VOTES

## H. 4300

# MISSED OPPORTUNITY BUDGET **AGREEMENT**

#### (CFGF OPPOSES)

This bill allocates nearly \$14 billion in spending for the state budget. The legislation includes a 12.5 percent increase in the year-over-year recurring base of the general fund and includes another meritless teacher salary increase equal to \$2,500 across the board for every pay schedule. Additionally, the bill incorporates another 5 percent pay raise for state employees, once again bribes universities with \$124 million to "freeze" tuition increases, and includes an eye-popping \$600 million in local earmarks. The bill also contains the \$1.3 billion corporate welfare giveaway to Scout Motors for the construction of the electric vehicle factory. The South Carolina House passed the bill, 92-14, on June 14, 2023. The South Carolina Senate passed it, 43-0, on April 19, 2023.

### S. 39

# SIGNIFICANT SCHOOL CHOICE SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM

#### (CFGF SUPPORTS)

This bill creates an education scholarship program for low-income K-12 students. Specifically, the legislation implements an education scholarship program for roughly 5.000 low-income K-12 students below 250 percent of the federal poverty line (FPL). This eligibility threshold expands to include some 15,000 students within 400 percent FPL by the 2026-27 school year. Parents will have access to \$6,000 per year to use for tuition, books, tutoring, and other qualified education expenses. The South Carolina House passed the bill, 74-36, on April 27, 2023. The South Carolina Senate passed it, 28-15, on January 31, 2023.

### S. 241

# LICENSING SCHEME FOR GENETIC **COUNSELORS**

#### (CFGF OPPOSES)

This bill creates a new licensing board for genetic counseling. Specifically, the legislation creates the South Carolina Board of Genetic Counselors and imposes new licensing requirements on those practicing genetic counseling. The Board is authorized with the ability to impose and collect licensing and application fees as well as issue regulations that will drive up costs for counseling services. Onerous licensing schemes serve as barriers to entry that disproportionately impact low-income households while empowering government bureaucrats. The South Carolina Senate passed the bill, 39-6, on March 22, 2023. The South Carolina House did not take it up.

CAROLINA

**SNAPSHOT** 

**SOUTH CAROLINA** SENATE VOTE DESCRIPTIONS

**VOTES** 

S. 284

# TAX-AND-SPEND GOVERNMENT HOUSING **SCHEME**

#### (CFGF OPPOSES)

This bill allows municipalities to use local taxes for government-funded housing. Specifically, the legislation empowers counties and municipalities to divert 15 percent from existing hospitality and lodging taxes for the development of new government housing and authorizes new local bonds for the construction of such developments. While the total impact on hardworking South Carolinians is unknown, this massive tax-andspend scheme immediately allows for 60 percent of counties in the state to levy new tax bonds on residents for the expansion of government housing. The South Carolina House passed the bill, 80-29, on May 10, 2023. The South Carolina Senate passed it, 41-2, on May 11, 2023.

S. 285

# SCHOOL CHOICE TAX CREDIT PROGRAM (CFGF SUPPORTS)

This bill creates a new scholarship program for school choice. Specifically, the legislation repeals the existing Exceptional Needs program and replaces it with an expanded scholarship program equal to \$11,800 for students with disabilities, \$8,400 for low-income students in households below 400 percent of the federal poverty level, and \$1,700 for home school children. The aggregate annual cap for the program is set at \$55 million and individuals may claim a credit against their income or bank taxes equal to 100 percent of their donation to a scholarship organization. The South Carolina Senate passed the bill, 28-9, on March 15, 2023. The South Carolina House did not take it up.

S. 604

# SUPPLEMENTAL COVID SPENDING SPLURGE

#### (CFGF OPPOSES)

This resolution authorizes remaining federal COVID fund expenditures for pet projects. Specifically, the resolution identifies \$586 million in federal ARPA funds designated for the Rural Infrastructure Authority and earmarks \$100 million for crony economic development initiatives at the local level. Further, the resolution gives sole discretion for disbursement to the Secretary of Commerce. The \$2 trillion price tag on ARPA is one of the primary drivers of the record inflation eating into household budgets and family finances. Earmarking federal money wrongly seen as "free" for myriad big government projects creates a false spending floor for future legislative sessions, building pressure for future spending and tax hikes. The South Carolina House passed the resolution, 98-14, on April 5, 2023. The South Carolina Senate passed it, 40-0, on March 15, 2023.

