

LABI 2009 VOTING RECORD

Introduction

The dearth of votes scored in the LABI Voting Record is not indicative of the level of activity that occurred during the session. As is sometimes the case, most of the legislation that would have significantly affected Louisiana businesses never made it to the House or Senate floor for a vote. On balance, Louisiana moved incrementally toward a more favorable business environment this session, but there is still a long way to go.

We gained some ground with the passage of SB 268, which puts the taxpayer on a more level playing field with the state tax collector, and the workers comp system will see systemic improvements with the enactment of HB 303. Two bills that would have reduced business exposure to frivolous lawsuits in asbestos cases made it through the House, but died when the bills were denied a hearing in the Senate Judiciary A Committee.

LABI succeeded in stopping a slew of bills that would have increased business property taxes, as well as a measure to allow the Attorney General to hire contingency fee attorneys. The House refused to pass HB 705, another attempt to increase employer exposure to frivolous lawsuits, and the Senate ultimately killed a measure that would have increased employer UC payments. Local tax collectors, augmented by lobbyists in the employ of local government officials, tried to codify the use of contingency fee auditors, but a strong grassroots response by businesses that had been victims of this practice thwarted their effort.

Unfortunately, a package of bills supported by LABI aimed at reforming local school boards ran into stiff opposition in the House. Only one of these – HB 851 – made it to the House floor, where it was killed.

Please take the time to evaluate your legislators' performance, using the Voting Record as a guide. Many legislators "talk the talk," but when it comes time to vote, we sometimes find they are less concerned about your business than they claim. It is important that your representatives and senators know how you feel. If you are pleased with their votes, by all means tell them, and encourage them with your support where you can. If you are not happy with the way they voted, then have that discussion as well. Remember, legislators will be hearing from a long line of interest groups, from trial lawyers and unions to local government officials and public employees, whose interests are often directly opposite yours. They need to hear from you as well.

We are now halfway through the current term. Over the course of a term, many critical votes will be cast on legislation important to business people across Louisiana. Throughout the cycle of regular, fiscal, and special sessions, voting records fluctuate – sometimes radically – depending on the issues. Because voting records do fluctuate from session to session, no single year's voting record should be considered in isolation; the average over the entire term best reflects the level of a legislator's support for a better business climate in this state.

HOUSE VOTES

SUBSTANTIATE LAWSUIT CLAIMS

HB 220, T. Burns – This bill would have required those filing a petition for a civil action for latent diseases arising from exposure to asbestos or silica to substantiate their claims. Plaintiffs would have had to specifically identify the time period and location of the exposure along with the types of products to which they were exposed.

A proliferation of lawsuits alleging diseases from past asbestos exposure has bankrupted companies, making it difficult for those who are truly suffering to receive fair compensation for their injuries. Continued aggressive solicitations for such lawsuits threaten to bankrupt more companies and deprive deserving injured parties of much needed medical assistance.

Some states, including Mississippi and Texas, have already reformed their laws to prevent such an occurrence. In the same vein, this reform measure would have helped to reduce unnecessary lawsuits, streamline litigation and expedite the discovery process for such cases, and ensure that sufficient resources remain available for deserving plaintiffs.

How the House Voted

A vote FOR final passage was a vote WITH LABI. The bill passed 56-38-10.

END VENUE SHOPPING

HB 245, Talbot – This bill would have required plaintiffs to file their lawsuits in the parish where the alleged exposure to asbestos or silica occurred. This would prevent what is commonly called “forum shopping” for a more favorable venue in which to file the lawsuit.

Aggressive solicitations for lawsuits over diseases alleged to have arisen from exposure to asbestos

or silica are resulting in numerous filings throughout the state. However, certain courts have proven to be more sympathetic to plaintiffs in these cases, and not surprisingly, are becoming the preferred venue for such lawsuits. Naturally, as the number of these suits accumulates, the dockets of those courts can become clogged, and justice delayed.

To expedite justice, a more orderly and appropriate approach to determining the venue for these cases is one that bases the suits in the parish in which the exposure occurred. This is even more necessary as plaintiffs from Mississippi and Texas have begun filing in Louisiana to escape the reforms enacted in their states, threatening to overwhelm our courts’ dockets.

How the House Voted

A vote FOR final passage was a vote WITH LABI. The bill passed 61-31-12.

