

## Mike Lawler Message #1 Backup

*Donald Trump himself says that Mike Lawler is “spectacular.” Mike Lawler has voted repeatedly against a woman’s right to an abortion. He recently said he wants to ban nearly every abortion in New York. Lawler is part of an extreme group of Republicans that would seek to ban abortion in New York, even in cases of rape and incest.*

### Donald Trump Himself Says That Mike Lawler Is “Spectacular.”

**Trump: “Somebody Who’s Been Really Spectacular For The Last, Especially For The Last Few Months. [...] Michael Lawler. [...] He Likes Me Better Now Than He Used To. And I Like That. Cause He’s A Good Man. Great Man.”** “Somebody who’s been really spectacular for the last, especially for the last few months...I don’t know what happened to him but boy he likes me a lot better now than he used to. Michael Lawler...Am I correct in that? Where’s Michael? Right? Something happened. But he likes me better now than he used to. And I like that. Cause he’s a good man. Great man.” [YouTube, DCCC, [9/20/24](#)] (VIDEO)

### Mike Lawler Has Voted Repeatedly Against A Woman’s Right To An Abortion.

#### **January 2023: Lawler Voted For Blocking Consideration Of The Women’s Health Protection Act.**

In January 2023, Lawler voted for: “Cole, R-Okla., motion to order the previous question (thus ending debate and possibility of amendment).” According to the Congressional Record, Rep. McGovern said, “Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up the Women’s Health Protection Act.” **A vote for the motion was a vote to block consideration of the bill.** The motion was agreed to by a vote of 211-205. [H. Res. 5, [Vote #21](#), 1/9/23; CQ, [1/9/23](#); Congressional Record, [1/9/23](#)]

- **The Women’s Health Protection Act Would Federally Codify Protections From Roe V. Wade.** “As a leaked draft opinion of a Supreme Court ruling shows a conservative majority of justices appear poised to overturn federal protections of abortion rights, Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer said Thursday the Senate will hold a procedural vote to begin debate on the Women’s Health Protection Act next week. WHPA is a bill that aims to codify Roe v. Wade, the landmark decision that grants protections for a woman’s right to abortion, at the federal level. The bill prohibits governmental restrictions on access to abortion services, according to the Congressional Research Service.” [ABC, [5/7/22](#)]
- **Federally Codifying Protections From Roe Would Prevent States From Passing “Full Bans” On Abortion Following The Overturning Of Roe.** “Congressional Democrats have mulled options to guarantee the 1973 Roe v. Wade ruling’s protections since a leaked majority draft indicated in May that the Supreme Court would reverse the decision. The majority conservative court indeed overturned Roe last week, sparking nationwide tumult among abortion-rights advocates and celebrations by their anti-abortion counterparts. The reversal returns the power to state legislatures to pass full bans on abortion. The ruling, which stood for nearly 50 years, had nullified broad bans on the procedure and established it as a constitutional right. Now Democrats are pushing to effectively restore that right by ‘codifying’ Roe v. Wade.” [USA Today, [6/30/22](#)]

**May 2022: Lawler Voted Against S09039A.** In May 2022, Lawler voted against S09039 in a floor vote in the New York State Assembly. [New York State Assembly, S09039A, [5/31/22](#)]

- **S09039A Passed The Assembly By A Vote Of 100 To 49 And Was Signed Into Law.** [New York State Assembly, S09039A, [6/13/22](#)]
- **S09039A Protected “The Rights Of Individuals Seeking Abortion Care Or Gender Affirming Care In New York State.”** “Other bills signed into law today as part of the comprehensive effort to protect reproductive rights in New York include: [...] Freedom from Interference with Reproductive Healthcare Access: S.9039A will protect the rights of individuals seeking abortion care or gender affirming care in New York State. This legislation also creates a civil cause of action for unlawful interference with the protected rights to reproductive healthcare.” [New York State Senator Anna M. Kaplan, Press Release, [6/13/22](#)]

**May 2022: Lawler Voted Against S09077A.** In May 2022, Lawler voted against S09077A in a floor vote in the New York State Assembly. [New York State Assembly, S09077A, [5/31/22](#)]

