

Mariannette Miller-Meeks (IA-01) Message #1 Backup

Miller-Meeks took nearly two million dollars from special interests – and voted their way. Miller-Meeks sided with the big drug companies in opposing a law that caps the price of insulin at \$35/month for seniors — a cap that saves Iowans hundreds each year. And Miller-Meeks sided with big insurance companies and voted to cut Medicare. Miller-Meeks even called for raising the retirement age.

Miller-Meeks Took Nearly \$2 Million Dollars From Corporate Special Interests – And Voted Their Way

Miller-Meeks Took \$1,884,999 In Business PAC Money Throughout Her Career. [OpenSecrets.org, accessed [7/14/24](#)]



[OpenSecrets.org, accessed [7/14/24](#)]

Miller-Meeks Has Taken \$151,277 From Pharmaceuticals/Health Product Industry Throughout Her Career. [OpenSecrets.org, accessed [7/14/24](#)]

- **August 12, 2022: Miller-Meeks Voted Against The Inflation Reduction Act.** [H.R. 5376, Vote No. 420, [8/12/22](#)]
- **The Inflation Reduction Act Would Lower The Cost Of Insulin To \$35 A Month For People With Medicare.** “The Inflation Reduction Act of 2022, signed into law by President Biden on August 16, 2022, includes several provisions to lower prescription drug costs for people with Medicare and reduce drug spending by the federal government... Limit monthly cost sharing for insulin to \$35 for people with Medicare, beginning in 2023.” [Kaiser Family Foundation, [1/24/23](#)]

Miller-Meeks Has Taken \$158,343 From The Oil & Gas Industry Throughout Her Career. [OpenSecrets.org, accessed [7/14/24](#)]

- **Miller-Meeks Voted For The Lower Energy Costs Act.** In March 2023, Miller-Meeks voted for: “Passage of the bill, as amended, that would require a number of actions to boost the domestic production of fossil fuels and critical minerals, accelerate the construction of natural gas pipelines and other energy infrastructure, and reverse or repeal certain recent policies related to energy and climate change. Among provisions to boost oil and gas leasing and production, the bill would require the Interior Department to resume quarterly oil and gas lease sales on federal lands; complete certain proposed sales on the Outer Continental Shelf; and implement at least two lease sales per year in each of the Gulf of Mexico and the Alaska regions of the Shelf. It would roll back increased fees and royalties for onshore and offshore oil and gas development and production

established by the 2022 budget reconciliation package (PL 117-69). It would adjust revenue sharing requirements for onshore and offshore production to generally decrease federal shares and increase state shares, particularly for coastal states...” The bill passed by a vote of 225-204, with 221 Republicans and 4 Democrats voting for the bill, 1 Republican and 203 Democrats voting against the bill, and six Democrats not voting. [H.R. 1, [Vote #182](#), 3/20/23; CQ, [3/30/23](#)]

- **HEADLINE: “House Republicans Pass Energy Bill To Roll Back Regulation Of Fossil Fuel Production.”** [PBS, [3/30/23](#)]
- **National Parks Conservation Association: The Lower Energy Costs Act Was Bad For Climate Change, Environmental Laws, And Air And Water Pollution.** “The Lower Energy Costs Act should be a nonstarter for anyone who wants to preserve our national parks and everything they protect. Here are five reasons why: 1. The act would worsen climate change [...] The Lower Energy Costs Act would deepen our nation’s dependency on fossil fuel energy, slowing the benefits from our efforts to transition to clean energy, such as wind and solar. If enacted, hundreds of thousands of acres of public lands and waters would be vulnerable to mining and oil and gas development, with little regard to the effects these activities would have on our national parks, communities and climate. [...] 2. The act would gut existing environmental laws Even worse, the Lower Energy Costs Act would undercut bedrock environmental laws that address the impacts of climate change on our environment and give people a voice in how their public lands are managed. 3. The act would pollute air and water The Environmental Protection Agency estimates that 40 percent of the watersheds in the western United States are already contaminated by pollution from hard rock mines. For decades, mining and drilling activities across the country have wreaked havoc on our environment and communities, polluting the air we breathe and water we drink. The Lower Energy Costs Act would make matters worse, opening up swaths of public lands for unabated mining and oil and gas drilling.” [National Parks Conservation Association, Blog, [3/27/23](#)]