ALLEGED PAY DISCRIMINATION

HB 705, Norton – This bill would have exposed employers to lawsuits from disgruntled workers alleging that their pay was less than their co-workers of the opposite sex performing “the same or substantially similar work.” Federal and state laws already exist that provide remedies for such discrimination, but this bill would have established a new cause of action, significantly increasing the number of lawsuits against Louisiana employers.

The bill’s proponents promoted it as “equal pay for women” legislation, but this was merely a sales pitch since there are laws currently on the books that permit individuals of either sex who have been subjected to true pay discrimination to obtain redress. The creation of a new cause of action to allow unhappy employees to sue their employers would only burden the courts and increase the cost of

doing business in Louisiana. Were this bill enacted, employers with perfectly sound reasons for their pay differentials could have been dragged into court to prove it, incurring costs of time, effort and legal fees spent in defending themselves.

Enactment of the bill would also have had an adverse impact on Louisiana's economic development. It would have discouraged business investment in the state. Businesses are very sensitive to laws governing the management of their workforces—especially laws regarding pay scales—because these laws substantially impact their bottom lines. Businesses tend not to locate or remain in states where their employees have more opportunities to sue them.

How the House Voted

A vote AGAINST final passage was a vote WITH LABI. The bill failed 33-59-12.

LOCAL SCHOOL BOARD REFORM

HB 851, Carter – Would have ended the micro-management of local school districts by local school board members by limiting their influence in personnel decisions such as hiring, firing, compensation, assignments and transfers. Would have further shielded local school superintendents from political retribution by requiring a two-thirds vote of the board to terminate a contract.

Louisiana has one of the most highly rated public school accountability systems in the nation, yet our state's students continually perform among the worst in the nation. There is a major disconnect between policy and law adopted at the state level and local implementation of those policies and laws. HB 851 attempted to refocus local school board priorities from day-to-day management of the system to issues affecting students and schools. The business community across the state supported this reform legislation, as did numerous state and local nonprofit and civic organizations. Had it passed, additional stakeholders would have been incorporated into public education reform.

How the House Voted

A vote FOR final passage was a vote WITH LABI. The bill failed 46-51-7.

DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE PRIVATE COUNSEL ATTORNEY FEES

SB 268, Donahue – This legislation provides taxpayer fairness in the payment of private counsel attorney fees in state tax cases. Under R.S. 47:1512, taxpayers are assessed an additional penalty for attorney fees in the amount of 10% of the tax, interest, and penalty due, to be paid by the taxpayer directly to the Louisiana Department of Revenue's (LDR) private counsel. Consequently, under current law, the Department of Revenue makes no expenditure for its own private counsel fees, as these fees are paid directly by the litigating taxpayer. On the other hand, if the taxpayer prevails in the litigation, no 10% attorney fees are awarded to the taxpayer. This bill repeals this bad tax policy with respect to state tax cases. SB 268 also expands the right of taxpayers in local sales tax cases to post bond or other security, in lieu of making a payment under protest.

Both the Department of Revenue and taxpayers should have a level playing field in tax litigation--neither party should have an advantage over the other. There appears to be no other state in the country that imposes a similar burden on its taxpayers. In an independent review of the fairness of state tax administration, Louisiana received the grade of "D" – tied for second worst in the country ("The Best and Worst of State Tax Administration," COST, April 2007).

Rep. Robideaux handled the bill for Sen. Donahue on the House floor. Rep. Greene proposed an amendment to delay implementation of the bill, until the Department of Revenue obtained an appropriation to fund their own private counsel fees. LABI and Rep. Robideaux opposed the amendment, as this amendment would have in effect gutted the bill, and conditioned the repeal of this bad tax policy to annual budgetary constraints. Taxpayers are required to hire and find a way to pay their own attorney fees – the LDR should be required to do the same.

How the House Voted

A vote AGAINST Rep. Greene’s amendment was a vote WITH LABI. The amendment failed to be adopted by a vote of 36-51-17.

After the defeat of the amendment, Rep. Robideaux moved for final passage.

A vote FOR final passage of the bill was a vote WITH LABI. The bill passed 87-4-13.

WC MEDICAL GUIDELINES

SB 303, Riser – This Act creates a medical advisory council to assist the state workers compensation (WC) director in establishing guidelines for the medical treatment of injured workers. It provides for the council to develop the guidelines by the fall of next year. The council will be composed of at least eight representatives from specific medical disciplines plus any other persons the director believes may be helpful to the work of the council. Members of the council will be appointed to two-year terms. The Act also permits the director to contract with a medical director to assist the council with the development of the guidelines and to handle any disputes arising over treatment rendered outside of the guidelines once they are established.