CAROLINA

**SNAPSHOT** 

**SOUTH CAROLINA** SENATE VOTE DESCRIPTIONS

VOTES

S. 739

#### HOUSING TAX CREDIT EXPANSION

#### (CFGF OPPOSES)

This bill expands the South Carolina Housing Tax Credit program. Specifically, the legislation authorizes another one-time housing tax credit expenditure equal to \$25 million in special interest carveouts for entities engaged in housing construction projects. Lawmakers should not wield the tax code to benefit well-connected entities at the expense of hardworking South Carolinians for the purpose of centrally planning government housing initiatives. The South Carolina House passed the resolution, 84-26, on May 10, 2023. The South Carolina Senate passed the resolution, 43-0, on May 3, 2023.



**124 MEMBERS** 

# South Carolina House Snapshot

88 Republicans

**36 Democrats** 

**O Vacancies** 

Average Republican Score: 34%

(Down from 41% in 2022)

Average Democrat Score: 5%

(Down from 15% in 2022)



### **HIGHEST-RATED REPUBLICANS**

Rep. Robert May (HD-88) | 100%

Rep. T. Alan Morgan (HD-18) | 100%



SENATE SNAPSHOT

CAROLINA

SOUTH CAROLINA SENATE VOTES

SOUTH CAROLINA
SENATE
VOTE
DESCRIPTIONS

SOUTH CAROLINA HOUSE SNAPSHOT

SOUTH CAROLINA HOUSE VOTES

SOUTH CAROLINA HOUSE VOTE DESCRIPTIONS



LOWEST-RATED REPUBLICAN

Rep. Neal Collins (HD-5) | 6%



HIGHEST-RATED DEMOCRAT

Rep. Jackie Hayes (HD-55) | 13%



**LOWEST-RATED DEMOCRATS** 

Multiple Representatives | 0%

# South Carolina 2023 | House Scorecard

Name	District	Party	Score	Lifescore	H3514	H3604	H3690	H3726	H3726 Amdt 12	H3810	H3811	H3948	H4020	H4087	H4115	H4124	H4300	80039	50284	50604	S0604 Amdt 2	80739	Rank
PRO-GROWTH POSITION					N	N	Υ	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Υ	N	N	N	N	
POINTS					4	8	6	3	3	5	5	3	5	8	3	4	10	9	8	8	3	5	
Alexander, Terry	HD-059	D	n/a	24%	Х	х	х	-	-	Х	х	-	Х	х	Х	х	-	х	х	х	х	-	
Anderson, Carl	HD-103	D	6%	11%	-	-	6	Х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	101
Atkinson, Lucas	HD-057	D	9%	15%	-	-	6	-	-	-	х	-	Х	х	Х	-	-	х	-	-	-	-	85
Bailey, William	HD-104	R	27%	28%	4	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	-	-	3	5	33
Ballentine, Nathan	HD-071	R	28%	28%	-	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	8	-	-	5	31
Bamberg, Justin	HD-090	D	9%	12%	-	-	6	Х	х	-	х	х	-	-	Х	-	-	-	х	-	-	х	85
Bannister, Bruce	HD-024	R	16%	20%	-	-	6	-	х	-	-	Х	-	-	-	-	-	9	-	-	-	-	61
Bauer, Heather	HD-075	D	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	108
Beach, Thomas	HD-010	R	90%	90%	4	8	6	-	3	5	-	х	5	8	3	4	10	9	х	8	3	х	11
Bernstein, Beth	HD-078	D	0%	8%	Х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Х	х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	108
Blackwell, Bart	HD-081	R	15%	24%	-	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	-	-	-	-	66
Bradley, Jeffrey	HD-123	R	18%	25%	Х	-	х	-	-	Х	-	-	Х	х	-	х	-	9	х	х	х	-	57
Brewer, Gary	HD-114	R	18%	18%	Х	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	-	х	х	-	57
Brittain, Thomas	HD-107	R	16%	20%	-	-	6	-	-	-	х	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	-	-	-	-	61
Burns, James	HD-017	R	47%	48%	4	-	6	-	3	-	-	3	5	-	-	4	Х	9	-	-	3	5	17
Bustos, Joseph	HD-112	R	25%	27%	-	-	6	-	х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Х	9	х	-	-	5	35
Calhoon, Paula	HD-087	R	33%	33%	4	-	6	-	-	-	-	Х	-	-	-	-	-	9	8	-	-	5	24
Carter, Jerry	HD-003	R	10%	14%	4	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	83
Caskey, Micajah	HD-089	R	16%	28%	-	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	Х	-	-	-	-	х	8	-	-	-	61
Chapman, Donald	HD-008	R	22%	22%	4	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	х	•	-	-	х	8	-	-	-	43
Chumley, William	HD-035	R	59%	59%	4	-	Х	-	3	Х	-	3	Х	х	-	4	Х	9	8	-	3	5	16