- **S09077A Passed The Assembly By A Vote Of 100 To 49 And Was Signed Into Law.** [New York State Assembly, S09077A, [6/13/22](#)]
- **S09077A Prohibited “New York State From Cooperating With Out-Of-State Legal Cases Involving Abortion Except In Limited Circumstances.”** “Other bills signed into law today as part of the comprehensive effort to protect reproductive rights in New York include: [...] Extradition and Discovery Non-Cooperation: S.9077A forbids New York State from cooperating with out-of-state legal cases involving abortion except in limited circumstances.” [New York State Senator Anna M. Kaplan, Press Release, [6/13/22](#)]
  - **Defendants From States Where Abortion Was Illegal Could Not Be Extradited Unless “The Defendant Was Present In That State At The Time Of The Alleged Offense And That They Later Fled.”** “For criminal cases, this bill prohibits New York from extraditing a defendant to another state to face abortion-related charges unless the governor of that state alleges in writing that the defendant was present in that state at the time of the alleged offense and that they later fled.” [New York State Senator Anna M. Kaplan, Press Release, [6/13/22](#)]
  - **Courts Could Not Comply With Out-Of-State Subpoenas “If The Out-Of-State Case Relates To Abortion Services Legally Performed In New York State.”** “For civil cases, the bill prohibits a New York court from honoring a subpoena request from the court of another state if the out-of-state case relates to abortion services legally performed in New York State. A New York court may still honor an out-of-state subpoena if the case is brought by the patient.” [New York State Senator Anna M. Kaplan, Press Release, [6/13/22](#)]

**July 2022: Lawler Voted Against S51002 Which Passed The Assembly By A Vote Of 95 To 45.** [New York State Assembly, S51002, [7/2/22](#)]

- **S51002 Sought To Ensure That The State Constitution Anti-Discrimination Provision Applied To All New Yorkers.** “The purpose of this amendment is to ensure that our state constitution extends to all New Yorkers the equality right to be free from discrimination, and in particular those who have faced severe and pervasive injustice. It does so by expanding the list of classes protected by the New York Constitution in recognition of the need for comprehensive and intersectional equality under the law.” [New York State Assembly, S51002, [7/2/22](#)]
- **S51002 Would Add Anti-Discrimination Protections For Disability, Including Pregnancy, To The State Constitution.** “Discrimination with respect to, for instance, disability or pregnancy would

include the failure to provide reasonable accommodations. This amendment is intended to promote equality of opportunity for people with disabilities both by banning disability discrimination and by affording enforceable legal rights to people with disabilities. The term "disability" means a physical, mental or medical impairment resulting from anatomical, physiological, genetic or neurological conditions which prevents the exercise of a normal bodily function or is demonstrable by medically accepted clinical or laboratory diagnostic techniques or a record of such an impairment or a condition regarded by others as such an impairment. No person because of disability should be subjected to any discrimination, including but not limited to actions which prevent them exercising their right to live in the community, to lead an independent life, and to be free from institutionalization. Discrimination with respect to, for instance, disability or pregnancy would include the failure to provide reasonable accommodations." [New York State Assembly, S51002, [7/2/22](#)]

- **S51002 Would Add Anti-Discrimination Protections For Sex, Including Issues Relating To Pregnancy And Abortion, To The State Constitution.** “Further, by including a prohibition on sex discrimination, this amendment inherently prohibits discrimination on the basis of pregnancy, pregnancy outcomes, and reproductive healthcare and reproductive autonomy. The amendment’s explicit clarification however is critical. While federal courts, Congress, and the EEOC have recognized that sex discrimination includes discrimination based on pregnancy (including abortion), a lack of clarity on whether pregnancy discrimination transgresses the federal constitution still exists. See e.g. *Geduldig v. Aiello*, 417 U.S. 484 (1974). This translates into New York law as well. For example, New York State courts have failed to recognize the New York State Patient Bill of Rights as applying to pregnant patients, as well as constitutional and common law protections to privacy, bodily integrity, and medical decision-making throughout pregnancy. See, e.g., *Dray v. Staten Island University Hospital, Order, Genine Edwards*, Supreme Court of the State of New York, Kings County, October 4, 2019. And increasingly across the country in virtually every state, including New York, women face criminal and civil consequences in relationship to their pregnancies and pregnancy outcomes, including abortions, miscarriages, stillbirths, or other adverse outcomes. This is particularly important for women at the intersection of multiple marginalized identities, namely Black women and women of color, who are not only wrongly seen as less deserving of or fit for motherhood but further experience disproportionate discrimination in our criminal law system and health disparities likely to lead to adverse outcomes that put them under scrutiny and surveillance.” [New York State Assembly, S51002, [7/2/22](#)]