LABI strongly supported this legislation that was developed by the Office of Workers’ Compensation Administration Advisory Council, on which LABI has a seat. Disputes frequently occur over whether certain types of treatment for on-the-job injuries are premature or even appropriate. These disputes can delay injured workers receiving treatment and may ultimately retard their recovery, resulting in higher system costs for which employers must pay.

The delineation of treatment procedures through guidelines will reduce the number of such disputes and assure that injured workers obtain a higher quality of care. It will also improve the timeliness of payment to medical providers for their services. States with such guidelines have generally seen substantial systemic improvements and lower costs.

How the House Voted

In an effort to undo the amendment to HB 841 which expanded unemployment compensation (UC) coverage (*see* “Senate Votes”), the House amended SB 303 to provide that the amendment would be null and without effect if HB 841 were enacted. With the subsequent deferral of HB 841 by the Senate Labor Committee, the amendment to SB 303 was no longer necessary, and Sen. Riser moved to reject the House amendment to his bill and send it to conference committee. The conference committee reported the bill in the same version that it originally had passed the Senate. A vote FOR adoption of the conference committee report was a vote WITH LABI. The conference committee report was adopted 91-0-13.

STAFF LOBBYISTS

3113 Valley Creek Drive
Post Office Box 80258
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70898-0258
Ph.: 225-928-5388 Fax: 225-929-6054

Dan Juneau
President

Bruce Bradley
Trade, Tourism and Transportation

Jonica Coates
Civil Justice Reform, Liability, Tort Reform

Brian Landry
Governmental Reform, Small Business

John LeBlanc
Taxation and Finance

Brigitte Nieland
Education and Workforce Development,
Communications

Jim Patterson
Employee Relations, Workers Compensation,
Unemployment Compensation, Right-to-Work

Bridgette Richard
Health Care, Legislative Legal Counsel

Ginger Sawyer
Energy, Political Action, Grassroots

Emily Stich
Environmental Quality, Research and Programs

For more information, visit our Web site
at www.labi.org

SENATE VOTES

DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE PRIVATE COUNSEL ATTORNEY FEES

SB 268, Donahue – This legislation provides taxpayer fairness in the payment of private counsel attorney fees in state tax cases. Under R.S. 47:1512, taxpayers are assessed an additional penalty for attorney fees in the amount of 10% of the tax, interest, and penalty due, to be paid by the taxpayer directly to the Department of Revenue’s private counsel. Consequently, under current law, the Department of Revenue makes no expenditure for its own private counsel fees, as these fees are paid directly by the litigating taxpayer. On the other hand, if the taxpayer prevails in the litigation, no 10% attorney fees are awarded to the taxpayer. This bill repeals this bad tax policy with respect to state tax cases. SB 268 also expands the right of taxpayers in local sales tax cases to post bond or other security, in lieu of making a payment under protest.

Both the Department of Revenue and taxpayers should have a level playing field in tax litigation – neither party should have an advantage over the other. There appears to be no other state in the country that imposes a similar burden on its taxpayers. In an independent review of the fairness of state tax administration, Louisiana received the grade of “D” – tied for second worst in the country (“The Best and Worst of State Tax Administration,” COST, April 2007).

How the Senate Voted

A vote FOR final passage of the bill was a vote WITH LABI. The bill passed 36-0-3.

WC MEDICAL GUIDELINES

SB 303, Riser – This Act creates a medical advisory council to assist the state workers compensation (WC) director in establishing guidelines for the medical treatment of injured workers. It provides for the council to develop the guidelines by the fall of next year. The council will be composed of at least eight representatives from specific medical disciplines plus any other persons the director believes may be helpful to the work of the council. Members of the council will be appointed to two-year terms. The Act also permits the director to contract with a medical director to assist the council with the development of the guidelines and to handle any disputes arising over treatment rendered outside of the guidelines once they are established.

LABI strongly supported this legislation that was developed by the Office of Workers’ Compensation Administration Advisory Council, on which LABI has a seat. Disputes frequently occur over whether certain types of treatment for on-the-job injuries are premature or even appropriate. These disputes can delay injured workers receiving treatment and may ultimately retard their recovery, resulting in higher system costs for which employers must pay.