Name	District	Party	Score	Lifescore	H3514	H3604	H3690	H3726	H3726 Amdt 12	H3810	H3811	H3948	H4020	H4087	H4115	H4124	H4300	62003	S0284	80604	S0604 Amdt 2	80739	Rank
PRO-GROWTH POSITION					N	N	Υ	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Υ	N	N	N	N	
POINTS					4	8	6	3	3	5	5	3	5	8	3	4	10	9	8	8	3	5	
Clyburn, William	HD-082	D	8%	12%	-	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	х	х	-	-	х	-	-	-	-	-	88
Cobb-Hunter, Gilda	HD-095	D	12%	14%	-	-	Х	Х	Х	-	-	-	-	-	Х	-	10	-	-	-	-	-	80
Collins, Neal	HD-005	R	6%	13%	-	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	101
Connell, Benjamin	HD-052	R	15%	15%	-	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	-	-	-	-	66
Cox, Bobby	HD-021	R	45%	46%	Х	-	6	-	3	-	х	х	5	-	3	-	х	9	х	-	3	х	18
Cox, Brandon	HD-092	R	n/a	n/a	Х	-	х	-	-	х	-	х	х	х	х	х	-	9	Х	х	х	-	
Crawford, Heather	HD-068	R	29%	30%	4	-	6	-	-	-	х	х	-	-	-	-	х	9	х	-	х	х	29
Cromer, April	HD-006	R	97%	97%	4	8	6	-	3	5	х	3	5	8	3	4	10	9	8	8	3	5	3
Davis, Sylleste	HD-100	R	20%	34%	4	-	6	-	-	-	-	х	-	-	-	-	-	9	-	-	-	-	48
Dillard, Chandra	HD-023	D	6%	11%	-	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	101
Elliott, Jason	HD-022	R	20%	31%	-	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	Х	-	3	-	48
Erickson, Shannon	HD-124	R	15%	19%	-	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	-	-	-	-	66
Felder, Raye	HD-026	R	7%	19%	Х	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	х	х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	95
Forrest, Cally	HD-039	R	24%	35%	-	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	8	-	х	-	38
Gagnon, Craig	HD-011	R	19%	26%	4	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	-	-	-	-	51
Garvin, Kambrell	HD-077	D	7%	12%	-	-	6	-	-	-	х	-	х	х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	95
Gatch, Gil	HD-094	R	7%	9%	-	-	6	Х	Х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	х	-	-	-	-	95
Gibson, Daniel	HD-012	R	19%	19%	4	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	-	-	-	-	51
Gilliam, Leon	HD-042	R	25%	39%	4	-	6	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	-	-	3	-	35
Gilliard, Wendell	HD-111	D	8%	12%	-	-	6	-	-	-	х	х	-	-	-	-	-	-	Х	-	-	х	88
Guest, Thomas	HD-106	R	20%	20%	4	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	-	-	Х	-	48