## He Recently Said He Wants To Ban Nearly Every Abortion In New York.

**LoHud: “Lawler Believes That The Right To Abortion Should Be Reserved To A Tiny Subset Of American Women: Those Who Face ‘Serious Health Issues’ When Pregnant Or Are The Victims Of Rape Or Incest.”** “On abortion, Lawler’s stance — what he calls his ‘commonsense, mainstream position’ — hasn’t changed, according to his campaign website. Lawler believes that the right to abortion should be reserved to a tiny subset of American women: those who face ‘serious health issues’ when pregnant or are the victims of rape or incest.” [LoHud, [9/9/24](#)]

## Lawler Is Part Of An Extreme Group Of Republicans That Would Seek To Ban Abortion In New York, Even In Cases Of Rape And Incest.

**April 2024: Lawler Filed To Run On The Conservative Party Line In The NY-17 Congressional Election.** [New York Board of Elections, filed [4/2/24](#)]

**The NY Conservative Party Supports Repealing New York’s Law Protecting Abortion Access And Only Allowing Abortion In Cases Of “Clearly Defined Conditions Hazardous To The Life Of The**

**Mother.”** “We believe that New York’s expanded abortion law should be repealed and the legislature should re-adopt the prior statute permitting therapeutic abortions only under the most clearly defined conditions hazardous to the life of the mother. Tax dollars should not be used to prevent or end a pregnancy, nor should they be used for non-residents to travel to NY and pay for their abortion.” [Conservative Party of New York State, “2024 Legislative Program,” accessed [1/29/24](#)]

**The NY Conservative Party Supports Repealing New York’s Law Protecting Abortion Access And Only Allowing “Therapeutic Abortion” In Cases Of “Clearly Defined Conditions Hazardous To The Life Of The Mother.”** “We believe that New York’s expanded abortion law should be repealed and the legislature should re-adopt the prior statute permitting therapeutic abortions only under the most clearly defined conditions hazardous to the life of the mother. Tax dollars should not be used to prevent or end a pregnancy, nor should they be used for non-residents to travel to NY and pay for their abortion.” [Conservative Party of New York State, “2023 Legislative Program,” accessed [12/21/23](#)]

**1965: New York Amended Its Statute To Widen Life Of The Mother Exceptions.** [New York University Law Review, 66 (6), Samuel Buell, Criminal Abortion Revisited, pg. 1798, [1/1/1991](#)]

<sup>130</sup> New York amended its statute in 1965 to widen the therapeutic exceptions. See Means, supra note 25, at 498-500. California adopted the most progressive abortion reform in 1967 to close a perceived gulf between the legal and medical standards concerning justifications for abortion. See George, supra note 50, at 393-402 (discussing perceived gulf); Sands, supra note 52, at 286-88 (same); Note, Abortion Reform, supra note 59, at 530-34 (discussing California legislation); Note, Survey of Abortion Reform Legislation, 43 Wash. L. Rev. 644, 644-54 (1968) (discussing California legislation in comparison with Colorado, North Carolina, and Great Britain legislation). Then Governor Reagan signed the bill only after the legislature eliminated a provision permitting abortion of a greatly deformed child. See Note, Changing Abortion Laws, supra note 30, at 496-97. Arkansas, Colorado, Georgia, Maryland, New Mex-

[New York University Law Review, 66 (6), Samuel Buell, Criminal Abortion Revisited, pg. 1798, [1/1/1991](#)]