Miller-Meeks Sided With The Big Drug Companies In Opposing A Law That Caps The Price Of Insulin At \$35/Month For Seniors — A Cap That Saves Iowans Hundreds Each Year

August 12, 2022: Miller-Meeks Voted Against The Inflation Reduction Act. [H.R. 5376, Vote No. 420, [8/12/22](#)]

- **The Inflation Reduction Act Would Lower The Cost Of Insulin To \$35 A Month For People With Medicare.** “The Inflation Reduction Act of 2022, signed into law by President Biden on August 16, 2022, includes several provisions to lower prescription drug costs for people with Medicare and reduce drug spending by the federal government... Limit monthly cost sharing for insulin to \$35 for people with Medicare, beginning in 2023.” [Kaiser Family Foundation, [1/24/23](#)]
- **The Insulin Cap Resulted In \$725 Annual Out-Of-Pocket Savings For Iowans Impacted.** “In January 2023 the IRA introduced caps for certain covered insulin products for Medicare Part D beneficiaries. Under this cap the covered insulin products were capped at \$35 per month- and the deductible no longer applies. The federal Department of Health and Human Services estimates the insulin cap is resulting in annual out-of-pocket savings for Iowans impacted of \$725.” [Iowa SHIIP And SMP, [4/23/24](#)]
- **Bristol Myers Squibb, Novo Nordisk, Novartis And Johnson & Johnson Sought To Challenge The Inflation Reduction Act’s Medicare Negotiation Framework.** “Bristol Myers Squibb, Novo

Nordisk, Novartis and Johnson & Johnson present oral arguments together in their bid to challenge the IRA's Medicare negotiations framework, which will allow Medicare to bargain over the costs of certain drugs beginning in 2026." [Fierce Pharma, [2/21/24](#)]

- **Washington Post: "How Big Pharma Is Fighting Biden's Program To Lower Seniors' Drug Costs."** [Washington Post, [3/11/24](#)]

And Miller-Meeks Sided With Big Insurance Companies And Voted To Allow Cuts To Medicare

HEADLINE: "Republicans Furiously Defend Insurance Company Looting of Medicare." [The American Prospect, [2/13/23](#)]

Insurance Companies Advocated For Medicare Advantage, Which Has Cost Taxpayers Tens Of Billions Of Dollars. "Switching seniors to Medicare Advantage plans has cost taxpayers tens of billions of dollars more than keeping them in original Medicare, a cost that has exploded since 2018 and is likely to rise even higher, new research has found... Medicare Advantage, a fast-growing alternative to original Medicare, is run primarily by major insurance companies... While some of that money would provide patients with extra health benefits, Kronick estimates that as much as two-thirds of it could be going toward profits for insurance companies." [NPR, [11/11/21](#)]

Advocates Warned That Corporate Insurance Companies And Other Powerful Special Interest Lobbied Congress To Enact Medicare Cuts. "Yet corporate insurance companies and other powerful special interests are lobbying Congress to enact harmful Medicare cuts to hospital care that would jeopardize access to crucial services that only hospitals provide and put patients at even greater risk." [Coalition to Strengthen America's Healthcare, Press Release, [1/11/24](#)]

December 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against Preventing Sequestration Cuts To Medicare And Establishing Procedures To Expedite Senate Consideration Of A Debt Limit Increase. On December 7, 2021, Miller-Meeks voted against the "Passage of the bill, as amended, that would extend from Dec. 31, 2021, to March 31, 2022, a temporary suspension of the 2 percent annual sequester of Medicare payments, and provide for payment reductions of 1 percent for the period of April 1 through June 30, 2022. As an offset, it would increase sequestration percentages above 2 percent in fiscal 2030. It would also require budget year debit for 2022 to be rolled over to the 2033 scorecards under statutory pay-as-you-go requirements, thus delaying spending cuts to Medicare and other mandatory programs subject to sequestration that would otherwise be triggered in January. It would delay a number of other Medicare payment reductions and policies, including to extend a temporary increase in payment amounts for physicians to provide a 3 percent increase for services furnished in 2022; delay for one year a provision that would phase in payment reductions for clinical diagnostic laboratory tests, prohibiting any reductions for 2021 and 2022 and prohibiting reductions greater than 15 percent for 2023 through 2025; and delay through 2022 the implementation of the Medicare radiation oncology model. It would decrease from \$165 million to \$101 million funding that may be expended from the Medicare Improvement Fund for fiscal 2021. Finally, the bill would establish procedures to expedite Senate consideration of a joint resolution to increase the debt limit by a specific dollar amount. Specifically, it would provide for a non-debatable motion to proceed to the joint resolution and, if the motion is agreed to, up to 10 hours of debate on the measure with no amendments or other motions in order, immediately followed by a vote on passage. Such procedures would be valid for consideration of one joint resolution by Jan. 16, 2022." Passed by a vote of 222-212. [S. 610, Vote 404, [12/7/21](#); CQ, [12/7/21](#)]