Name	District	Party	Score	Lifescore	H3514	H3604	H3690	H3726	H3726 Amdt 12	H3810	H3811	H3948	H4020	H4087	H4115	H4124	H4300	80039	50284	50604	S0604 Amdt 2	80739	Rank
PRO-GROWTH POSITION					N	N	Υ	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Υ	N	N	N	N	
POINTS					4	8	6	3	3	5	5	3	5	8	3	4	10	9	8	8	3	5	
Guffey, Brandon	HD-048	R	23%	23%	4	-	6	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	Х	-	-	9	-	-	-	-	41
Haddon, Patrick	HD-019	R	39%	66%	4	-	6	-	3	-	-	х	5	Х	-	-	-	9	-	-	3	5	20
Hager, William	HD-122	R	19%	19%	4	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	-	-	-	-	51
Hardee, Kevin	HD-105	R	35%	35%	4	х	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	8	-	-	5	23
Harris, Robert	HD-036	R	91%	91%	4	8	6	3	3	5	5	3	5	8	3	4	10	-	8	8	3	5	9
Hart, Christopher	HD-073	D	n/a	19%	Х	х	Х	-	-	-	х	Х	Х	х	Х	Х	Х	х	х	х	Х	х	
Hartnett, Thomas	HD-110	R	23%	23%	-	Х	6	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	-	-	3	-	41
Hayes, Jackie	HD-055	D	13%	12%	4	-	6	-	-	-	х	-	х	Х	х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	78
Henderson-Myers, Rosalyn	HD-031	D	7%	10%	-	-	6	х	х	-	-	-	-	-	х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	95
Henegan, Patricia	HD-054	D	0%	6%	-	-	Х	х	х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	х	-	-	-	-	108
Herbkersman, William	HD-118	R	10%	19%	Х	-	6	-	х	Х	-	х	-	-	-	-	-	х	-	х	х	х	83
Hewitt, Lee	HD-108	R	15%	21%	-	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	-	-	-	-	66
Hiott, Davey	HD-004	R	21%	40%	4	-	6	-	х	-	-	-	х	-	х	-	-	9	-	-	-	-	45
Hixon, William	HD-083	R	17%	32%	Х	-	Х	-	-	Х	-	-	х	х	х	Х	-	9	-	х	Х	-	59
Hosey, Lonnie	HD-091	D	0%	9%	-	-	Х	-	-	-	-	-	х	х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	108
Howard, Leon	HD-076	D	11%	16%	-	Х	6	х	х	-	х	-	-	-	-	-	-	Х	Х	-	Х	х	81
Hyde, Max	HD-032	R	19%	21%	4	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	-	-	-	-	51
Jefferson, Joseph	HD-102	D	7%	11%	-	Х	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	95
Johnson, Jeffrey	HD-058	R	n/a	28%	Х	-	Х	Х	Х	Х	-	-	Х	х	Х	Х	-	9	-	х	Х	-	
Johnson, Jermaine	HD-070	D	0%	9%	-	-	Х	Х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	х	108
Jones, Stewart	HD-014	R	79%	79%	Х	8	6	-	3	-	х	-	Х	Х	3	-	10	9	8	Х	3	5	13

Name	District	Party	Score	Lifescore	H3514	H3604	H3690	H3726	H3726 Amdt 12	H3810	H3811	H3948	H4020	H4087	H4115	H4124	H4300	80039	50284	80604	S0604 Amdt 2	80739	Rank
PRO-GROWTH POSITION					N	N	Υ	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Υ	N	N	N	N	
POINTS					4	8	6	3	3	5	5	3	5	8	3	4	10	9	8	8	3	5	
Jones, Wendell	HD-025	D	6%	6%	-	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Х	-	101
Jordan, Jay	HD-063	R	37%	30%	4	-	6	-	х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	х	9	8	-	-	5	21
Kilmartin, John	HD-085	R	95%	95%	4	8	6	3	3	-	5	3	5	8	3	4	10	9	8	8	3	5	7
King, John	HD-049	D	9%	12%	-	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	85
Kirby, Roger	HD-101	D	0%	9%	-	-	х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	108
Landing, Katherine	HD-080	R	25%	25%	4	-	6	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	-	-	3	-	35
Lawson, Brian	HD-030	R	22%	22%	4	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	-	-	3	-	43
Leber, Matthew	HD-116	R	28%	28%	-	-	6	-	х	-	-	-	Х	-	-	-	-	9	8	-	3	-	31
Ligon, Thomas	HD-043	R	16%	20%	Х	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	-	-	-	-	61
Long, Steven	HD-037	R	36%	47%	4	-	6	-	х	-	-	3	5	-	-	-	-	9	-	-	3	5	22
Lowe, Phillip	HD-060	R	30%	29%	-	х	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	8	-	-	5	27
Magnuson, Josiah	HD-038	R	97%	96%	Х	8	6	-	3	5	х	Х	5	8	3	4	10	9	8	8	3	5	3
May, Robert	HD-088	R	100%	98%	4	8	6	3	3	5	5	3	5	8	3	4	10	9	8	8	3	5	1
McCabe, Donald	HD-096	R	91%	88%	4	8	6	3	3	5	5	3	5	8	3	4	10	-	8	8	3	5	9
McCravy, John	HD-013	R	43%	47%	4	-	6	-	3	-	5	-	5	-	-	-	-	9	8	-	3	-	19
McDaniel, Annie	HD-041	D	6%	11%	-	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	х	-	101
McGinnis, Timothy	HD-056	R	31%	32%	-	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	8	-	3	5	26
Mitchell, Cody	HD-065	R	17%	17%	Х	-	6	-	х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	-	-	Х	-	59
Moore, JA	HD-015	D	11%	12%	Х	Х	6	-	х	-	Х	-	Х	-	х	Х	Х	-	-	-	-	Х	81
Moore, Travis	HD-033	R	24%	26%	4	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Х	9	-	-	3	-	38
Morgan, Adam	HD-020	R	97%	96%	4	8	6	-	3	5	х	3	5	8	3	4	10	9	8	8	3	5	3