The delineation of treatment procedures through guidelines will reduce the number of such disputes and assure that injured workers obtain a higher quality of care. It will also improve the timeliness of payment to medical providers for their services. States with such guidelines have generally seen substantial systemic improvements and lower costs.

How the Senate Voted

A vote FOR final passage was a vote WITH LABI. The bill passed 35-0-3.

EXPANDED UC COVERAGE

HB 841, Honey – As originally introduced, the bill provided for a number of improvements to the state WC law. However, it was amended on the House floor to expand UC coverage to persons for whom such benefits were never intended in order for Louisiana to receive \$98 million in UC funds through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) of 2009, commonly referred to as the stimulus bill. Enactment of the bill would have only added to the burden Louisiana’s UC system and trust fund must soon shoulder as the nation’s economic distress increasingly impacts our economy.

The amended bill would have made persons with little attachment to the workforce eligible for benefits by establishing a costly “alternative base period” calculation for determining an individual’s eligibility, allowing those who just entered the workforce or who work infrequently to collect benefits. It would have let persons restrict their work searches to part-time employment if they previously worked in a part-time capacity even if there was full-time employment available to them. Finally, it would have allowed claimants to collect an additional six months of benefits if they were in a training program authorized under the Workforce Investment Act or approved by the state, even if the training did not assist them in becoming re-employed.

Louisiana’s UC trust fund is exclusively funded by employer quarterly payroll taxes. The \$98 million in ARRA UC stimulus monies are from the Federal Unemployment Account, which is funded exclusively through employer federal payroll taxes. Therefore, the wishes of the businesses that pay those taxes should have weight when considering what constitutes a proper use of their dollars. The purpose of the UC system has always been to provide assistance to workers who have a clear attachment to the workforce, who lose their jobs because of what happens at the workplace, and who make an effort to return to work. Employers agree with this and expect it, but the expensive expansions contemplated by the ARRA constitute a significant departure from that purpose.

In addition, if HB 841 had been enacted, many employers’ “experience-rated” state UC taxes would have gone even higher in 2010 because the U.S. Department of Labor (USDOL) has advised that the new UC stimulus benefits must be charged directly to the individual accounts of previous employers. This tax increase would have been on top of the increase anticipated for all employers next year, triggered by our already declining state UC trust fund.

HB 841’s fiscal note showed that the \$98 million would have covered the cost of the new benefits for less than three years. Those benefits would have then accelerated the erosion of the state’s UC trust fund at a time when Louisiana’s struggling economy will place even greater demands on it. This would lead to higher employer taxes and lower benefits to the unemployed triggered when the fund’s level falls below certain amounts.

The ARRA requires that if the Legislature had made the changes contemplated by HB 841, they must be permanent. Both in letters and in advisory opinions, the USDOL stressed that the Congress fully intended for such changes to “be in effect as permanent law.” Repealing the changes later would risk the USDOL declaring Louisiana’s UC law “out of conformity” with federal requirements and imposing expensive federal tax penalties on Louisiana employers.

How the Senate Voted

Proponents of the bill employed legislative maneuvers – violating the Louisiana Constitution and legislative rules – to get around obstacles to the measure’s passage. They tacked the UC stimulus amendment onto a WC bill, violating the state Constitution’s prohibition against bills containing “dual objects.” (Rep. Honey accomplished this by having his bill placed on the House calendar as noncontroversial. When he offered the amendment, he did not properly explain it, stating that it merely added ARRA provisions to the bill. Few House members knew what ARRA stood for, so no one objected, understandably believing the amendment to be noncontroversial like the bill. Most House members did not know what the amended bill did when they unanimously voted for it.)

HB 841 was received in the Senate where, in direct violation of Senate rules, the bill was not referred to the Labor Committee – the proper committee for the bill’s subject matter. Instead, it was referred to the Finance Committee, where proponents knew it had a better chance of passing. As expected, the Finance Committee sent the bill to the Senate floor. Next, to prevent opponents from redirecting the bill to the Labor Committee – which was critical to defeating the legislation – the proponents moved to “Call the Question” to force a final passage vote on the bill.

A vote AGAINST the motion to “Call the Question” was a vote WITH LABI. The motion failed 12-23-4. After the motion to “Call the Question” failed, there was no objection to the motion to “Recommit.” Following a hearing on the bill later that evening in the Senate Labor Committee, the bill was deferred, effectively killing it for the session.