**19<sup>th</sup> Century: New York Fully Banned Abortion At All Phases Of Pregnancy, And Later Included A “Therapeutic Exception.”** [New York University Law Review, 66 (6), Samuel Buell, Criminal Abortion Revisited, pgs. 1784-85, [1/1/1991](#)]

- **Brittanica: A Therapeutic Abortion Can Take Place Because The Pregnancy Endangers The Mother’s Life.** “A therapeutic abortion is the interruption of a pregnancy before the 20th week of gestation because it endangers the mother’s life or health or because the baby presumably would not be normal.” [Encyclopedia Britannica, accessed [12/22/23](#)]
- **One Scholar, Cyrus Means, Argued That Therapeutic Exceptions In New York Were Driven Out Of Concern For The Life Of The Woman.** [New York University Law Review, 66 (6), Samuel Buell, Criminal Abortion Revisited, pgs. 1784-85, [1/1/1991](#)]

prequickening abortion in 1827.<sup>41</sup> And New York adopted its first statute in 1829, elevating postquickening abortion from a misdemeanor to a felony.<sup>42</sup> Over the next sixty years, other states adopted abortion legislation and increasingly restrictive amendments. By the end of the nineteenth century, every state had criminalized abortion by statute and, with three exceptions, had prohibited it during all phases of pregnancy.<sup>43</sup>

[...]

the nineteenth century.<sup>45</sup> New York was the first state to include a therapeutic exception in its statute, and one scholar, Cyril Means, uses this information to argue that New York's legislature was motivated primarily by concern for the woman's life.<sup>46</sup> In the late 1860s and 1870s, attitudes toward abortion in New York grew increasingly intolerant as the

[New York University Law Review, 66 (6), Samuel Buell, Criminal Abortion Revisited, pgs. 1784-85, [1/1/1991](#)]

**1872: New York Passed A Law Increasing Its Penalty For Abortion To Between Four Years And 20 Years Imprisonment.** [New York University Law Review, 66 (6), Samuel Buell, Criminal Abortion Revisited, pgs. 1784-85, [1/1/1991](#)]

prequickening abortion in 1827.<sup>41</sup> And New York adopted its first statute in 1829, elevating postquickening abortion from a misdemeanor to a felony.<sup>42</sup> Over the next sixty years, other states adopted abortion legislation and increasingly restrictive amendments. By the end of the nineteenth century, every state had criminalized abortion by statute and, with three exceptions, had prohibited it during all phases of pregnancy.<sup>43</sup>

[...]

the nineteenth century.<sup>45</sup> New York was the first state to include a therapeutic exception in its statute, and one scholar, Cyril Means, uses this information to argue that New York's legislature was motivated primarily by concern for the woman's life.<sup>46</sup> In the late 1860s and 1870s, attitudes toward abortion in New York grew increasingly intolerant as the

New York press widely publicized sensational cases of deaths from unskilled abortionists.<sup>47</sup> The legislature increased the penalty for abortion in 1872 to between four and twenty years imprisonment.<sup>48</sup>

[New York University Law Review, 66 (6), Samuel Buell, Criminal Abortion Revisited, pgs. 1784-85, [1/1/1991](#)]

**Dr. Alan F. Guttmacher, On New York's 1970 Legalization Of Abortion: "After 142 Years Of One Of The Most Restrictive Abortion Statutes — Allowing Abortions Only When Necessary To Preserve The Life Of The Mother — New York Suddenly Had The Most Liberal Abortion Law In The World."** "Three years before Roe v. Wade established a constitutional right to abortion, New York legalized the procedure in 1970, turning the state into a magnet for women who wanted to terminate their pregnancies but were barred from doing so where they lived. [...] The New York law allowed abortions to be performed within 24 weeks of pregnancy and at any time if the woman's life was at risk. [...] 'After 142 years of one of the most restrictive abortion statutes — allowing abortions only when necessary to preserve the life of the mother — New York suddenly had the most liberal abortion law in the world,' wrote Dr. Alan F. Guttmacher, a birth control pioneer who advocated legalizing abortion, in a 1972 report." [New York Times, [7/19/18](#)]