Name	District	Party	Score	Lifescore	H3514	H3604	H3690	H3726	H3726 Amdt 12	H3810	H3811	H3948	H4020	H4087	H4115	H4124	H4300	62003	50284	50604	S0604 Amdt 2	80739	Rank
PRO-GROWTH POSITION					N	N	Υ	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Υ	N	N	N	N	
POINTS					4	8	6	3	3	5	5	3	5	8	3	4	10	9	8	8	3	5	
Morgan, T. Alan	HD-018	R	100%	100%	4	8	6	Х	3	5	5	3	5	8	3	4	10	9	8	8	3	5	1
Moss, Dennis	HD-029	R	15%	29%	-	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	-	-	-	-	66
Murphy, Christopher	HD-098	R	15%	15%	-	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	-	-	-	-	66
Neese, James	HD-044	R	8%	8%	-	-	6	-	-	-	-	х	-	-	-	-	-	х	х	-	-	х	88
Newton, Brandon	HD-045	R	15%	17%	-	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	-	-	-	-	66
Newton, Weston	HD-120	R	15%	18%	-	-	6	-	х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	-	-	-	-	66
Nutt, Roger	HD-034	R	30%	44%	4	-	6	-	3	-	-	-	5	-	-	-	-	9	-	-	3	-	27
O'Neal, David	HD-066	R	79%	79%	4	8	6	-	3	5	-	-	5	8	3	4	-	9	8	8	3	5	13
Oremus, Melissa	HD-084	R	65%	63%	4	-	6	-	3	-	-	-	5	-	-	4	10	9	8	8	3	5	15
Ott, Russell	HD-093	D	6%	11%	-	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	101
Pace, Jordan	HD-117	R	96%	96%	4	8	6	-	3	5	х	х	5	Х	3	4	10	Х	8	8	3	5	6
Pedalino, Fawn	HD-064	R	21%	21%	Х	-	6	-	х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	х	-	3	-	45
Pendarvis, Marvin	HD-113	D	8%	12%	-	х	6	-	-	-	х	-	-	-	-	х	-	-	-	-	-	х	88
Pope, Thomas	HD-047	R	19%	21%	4	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	-	-	-	-	51
Rivers, Michael	HD-121	D	6%	11%	-	-	6	-	-	Х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	101
Robbins, Robby	HD-097	R	16%	16%	Х	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	-	-	-	-	61
Rose, Seth	HD-072	D	8%	12%	-	-	6	-	-	-	х	-	-	х	-	-	х	-	-	-	-	-	88
Rutherford, J. Todd	HD-074	D	8%	13%	Х	-	6	-	-	-	х	-	Х	Х	Х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	88
Sandifer, William	HD-002	R	19%	21%	4	-	6	•	-	-	-	-	-	-	•	-	-	9	-	-	-	-	51
Schuessler, Carla	HD-061	R	15%	15%	-	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	-	-	-	-	66
Sessions, Heath	HD-046	R	n/a	n/a	Х	-	Х	-	3	Х	-	-	Х	Х	Х	х	х	9	-	х	х	Х	

Name	District	Party	Score	Lifescore	H3514	H3604	H3690	H3726	H3726 Amdt 12	H3810	H3811	H3948	H4020	H4087	H4115	H4124	H4300	80039	50284	80604	S0604 Amdt 2	80739	Rank
PRO-GROWTH POSITION					N	N	Υ	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Υ	N	N	N	N	
POINTS					4	8	6	3	3	5	5	3	5	8	3	4	10	9	8	8	3	5	
Smith, G. Murrell	HD-067	R	21%	23%	4	-	Х	-	-	Х	-	-	Х	х	-	Х	-	9	-	Х	х	-	45
Smith, Marvin	HD-099	R	15%	26%	-	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	-	-	-	-	66
Stavrinakis, Leonidas	HD-119	D	0%	3%	Х	-	-	-	-	Х	-	-	Х	Х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	108
Taylor, Bill	HD-086	R	15%	29%	-	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	-	-	-	-	66
Tedder, Deon	HD-109	D	0%	8%	-	-	Х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	х	-	-	-	-	-	108
Thayer, Anne	HD-009	R	29%	36%	4	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	х	-	-	-	9	8	-	-	-	29
Thigpen, Ivory	HD-079	D	0%	9%	-	-	Х	-	-	-	х	-	-	-	Х	Х	х	-	-	-	-	-	108
Trantham, Ashley	HD-028	R	84%	84%	4	8	6	-	3	-	-	-	5	8	3	4	10	9	8	8	3	5	12
Vaughan, David	HD-027	R	26%	26%	4	-	6	-	3	•	-	-	-	-	Х	-	-	9	-	-	3	-	34
Weeks, J. David	HD-051	D	8%	13%	-	-	6	-	-	-	х	-	Х	х	-	-	х	-	-	-	-	-	88
West, John	HD-007	R	13%	25%	4	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Х	-	х	х	-	-	Х	-	78
Wetmore, Elizabeth	HD-115	D	0%	8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	108
Wheeler, William	HD-050	D	7%	12%	-	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	Х	х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	95
White, Joseph	HD-040	R	95%	95%	4	8	6	3	3	-	5	3	5	8	3	4	10	9	8	8	3	5	7
Whitmire, William	HD-001	R	32%	31%	4	-	6	х	х	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	8	-	3	-	25
Williams, Robert	HD-062	D	0%	8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	108
Willis, Mark	HD-016	R	15%	23%	Х	-	6	-	3	-	х	-	-	-	-	-	-	Х	-	-	3	-	66
Wooten, Christopher	HD-069	R	24%	33%	-	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	Х	-	-	-	-	9	8	-	-	-	38
Yow, Richard	HD-053	R	n/a	36%	Х	-	6	-	Х	-	-	Х	Х	Х	Х	-	-	Х	Х	Х	-	Х	