Voting Record Criteria

There are certain rules that apply consistently to LABI voting records and to LABI’s use of those records:

- ✓ Only KEY business votes are included in the record. Only bills on which LABI has taken a clear, broad-based position are considered.
- ✓ A vote may be on an amendment or procedural motion, as well as on final passage, if that vote was crucial to the fate of the bill.
- ✓ Because of factors such as committee action or amendments, the inclusion of a vote on a bill in one house doesn’t necessarily mean that it will be a record vote in the second house.
- ✓ Votes are weighted according to their importance to the business community. See voting record chart for specific point values.
- ✓ Each term stands alone. Every legislator has an equal opportunity for a good four-year record, despite historical voting patterns.
- ✓ The annual and cumulative voting averages are based upon the number of points actually earned, compared to the number of points that could have been earned over the period.
- ✓ Legislators are not penalized in LABI voting records for absences due to hospitalization or immediate family illness or death, nor for abstentions due to conflicts of interest.
- ✓ The voting record is based on printouts from the House and Senate voting machines and personal privilege corrections recorded in the Official Journal.

HOUSE

2008-2009 Cumulative Voting %			2008 - 2009 Cumulative Voting %		
Party	Representatives	Voting %	Party	Representatives	Voting %
(R)	Katz	92	(R)	Simon	67
(R)	Nowlin	89	(D)	Fannin	66
(R)	Richardson	89	(D)	Champagne	65
(R)	Schroder	89	(D)	Hardy	65
(R)	Smiley	89	(D)	Billiot	64
(D)	Chaney	85	(R)	Geymann	64
(R)	Pope	85	(D)	Gisclair	64
(R)	Carmody	84	(R)	Greene	64
(R)	Downs	82	(R)	Kleckley	64
(R)	Hoffmann	82	(R)	Wooton	64
(R)	Ligi	82	(D)	Guillory	63
(R)	McVea	82	(R)	Landry	63
(R)	Burns, Henry	81	(D)	Baldone	62
(R)	Ponti	81	(R)	Harrison	62
(I)	Robideaux	81	(R)	Monica	62
(R)	Foil	80	(D)	Anders	60
(R)	Morris	80	(R)	Connick	58
(R)	Tucker	80	(D)	LaFonta	58
(D)	Aubert	78	(D)	Williams	58
(D)	Barras	78	(D)	Arnold	57
(R)	Carter	78	(D)	Doerge	57
(R)	Cortez	78	(I)	Jackson, Michael	57
(R)	Smith, Jane	78	(R)	Lambert	56
(R)	Talbot	78	(D)	Barrow	55
(R)	Waddell	78	(D)	Montoucet	55
(D)	Abramson	77	(D)	Badon, Bobby	53
(R)	LaBruzzo	77	(D)	Franklin	53
(R)	Burford	75	(D)	St. Germain	53
(R)	Cromer	75	(D)	Hill	51
(D)	Hines	75	(D)	Norton	51
(R)	Little	75	(D)	Stiaes	51
(R)	Pugh	75	(R)	Willmott	51
(R)	Templet	75	(D)	Henderson	49
(D)	Thibaut	75	(D)	Leger	49
(R)	Lorusso	74	(D)	Ritchie	49
(R)	Burns, Tim	73	(D)	Smith, Pat	47
(R)	Guinn	73	(D)	Edwards	45
(D)	Jones, Sam	73	(D)	Burrell	44
(I)	Richard	73	(D)	Gallot	43
(D)	Badon, Austin	72	(D)	Honey	43
(D)	Danahay	71	(R)	Dove	42
(R)	Henry	71	(D)	Johnson	42
(R)	Pearson	71	(D)	LeBas	42
(R)	Perry	71	(D)	Dixon	40
(R)	White	71	(D)	Roy	40
(R)	Hazel	70	(D)	Smith, Gary	40
(R)	Howard	70	(D)	Armes	38
(R)	Hutter	69	(D)	Jackson, Girod	38
(R)	Lopinto	69	(D)	Jones, Rosalind	38
(D)	Mills	69	(D)	Richmond	38
(D)	Chandler	67	(D)	Peterson	37
(D)	Ellington	67	(D)	Brossett	13

Legislative Sessions

2008 Special Sessions

2008 Regular Session

2009 Regular Session

SENATE

HB 1 Financial Disclosure. Adopt Conference Report
 SB 10 Corporate Franchise Tax. Final Passage
 SB 12 Tax on Mfg. Machinery and Equipment. Final Passage
 HB 1 Utilities Sales Tax. Final Passage