## Mike Lawler Message #2 Backup

*While taking thousands from the insurance industry, Lawler opposed lowering health care premiums, voted 19 times against protecting Social Security and Medicare benefits for people who spent a lifetime paying into the system, and opposed capping the cost of the lifesaving drug insulin. If Lawler had his way, insurance companies would be able to deny people health care if they have pre-existing conditions like cancer and diabetes.*

## While Taking Thousands From The Insurance Industry...

As Of September 2024, Lawler's Campaign Accepted \$176,750 From The Insurance Industry. [OpenSecrets, accessed [9/30/24](#)]

## ...Lawler Opposed Lowering Health Care Premiums...

**August 2022: Lawler Said, "I Would Not Have Supported The Quote Unquote Inflation Reduction Act."** "ASTORINO: "Mike, let me ask you. You've got inflation running rampant, right now, people can't afford it. Let's talk about that first. What are some of the things that you would do to stop this economy from spinning out of control?" LAWLER: "Well you know, first and foremost I would not have supported the quote unquote Inflation Reduction Act. It is nothing more than a slimmed down version of Build Back Better which was, you know, the progressive pipedream and incorporated a lot of the Green New Deal into it. Sean Patrick Maloney was a proud original cosponsor, he tells everybody, original cosponsor of the Green New Deal." [Mike Lawler, Facebook, 7:03, [8/22/22](#)] (VIDEO)

- **The IRA Extended Expanded Affordable Care Act Subsidies For Three More Years Helping Low- And Middle-Income Families Afford Healthcare.** "One way Obamacare expanded health care coverage was by creating marketplaces for people to purchase insurance and offering federal subsidies to help low- and middle-income households afford it. Households making up to 400 percent of the federal poverty line — about \$106,000 for a family of four — could get federal help to pay their premiums. After that, they were on their own. But in 2021, Congress eliminated those caps, instead saying that no household should have to pay more than 8.5 percent of their income for health insurance. The change had the biggest effect on people making between 400 and 600 percent of the federal poverty line (for the same household of four, that would be up to \$159,000 per year). As Vox's Dylan Scott previously reported, the changes also enabled roughly 7 million people to qualify for free health insurance under the ACA. Those policies, however, were set to sunset by the end of this year, leaving millions of people to face much higher health care expenses moving forward. The Inflation Reduction Act extends these subsidies for three years through the end of 2025, ensuring that people won't face that surge for a while yet. That extension is expected to cost \$64 billion, according to a projection from the Congressional Budget Office." [Vox, [7/28/22](#)]
- **The IRA Will Save Average Marketplace Enrollees \$800 Per Year By Extending Premium Tax Credits Through 2025 Initially Made Available By The American Rescue Plan.** "The Inflation Reduction Act lowers costs for millions of people who purchase health coverage on their own by extending the enhanced financial assistance made available through the American Rescue Plan Act (ARP) through 2025. By making premium tax credits newly available to more middle-class families and improving the generosity of financial help for those previously eligible, the ARP helped drive marketplace enrollment to a record high of 14.5 million and the U.S. uninsurance rate to an all-time low of just 8 percent. Thanks to the ARP, the average marketplace enrollee saves \$800 per year." [Center for American Progress, [8/12/22](#)]

**June 2023: Lawler Voted For The Passage Of The Bill Allowing Employers More Flexibility in Deciding What Type Of Healthcare To Provide Employees.** In June 2023, Lawler voted for: "Passage of the bill, as amended, that would create additional flexibilities for employers providing health insurance. The bill would allow groups of employers to establish and maintain group health plans for employees. It would require such groups to provide coverage to at least 51 employees and to have been in existence for at least two years prior to establishing the health plan. It would allow self-employed individuals to establish a group for the purpose of maintaining a group health plan. The bill would also allow employer-financed health reimbursement arrangements (HRA) to be used by employees to purchase insurance plans