SOUTH CAROLINA
HOUSE
VOTE
DESCRIPTIONS

# South Carolina 2023 | House Vote Descriptions

# H. 3514

# CRONY HORSE RACING GAMBLING PROGRAM

#### (CFGF OPPOSES)

This bill creates a new government-subsidized entity to regulate gambling on horse racing. Specifically, the legislation creates a new horse racing commission along with a new Equine Industry Development Fund. The bill requires the commission to license vendors to accept wagers, taxes the vendors at 10 percent, and then provides for the new state development fund to receive 50 percent of the vendor taxes to "promote and improve" the equine industry for a state-regulated tax-and-spend cronyism program. The South Carolina House passed the bill, 55-46, on April 6, 2023. The South Carolina Senate did not take it up.

### H. 3604

#### **SCOUT MOTORS SWEETHEART DEAL**

#### (CFGF OPPOSES)

This bill appropriates an exorbitant amount of taxpayer money for Project Connect. Specifically, the legislation provides a \$1.3 billion taxpayer-funded sweetheart deal for Scout Motors through the construction of a rail spur and other infrastructure to launch an electric vehicle manufacturing facility for Scout Motors in Richland County. This is flagrant corporate welfare and is a textbook case of the government putting the interests of well-connected companies above those of hardworking citizens. The South Carolina House passed the bill, 101-14, on January 19, 2023. The South Carolina Senate passed it, 36-4, on March 14, 2023.

## H. 3690

# PROHIBITION ON TAXPAYER-FINANCED ESG INVESTMENTS

#### (CFGF SUPPORTS)

This bill prevents hedge funds and private equity funds responsible for managing the portfolios of taxpayer-funded pensions from abandoning their fiduciary duty in favor of a political agenda. Specifically, the legislation constrains the commission charged with overseeing the \$39 billion in South Carolina's pension system to only engage with companies for the sole purpose of maximizing shareholder value as opposed to those that prioritize woke Environmental, Social, Governance (ESG) practices. The South Carolina House passed the bill, 103-5, on April 5, 2023. The South Carolina Senate did not take it up.

20

## H. 3726

# NEW WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT **AGENCY**

#### (CFGF OPPOSES)

This bill creates a new state government agency. Specifically, the legislation transfers workforce development powers out of the Department of Commerce, creates the Office of Statewide Workforce Development (OWSD) within the Department of Employment and Workforce to centrally plan job development within the Palmetto State, and gives the Governor control over the director of OWSD. Instead of allowing iob creation to flow from the needs of the market, this bill empowers the government to shape it in directions that will benefit politically well-connected industries. The South Carolina House passed the bill, 108-5, on March 9, 2023. The South Carolina Senate passed it, 41-2, on May 10, 2023.

### H. 3726 AMDT #12

#### TABLING ANTI-ESG AMENDMENT

#### (CFGF OPPOSES)

This amendment provides protections for South Carolinian taxpayers from companies that engage in anti-free market activities. Specifically, the amendment prohibits the new Office of Statewide Workforce Development from approving workforce development initiatives funded by taxpayers to companies that prioritize woke Environmental, Social, Governance (ESG) practices over the pecuniary interests of consumers, employees, and investors. The South Carolina House tabled the amendment, 76-28, on March 8, 2023. The South Carolina Senate did not take it up.