SB 51 Firearms in Workplace. Final Passage
 SB 51 Firearms in Workplace. Reconsideration
 SB 134 Little Hatch Act. Final Passage
 SB 186 Increase Prescription Period. Final Passage
 SB 290 LDR Attorney Fees. Final Passage
 SB 535 Mental Health Mandate. Final Passage
 HB 318 Prosthetic Mandate. Final Passage
 HB 888 Expenditure Limit Formula. Final Passage
 HB 958 Autism Mandate. Final Passage
 HB 1104 Workforce Development. Adopt Conference Report
 HB 1105 Charter Schools. Final Passage
 HB 1165 UC Tax Reduction. Final Passage
 HB 1347 School Choice. Final Passage
 2008 Voting Percentage

SB 268 Dept. of Revenue Attorney Fees. Final Passage
 SB 303 WC Medical Guidelines. Final Passage
 HB 841 Expanded UC Coverage. Call the Question
 2009 Voting Percentage
 2008-2009 Cumulative Voting Percentage

a- Was absent when LABI needed a "yes" vote, or the motion required only a majority of supermajority of those present and voting.
 a° Was absent when LABI needed a "no" vote and the motion required a majority or supermajority of the elected members.

Adley	¼	¼	¼	1	0	0	0	1	½	1	0	¼	0	1	½	¼	0	58	½	½	½	100	63	Adley
Alario	¼	¼	¼	a-	0	0	1	0	½	1	0	¼	0	1	½	¼	½	53	½	½	½	100	59	Alario
Amedee	¼	¼	¼	1	a°	0	0	0	½	1	1	¼	a°	1	½	¼	a-	68	½	½	½	0	67	Amedee
Appel	Elected to Senate				November 4, 2008													N/A	½	½	½	100	100	Appel
Broome	¼	¼	¼	1	½	½	a°	0	½	0	0	¼	0	1	½	¼	0	54	½	½	a-	67	56	Broome
Chaisson	¼	¼	¼	1	½	a°	0	0	½	0	0	¼	0	1	½	¼	½	51	½	½	a-	67	53	Chaisson
Cheek	¼	¼	¼	1	0	0	0	1	a-	1	0	¼	0	1	½	¼	½	58	½	½	½	100	63	Cheek
Claitor	Elected to Senate				April 4, 2009													N/A	½	½	½	100	100	Claitor
Crowe	¼	¼	¼	1	½	0	1	1	½	1	0	¼	0	1	½	¼	½	77	½	½	½	100	80	Crowe
Donahue	¼	¼	¼	1	0	0	1	1	½	1	1	¼	0	1	½	¼	½	81	½	½	½	100	84	Donahue
Dorsey	¼	¼	¼	1	0	0	0	0	½	1	0	¼	0	1	½	¼	0	49	½	a-	0	33	47	Dorsey
Duplessis	¼	¼	¼	1	½	a°	1	1	½	1	a°	¼	0	1	½	¼	½	89	½	½	0	67	86	Duplessis
Dupre	¼	a-	¼	a°	½	0	1	0	½	1	0	¼	0	1	½	¼	½	65	a-	½	0	67	65	Dupre
Erdey	¼	¼	¼	a°	0	0	0	1	½	0	0	¼	0	1	½	a°	0	42	½	½	½	100	50	Erdey
Gautreaux, Butch	¼	a-	a-	1	0	0	0	1	a-	0	0	¼	0	1	½	¼	½	44	½	½	0	67	47	Gautreaux, Butch
Gautreaux, Nick	¼	¼	¼	1	a°	0	1	1	½	1	0	¼	0	1	½	¼	½	76	½	½	½	100	79	Gautreaux, Nick
Gray-Evans	¼	¼	¼	1	½	½	0	0	½	a°	0	¼	0	1	½	¼	0	54	½	½	0	67	56	Gray-Evans
Guillory	Elected to Senate				May 2, 2009 (2008 House Voting Record)													84	½	N/A	0	50	80	Guillory
Hebert	¼	¼	¼	1	0	0	1	0	½	1	0	¼	0	a-	½	¼	½	53	½	½	a-	67	55	Hebert
Heitmeier	¼	a-	¼	1	½	0	0	0	½	1	0	¼	0	1	½	¼	½	56	a-	½	½	67	57	Heitmeier
Jackson	¼	¼	¼	1	½	½	1	a°	½	0	0	¼	0	1	½	¼	0	64	½	½	0	67	64	Jackson
Kostelka	¼	¼	¼	1	a°	0	1	1	½	1	1	¼	0	a-	½	¼	½	76	½	½	½	100	79	Kostelka
LaFleur	¼	¼	¼	1	0	0	a°	0	½	1	a°	a-	0	1	½	¼	0	57	½	a-	0	33	54	LaFleur
Long	¼	¼	¼	1	0	0	1	1	½	0	1	¼	0	1	½	a-	½	70	½	½	½	100	73	Long
Marionneaux	¼	¼	a-	1	½	0	0	0	½	0	0	¼	0	1	½	¼	0	42	½	a-	0	33	41	Marionneaux
Martiny	¼	¼	¼	1	0	0	1	0	½	1	0	¼	0	1	½	¼	½	63	½	½	a-	67	63	Martiny
McPherson	a-	¼	¼	1	0	0	0	1	½	0	1	¼	a°	1	½	a-	0	59	a-	½	½	67	60	McPherson
Michot	¼	¼	¼	1	½	a°	1	1	½	1	0	¼	a°	1	½	¼	½	89	½	½	½	100	91	Michot
Morrell	Elected to Senate				December 6, 2008 (2008 House Voting Record)													41	½	½	0	67	44	Morrell
Morrish	¼	¼	¼	1	½	0	1	1	½	1	1	¼	0	1	½	¼	½	86	½	½	½	100	88	Morrish
Mount	¼	¼	¼	1	½	0	1	0	½	1	a°	a-	a°	1	½	¼	½	80	½	½	½	100	83	Mount
Murray	¼	¼	¼	1	½	0	0	0	½	0	0	¼	0	1	½	¼	0	44	½	½	0	67	47	Murray
Nevers	¼	¼	¼	1	½	½	1	1	½	0	0	¼	0	1	½	¼	½	72	½	½	½	100	76	Nevers
Quinn	¼	a-	a-	a-	½	a°	1	1	a-	0	a°	¼	0	1	½	a-	½	54	½	½	½	100	60	Quinn
Riser	¼	¼	¼	1	0	0	1	1	½	1	0	¼	a°	1	½	¼	½	79	½	½	½	100	82	Riser
Shaw	¼	¼	¼	1	a°	0	1	0	a-	0	0	¼	0	1	½	¼	0	46	½	½	½	100	53	Shaw
Smith	¼	¼	¼	1	0	0	1	1	a-	1	0	¼	0	a-	½	¼	½	58	½	½	½	100	63	Smith
Thompson	¼	a-	¼	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	¼	0	1	½	¼	½	65	½	½	0	67	65	Thompson
Walsworth	¼	¼	¼	1	0	0	1	1	½	1	0	¼	0	1	½	¼	½	72	½	½	½	100	76	Walsworth