on state exchanges. It would also deem such HRAs compliant with requirements under current law for employers to provide health insurance coverage. To be eligible, it would require employers to offer the same HRA plan to all employees of a certain class, as defined by the bill, including full- and part-time employees, employees under the same collective bargaining agreement, and non-resident alien employees. It would also require employers to give eligible employees 90 days' written notice prior to the beginning of the plan year of their rights and obligations. Among other provisions, the bill would rescind \$245 million in fiscal 2024 from the Health and Human Services Department's Prevention and Public Health Fund, specify that stop-loss policies obtained by a self-insured group health plan or plan sponsor do not qualify as health insurance coverage under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act, and require the Treasury Department, within one year of enactment, to notify employers of the availability of tax-advantaged flexible health insurance benefits, with an initial focus on small businesses. HR 3799 also contains the text of the Small Business Flexibility Act (HR 3798), the Association Health Plans Act (HR 2868) and the Self-Insurance Protection Act (HR 2813)." The bill passed 220 to 209. [H.R. 3799, [Vote #282](#), 6/21/23; CQ, [6/21/23](#)]

- **Lawler Voted Against An Amendment To Delay Implementing Providing Health Care Flexibilities To Avoid Higher Premium Rates For Older Workers.** In June 2023, Lawler voted against: "Hayes, D-Conn., amendment no. 1 that would delay the effective date of the bill's provisions until the Labor Department certifies that they would not result in higher premium rates for older workers." The amendment was rejected by a vote of 211-220. [H.R. 3799, [Vote #278](#), 6/21/23; CQ, [6/21/23](#)]

## ...Voted 19 Times Against Protecting Social Security And Medicare Benefits For People Who Spent A Lifetime Paying Into The System...

**1. October 3, 2023: Lawler Voted To Block Consideration For Protecting Social Security And Medicare.** In October 2023, Lawler voted for: "Reschenthaler, R-Pa. motion to order the previous question (thus ending debate and possibility of amendment)." According to the Congressional Record, Rep. Scanlon said, "Madam Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to provide for consideration of a resolution which clearly states that it is the people's House's duty to keep our promise to American workers and seniors to protect and preserve Social Security and Medicare and fight against any cuts to these vital programs." A vote *for the motion* was a vote to block consideration of the bill. The motion was agreed to by a vote of 218-207. [H.Res. 756, [Vote #516](#), 10/3/23; CQ, [10/3/23](#); Congressional Record, [10/3/23](#)]

**2. September 19, 2023: Lawler Voted For Blocking Consideration Of A Resolution To Protect Social Security And Medicare.** In September 2023 Lawler voted for: "Cole, R-Okla., motion to order the previous question (thus ending debate and possibility of amendment)." According to the Congressional Record, Rep. Fernandez said, "I am going to offer my friends, my dear friends, a chance to show the American people that they are serious about preserving Social Security and Medicare. I urge you all to join us in defeating the previous question. If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to provide for consideration of a resolution which plainly states that the people's House won't cut a single cent from these crucial programs that so many of my constituents, so many of your constituents, rely on." A vote *for the motion* was a vote to block consideration of the resolution. The motion was agreed to by a vote of 217-209. [H. Res. 680, [Vote #397](#), 9/19/23; CQ, [9/19/23](#); Congressional Record, [9/19/23](#)]

**3. September 14, 2023: Lawler Voted For Blocking Consideration Of Protecting And Preserving Social Security And Medicare.** In September 2023, Lawler voted for: "Burgess, R-Texas, motion to order the previous question (thus ending debate and possibility of amendment)." According to the

Congressional Record, Rep. Leger Fernandez said, “Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to provide for consideration of a resolution which clearly states that it is the people’s House’s duty to keep our promise to American workers and seniors to protect and preserve Social Security and Medicare and fight against any cuts to these vital programs.” A vote *for the motion* was a vote to block consideration of the bill. The motion was agreed to by a vote of 214-198. [H.Res. 681, [Vote #388](#), 9/14/23; CQ, [9/14/23](#); Congressional Record, [9/14/23](#)]