- **Miller-Meeks Said She Voted Against Preventing Medicare Cuts Because Democrats Chose “A Short-Term Fix” And “Directly Tied It To A Debt Limit Increase.”** “Today, December 7th, 2021, Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks (IA-02) released the following statement after voting NO on an inadequate fix to Medicare sequestration: ‘Today, I voted no on the Democrat majority’s heavy-handed decision to play political games with Americans’ healthcare and businesses. Medicare patients need and deserve access to quality care and providers. After months of fair negotiations, the majority has chosen a short-term fix to Medicare sequestration and has directly tied it to a debt limit increase. Ensuring patients have access to care and that there are options for quality providers needs to be a top priority. Instead of kicking the can down the road, Congress should be staying in Washington until a long-term bipartisan solution is agreed upon to avoid cuts to Medicare. These political games are unacceptable and the American people deserve better. I look forward to working with my colleagues to address this issue in a permanent and constructive manner.’” [Office Of Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks, Press Release, [12/7/21](#)]

Miller-Meeks Even Called For Raising The Retirement Age

WHO 13 Des Moines: “On Money Matters, Republican Mariannette Miller-Meeks Supports Looking At Raising The Retirement Age To Ease The Strain On The Social Security System.” “On money matters, Republican Mariannette Miller-Meeks supports looking at raising the retirement age to ease the strain on the Social Security system. Democrat Rita Hart doesn’t. Hart wants to raise the federal minimum wage but didn’t say by how much. Miller-Meeks thinks the states should determine the minimum wage. Miller-Meeks said, ‘A minimum wage is...and I started out 30 cents an hour...so a minimum wage is an entry-level. It’s not supposed to be a wage or was not meant to be a wage that is supposed to support a family.’” [WHO 13 Des Moines, [9/25/20](#)]

Mariannette Miller-Meeks (IA-01) Message #2 Backup

Mariannette Miller-Meeks wants to turn back the clock and take away our reproductive rights and freedoms. Miller-Meeks says she’s “100% pro-life.” She even backed a bill that would ban all abortions nationwide — no exceptions for rape, incest, or to save a woman’s life. Miller-Meeks has repeatedly backed laws that could threaten IVF.

Miller-Meeks Says She’s “100% Pro-Life”

May 2020: Miller-Meeks Said She Had A “100% Pro-Life Voting Record.” “Now Miller-Meeks is ‘the only reliable pro-Trump conservative’ with a ‘100% pro-life voting record,’ she says. Schilling disputes that, backed by video clips and social media posts. The Schilling campaign released a screenshot from Miller-Meeks’ Twitter where she calls both Trump and Clinton ‘liars & corrupt.’ She was right, of course, but has since backtracked. Schilling also is promoting a video published by the Press-Citizen, in which Miller-Meeks in 2018 called herself ‘pro-choice.’ ‘I don’t want the government in my health care decisions,’ Miller-Meeks said in the video, recorded at an Ottumwa League of Women Voters forum. Again, she took the correct position in my view, but later said she misspoke.” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, Adam Sullivan Column, [5/31/20](#)]

She Even Backed A Bill That Would Ban All Abortions Nationwide — No Exceptions For Rape, Incest, Or To Save A Woman’s Life

February 2021: Miller-Meeks Co-Sponsored The Life At Conception Act. On May 14, 2021, Miller-Meeks co-sponsored HR 1011, the Life At Conception Act, which “declares that the right to life guaranteed by the Constitution is vested in each human being at all stages of life, including the moment of fertilization, cloning, or other moment at which an individual comes into being. Nothing in this bill shall be construed to authorize the prosecution of any woman for the death of her unborn child.” The bill was read twice and referred to House Judiciary. [H.R. 1011, Introduced [2/11/21](#)]