With LABI	38	31	35	36	16	4	23	20	30	24	7	36	0	34	38	32	25	36	35	23	With LABI
Against LABI	0	0	0	0	18	28	13	17	1	13	26	0	33	0	0	0	12	0	0	12	Against LABI
Absent	1	8	4	3	4	6	3	1	7	1	5	2	5	4	0	6	1	3	3	4	Absent

SENATE

2008 - 2009

Cumulative

Voting %

Party	Senators	
(R)	Appel	100
(R)	Claitor	100
(R)	Michot	91
(R)	Morrish	88
(D)	Duplessis	86
(R)	Donahue	84
(D)	Mount	83
(R)	Riser	82
(R)	Crowe	80
(D)	Guillory	80
(D)	Gautreaux, Nick	79
(R)	Kostelka	79
(D)	Nevers	76
(R)	Walsworth	76
(R)	Long	73
(D)	Amedee	67
(D)	Dupre	65
(D)	Thompson	65
(D)	Jackson	64
(R)	Adley	63
(R)	Cheek	63
(R)	Martiny	63
(D)	Smith	63
(D)	McPherson	60
(R)	Quinn	60
(D)	Alario	59
(D)	Heitmeier	57
(D)	Broome	56
(D)	Gray-Evans	56
(D)	Hebert	55
(D)	LaFleur	54
(D)	Chaisson	53
(R)	Shaw	53
(R)	Erdey	50
(D)	Dorsey	47
(D)	Gautreaux, Butch	47
(D)	Murray	47
(D)	Morrell	44
(D)	Marionneaux	41