## H. 3810

# **CORPORATE EQUITY LICENSE TAX CARVEOUT**

## (CFGF OPPOSES)

This bill creates a new corporate tax carveout. Specifically, the legislation provides a license

tax exemption on the first \$50 million for any corporation that has its headquarters and principal place of business located in South Carolina. Entities that qualify for the licensing tax exemption include venture capital funds, angel investors, and private investment funds. This carveout rewards niche corporate interests by manipulating regulatory and tax law to advantage politically well-connected businesses. The South Carolina House passed the bill, 103-10, on April 5, 2023. The South Carolina Senate did not take it up.

# H. 3811

# **CRONY TAX CREDIT EXPANSION**

# (CFGF OPPOSES)

This bill increases the annual spending cap for the Industry Partnership Fund crony tax credit program. Specifically, the legislation increases the existing aggregate annual cap from \$9 million to \$12 million in the partnership fund. Recipients of the credit are provided a \$500,000 maximum allowable credit against

CAROLINA

**SNAPSHOT** 

DESCRIPTIONS

**SNAPSHOT** 

**VOTES** 

their individual or corporate income taxes if they contribute to the fund for the South Carolina Research Authority. These distortions further complicate the state tax code and benefit the well-connected at the expense of hardworking South Carolinians. The South Carolina House passed the bill, 94-7, on May 11, 2023. The South Carolina Senate did not take it up.

## H. 3948

#### **GREEN ENERGY TAX EXEMPTION**

#### (CFGF OPPOSES)

This bill expands a property tax exemption for green energy equipment. Specifically, the legislation exempts customer-generator green energy resource properties from property taxes which include solar panels as well as other devices that store thermal or electric energy. The bill not only creates a new special exemption for subsidized energy, but also creates a dynamic that is likely to result in increased local millage rates to offset the

potential reductions in property tax revenue. The South Carolina House passed the bill. 97-11. on May 10, 2023. The South Carolina Senate did not take it up.

#### H. 4020

#### **HOLLYWOOD TAX GIVEAWAY**

#### (CFGF OPPOSES)

This bill greatly expands the South Carolina Film Commission rebate program. Specifically, the legislation triples the existing aggregate taxpayer funding from \$10 million to \$30 million on an annual basis and allows unexpended funds to be carried forward for three years. Additionally, the bill provides for the film commission to authorize 20 percent rebates to eligible production companies that qualify for the program. This type of flagrant cronvismwherein South Carolinians essentially subsidize wealthy Hollywood production companies to entice them to film in the state-enriches a select few well-connected, governmentpreferred entities at the expense of hardworking taxpayers. The South Carolina House passed the bill, 77-20, on April 5, 20203. The South Carolina Senate did not take it up.

## H. 4087

# SIGNIFICANT CORPORATE WELFARE **PACKAGE**

#### (CFGF OPPOSES)

This bill expands existing tax credits for large corporations operating in South Carolina. Specifically, the legislation expands eligibility for the corporate tax credit, dictates wage requirements for headquarters employees, and expands the value of the credit to include 20 percent of qualifying real property costs and 20 percent of the cost for tangible personal property. Additionally, the bill lowers the recycling facilities credit investment threshold from \$300 million to \$100 million and allows remote employees to count for eligible businesses using the job development credit. These corporate welfare giveaways total an estimated \$7 million in taxpayer-backed CAROLINA

**SNAPSHOT** 

**SNAPSHOT** 

**VOTES** 

handouts in 2024 alone. The South Carolina House passed the bill, 84-12, on April 5, 2023. The South Carolina Senate did not take it up.

## H. 4115

# **EXPANDED CONTRACTORS LICENSING** SCHEME

#### (CFGF OPPOSES)

This bill increases the licensing and regulatory scheme for contractors. Specifically, the legislation empowers the Contractor's Licensing Board to further regulate and fine contractors with increased income requirements, net worth requirements, and bid constraints for tiered groups of contractors. These types of onerous regulatory schemes serve as barriers to entry, serve only to perpetuate the continuance of the Board bureaucracy, and disproportionately impact lower-income households. The South Carolina House passed the bill, 90-15, on April 5, 2023. The South Carolina Senate passed it. 42-0, on May 10, 2023.