- **Cedar Rapids Gazette: The Life At Conception Act “Aims To Block Abortions At All Stages” And “Does Not Indicate Any Exceptions In Cases Of Rape, Incest Or When The Pregnant Person Is At Risk.”** “This legislation is a personhood bill, one of many proposals over the years that aims to block abortions at all stages by legally recognizing all stages of human development as persons. The bill defines human beings protected under this measure as those ‘at all stages of life, including the moment of fertilization, cloning, or other moment at which an individual member of the human species comes into being.’” [Cedar Rapids Gazette, [7/11/22](#)]
- **The Life At Conception Act Would Enact A Nationwide Abortion Ban.** “The Life at Conception Act is fewer than 300 words, but its language leaves little room for ambiguity on abortion... Put simply: “It would be a nationwide abortion ban,” said Mary Ziegler, a professor at UC Davis School of Law who studies reproductive rights. Even California, which has positioned itself as a haven for abortion rights, would be affected. [Los Angeles Times, [8/29/22](#)]
- **The Life At Conception Act Didn’t Include Exceptions For Rape, Incest, Or Threats To The Woman’s Health.** “Steel and Garcia were not made available for interviews but provided statements about the abortion debate. Both indicated they back exceptions to abortion bans in cases of rape, incest or threats to the mother’s health — a departure from the bill. The measure is dormant in the Democratic-led Congress, but that could change if Republicans take control of either chamber next year.” [Los Angeles Times, [8/29/22](#)]

Miller-Meeks Has Repeatedly Backed Laws That Could Threaten IVF

February 2021: Miller-Meeks Co-Sponsored The Life At Conception Act. On May 14, 2021, Miller-Meeks co-sponsored HR 1011, the Life At Conception Act, which “declares that the right to life guaranteed by the Constitution is vested in each human being at all stages of life, including the moment of fertilization, cloning, or other moment at which an individual comes into being. Nothing in this bill shall be construed to authorize the prosecution of any woman for the death of her unborn child.” The bill was read twice and referred to House Judiciary. [H.R. 1011, Introduced [2/11/21](#)]

- **The Life At Conception Act Would Not Protect IVF Access.** “The Life at Conception Act — the measure that would not protect IVF access — was reintroduced to Congress in January 2023 but it has not successfully been turned into law. No committee has held a hearing on it.” [Washington Post, [2/25/24](#)]
- **The Life At Conception Act Would Have Effectively Banned IVF Treatments.** “Like the Alabama ruling, the Life at Conception Act would have severely restricted—if not effectively banned—IVF treatments as well, because it grants ‘equal protection’ to ‘preborn’ humans, including embryos. Since it’s common for fertilized eggs not to survive the IVF process, the act would put doctors at risk of being charged for wrongful death of embryos. That risk would be enough to scupper the IVF industry.” [The New Republic, [2/23/24](#)]

2019: Miller-Meeks Voted For Expanding Penalties For Fetal Homicide. Miller-Meeks voted for SF 523, “a bill for an act relating to the nonconsensual cause of death of and serious injury to an unborn person, and providing penalties.” The bill passed by a vote of 31-18. [Iowa State Legislature, SF 523, [3/26/19](#)]

- **Under SF 523 Could Threaten In Vitro Fertility Treatments.** “A House subcommittee has advanced a bill (SF 523) that would increase the criminal penalty for intentionally or accidentally causing the death of an ‘unborn person.’ It was the first opportunity for supporters and opponents of the proposal to weigh in on controversial language defining an unborn person as starting at conception. Under the measure, some people convicted of killing an unborn person could receive a life sentence. [...] The original bill brought up for debate in the Senate was viewed as a bipartisan measure. Then an amendment changed the language to refer to an unborn person defined from ‘fertilization to live birth.’ The bill passed the Senate with only Republican support. ‘It didn’t need that language to protect pregnant women,’ said Planned Parenthood of the Heartland public affairs manager Jamie Burch Elliott who spoke against the bill. ‘It still increased penalties for harming pregnant women before the language of the bill was changed.’ Critics argued at the hearing that if the bill’s definition of personhood becomes law, access to abortion, birth control and even in vitro fertility treatments could be threatened, although the bill itself is restricted to criminal acts that harm a fetus against the woman’s wishes.” [Iowa Public Radio, [4/1/19](#)]