**4. July 26, 2023: Lawler Voted For Blocking Consideration Of Protecting Social Security And Medicare.** In July 2023, Lawler voted for: “Reschenthaler, R-Pa., motion to order the previous question (thus ending debate and possibility of amendment).” According to the Congressional Record, Rep. Neguse said, “Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment that we have offered before to the rule to provide for consideration of a resolution which unambiguously states that it is the House’s duty to keep our solemn promise to American workers and seniors to protect and preserve Social Security and Medicare and reject any cuts to these critical programs.” *A vote for the motion was a vote to block consideration of the bill.* The motion was agreed to by a vote of 208-191. [H.Res. 614, [Vote #367](#), 7/26/23; CQ, [7/26/23](#); Congressional Record, [7/26/23](#)]

**5. July 18, 2023: Lawler Voted For Blocking Consideration Of A Resolution To Protect Social Security and Medicare.** In July 2023, Lawler voted for: “Houchin, R-Ind motion to order the previous question (thus ending debate and possibility of amendment).” According to the Congressional Record, Rep. Scanlon, D-\_\_\_ said, “Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to provide for consideration of a resolution which unequivocally states that it is the House’s duty to keep our sacred promise to American workers and seniors to protect and preserve Social Security and Medicare and reject any cuts to those essential programs.” *A vote for the motion was a vote to block consideration of the bill.* The motion was agreed to by a vote of 213-207. [H.Res. 597, [Vote #331](#), 7/18/23; CQ, [7/18/23](#); Congressional Record, [7/18/23](#)]

**6. June 22, 2023: Lawler Voted For Blocking Consideration Of A Resolution Stating It Is The House’s Responsibility To Provide Social Security And Medicaid And To Reject Cuts To The Programs.** In June 2023, Lawler voted for: “Roy, R,Texas., motion to order the previous question (thus ending debate and the possibility of amendment).” According to the Congressional Record, Rep McGovern said, “Mr. Speaker, I urge that we defeat the previous question, and I will offer an amendment to the rule to provide for consideration of a resolution assuring our constituents that the people’s House will protect and preserve Social Security and Medicare for our future generations and reject any cuts to these essential programs.” *A vote for the motion was a vote to block consideration of the resolution.* The motion was agreed to 214-206. [H.Res. 463, [Vote #284](#), 6/22/23; CQ, [6/22/23](#); Congressional Record, [6/22/23](#)]

**7. June 13, 2023: Lawler Voted For Blocking Consideration Of A Joint Resolution Stating It Is The House’s Responsibility To Provide Social Security And Medicaid And To Reject Cuts To The Programs.** In June 2023, Lawler voted for: “Roy, R,Texas., motion to order the previous question (thus ending debate and the possibility of amendment).” According to the Congressional Record, Rep McGovern said, “Mr. Speaker, I am going to urge that we defeat the previous question, and if we do, then I will offer an amendment to the rule to provide for consideration of a resolution which states that it is the House’s duty to protect and preserve Social Security and Medicare for our future generations and reject any cuts to these essential programs.” *A vote for the motion was a vote to block consideration of the bill.* The motion was agreed to 216-209. [H.Res. 495, [Vote #249](#), 6/13/23; CQ, [6/13/23](#); Congressional Record, [6/13/23](#)]

**8. June 6, 2023: Lawler Voted For Blocking Consideration Of A Resolution Stating It’s The House’s Responsibility To Protect And Preserve Social Security And Medicaid And To Reject Cuts To The Programs.** In February 2019, Lawler voted for: “Massie, R-Ky, motion to order the previous question (thus ending debate and the possibility of amendment).” According to the Congressional Record,



Rep. Scanlon said “Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to provide for consideration of a resolution which states that it is the House’s responsibility to protect and preserve Social Security and Medicaid for our future generations and reject any cuts to these essential programs.” *A vote for the motion was a vote to block consideration of the bill.* The motion was agreed to 215-203. [H. Res. 463, [Vote #247](#), 6/6/23; CQ, [6/6/23](#); Congressional Record, [6/6/23](#)]

**9. May 23, 2023: Lawler Voted For Blocking Consideration Of Protecting Social Security And Medicare And Rejecting Cuts To The Programs.** In May 2023, Lawler voted for: “Burgess, R-Texas, motion to order the previous question (thus ending debate and possibility of amendment).” According to the Congressional Record, Rep. Leger Fernandez said, “Madam Speaker, I point out that if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to provide for consideration of a resolution, which states that it is the House’s responsibility to protect and preserve Social Security and Medicare for future generations and reject any cuts to these essential programs.” *A vote for the motion was a vote to block consideration of the bill.* The motion was agreed to by a vote of 219-208. [H.Res. 429, [Vote #230](#), 5/23/23; CQ, [5/23/23](#); Congressional Record, [5/23/23](#)]