## H. 4124

# **COSTLY AND INEFFICIENT AGENCY** RESTRUCTURING

#### (CFGF OPPOSES)

This bill divides the responsibilities of the Department of Health and Environmental Control (DHEC) into two new separate agencies. Specifically, the legislation creates the Department of Public Health to administer government regulations over public health matters and the Department of Environmental Services to administer government regulations over environmental matters. The initial estimated cost of this restructuring is \$22 million with no discernible reduction in bureaucracy or size of government. The South Carolina House passed the bill, 97-16, on April 5, 2023. The South Carolina Senate did not take it up.

### H. 4300

# MISSED OPPORTUNITY BUDGET **AGREEMENT**

#### (CFGF OPPOSES)

This bill allocates nearly \$14 billion in spending for the state budget. The legislation includes a 12.5 percent increase in the year-over-year recurring base of the general fund and includes another meritless teacher salary increase equal to \$2,500 across the board for every pay schedule. Additionally, the bill incorporates another 5 percent pay raise for state employees, once again bribes universities with \$124 million to "freeze" tuition increases, and includes an eye-popping \$600 million in local earmarks. The bill also contains the \$1.3 billion corporate welfare giveaway to Scout Motors for the construction of the electric vehicle factory. The South Carolina House passed the bill, 92-14, on June 14, 2023. The South Carolina Senate passed it, 43-0, on April 19, 2023.

CAROLINA

**SNAPSHOT** 

**SNAPSHOT** 

**VOTES** 

S. 39

# SIGNIFICANT SCHOOL CHOICE SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM

#### (CFGF SUPPORTS)

This bill creates an education scholarship program for low-income K-12 students. Specifically, the legislation implements an education scholarship program for roughly 5.000 low-income K-12 students below 250 percent of the federal poverty line (FPL). This eligibility threshold expands to include some 15,000 students within 400 percent FPL by the 2026-27 school year. Parents will have access to \$6,000 per year to use for tuition, books, tutoring, and other qualified education expenses. The South Carolina House passed the bill. 74-36, on April 27, 2023. The South Carolina Senate passed it, 28-15, on January 31, 2023.

S. 284

# TAX-AND-SPEND GOVERNMENT HOUSING **SCHEME**

#### (CFGF OPPOSES)

This bill allows municipalities to use local taxes for government-funded housing. Specifically, the legislation empowers counties and municipalities to divert 15 percent from existing hospitality and lodging taxes for the development of new government housing and authorizes new local bonds for the construction of such developments. While the total impact on hardworking South Carolinians is unknown, this massive tax-and-spend scheme immediately allows for 60 percent of counties in the state to levy new tax bonds on residents for the expansion of government housing. The South Carolina House passed the bill, 80-29, on May 10, 2023. The South Carolina Senate passed it. 41-2, on May 11, 2023.

S. 604

# SUPPLEMENTAL COVID SPENDING **SPLURGE**

#### (CFGF OPPOSES)

This resolution authorizes remaining federal COVID fund expenditures for pet projects. Specifically, the resolution identifies \$586 million in federal ARPA funds designated for the Rural Infrastructure Authority and earmarks \$100 million for crony economic development initiatives at the local level. Further, the resolution gives sole discretion for disbursement to the Secretary of Commerce. The \$2 trillion price tag on ARPA is one of the primary drivers of the record inflation eating into household budgets and family finances. Earmarking federal money wrongly seen as "free" for myriad big government projects creates a false spending floor for future legislative sessions, building pressure for future spending and tax hikes. The South Carolina House passed the resolution, 98-14, on April 5, 2023. The South Carolina Senate passed it, 40-0, on March 15, 2023.

CAROLINA

**SNAPSHOT** 

DESCRIPTIONS

**SNAPSHOT** 

VOTES

## S. 604 AMDT. 2

#### TABLING ARPA EARMARK KICKBACKS

#### (CFGF OPPOSES)

This amendment implements restrictions on beneficiaries of federal ARPA earmarks in South Carolina. Specifically, the amendment prohibits ARPA earmarks from going to any business or company owned by members of the state legislature. The South Carolina House tabled the amendment, 70-36, on April 5, 2023. The South Carolina Senate did not take it up.

# S. 739

#### HOUSING TAX CREDIT EXPANSION

#### (CFGF OPPOSES)

This bill expands the South Carolina Housing Tax Credit program. Specifically, the legislation authorizes another one-time housing tax credit expenditure equal to \$25 million in special interest carveouts for entities engaged in housing construction projects. Lawmakers should not wield the tax code to benefit well-connected entities at the expense of hardworking South Carolinians for the purpose of centrally planning government housing initiatives. The South Carolina House passed the resolution, 84-26, on May 10, 2023. The South Carolina Senate passed the resolution, 43-0, on May 3, 2023.

CAROLINA

**SNAPSHOT** 

**VOTES**