**10. May 16, 2023: Lawler Voted For Blocking Consideration Of Protecting Social Security And Medicare And Rejecting Cuts To The Programs.** In May 2023, Lawler voted for: “Fischbach, R-Minn, motion to order the previous question (thus ending debate and possibility of amendment).” According to the Congressional Record, Rep. McGovern said, “Mr. Speaker, I urge that we defeat the previous question. If we do, I will offer an amendment to the rule for consideration of a resolution which states that it is the House’s responsibility to protect and preserve Social Security and Medicare for future generations and reject any cuts to these essential programs.” *A vote for the motion was a vote to block consideration of the bill.* The motion was agreed to by a vote of 220-209. [H.Res. 398, [Vote #215](#), 5/16/23; CQ, [5/16/23](#); Congressional Record, [5/16/23](#)]

**11. April 26, 2023: Lawler Voted For Blocking Consideration Of Stating Responsibility To Defend And Preserve Social Security And Medicare And Reject Cuts To The Programs.** In April 2023, Lawler voted for: “Cole, R-Okla., motion to order the previous question (thus ending debate and possibility of amendment).” According to the Congressional Record, Rep. McGovern said, “Mr. Speaker, I urge that we defeat the previous question. If we do, then I will offer an amendment to the rule to provide for consideration of a resolution that allows the House to state unequivocally that it is our responsibility to defend and preserve Social Security and Medicare for generations to come and reject any cuts to these vital programs.” *A vote for the motion was a vote to block consideration of the bill.* The motion was agreed to by a vote of 218-210. [H. Res. 327, [Vote #195](#), 4/26/23; CQ, [4/26/23](#); Congressional Record, [4/26/23](#)]

**12. April 18, 2023: Lawler Voted For Blocking Consideration Of Affirming Commitment To Protect And Strengthen Social Security And Medicare And Reject Cuts To The Programs.** In April 2023, Lawler voted for: “Houchin, R-Ind., motion to order the previous question (thus ending debate and possibility of amendment).” According to the Congressional Record, Rep. Leger Fernandez said, “Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, which I hope we do, I will offer an amendment to the rule to provide for consideration of a resolution that affirms the House’s unwavering commitment to protect and strengthen Social Security and Medicare and states that it is the position of the House to reject any cuts to the program.” *A vote for the motion was a vote to block consideration of the bill.* The motion was agreed to by a vote of 218-203. [H.Res. 298, [Vote #185](#), 4/18/23; CQ, [4/18/23](#); Congressional Record, [4/18/23](#)]

**13. March 28, 2023: Lawler Voted For Blocking Consideration Of Affirming Commitment To Protect And Strengthen Social Security And Medicare.** In March 2023, Lawler voted for: “Reschenthaler, R-Pa., motion to order the previous question (thus ending debate and possibility of amendment).” According to the Congressional Record, Rep. McGovern said, “Mr. Speaker, I urge that we

defeat the previous question. If we do, I will offer an amendment to the rule to provide for consideration of a resolution that affirms the House’s unwavering commitment to protect and strengthen Social Security and Medicare, and states that it is the position of the House of Representatives to reject any cuts to these programs.” *A vote for the motion was a vote to block consideration of the bill.* The motion was agreed to by a vote of 218-203. [H.Res. 260, [Vote #165](#), 3/28/23; CQ, [3/28/23](#); Congressional Record, [3/28/23](#)]

**14. March 23, 2023: Lawler Voted For Blocking Consideration Of A Resolution To Defend And Preserve Social Security And Medicare And Reject Cuts To The Programs.** In March 2023, Lawler voted for: “Houchin, R-Ind., motion to order the previous question (thus ending debate and possibility of amendment).” According to the Congressional Record, Rep. Scanlon said, “Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to provide for consideration of a resolution that states the House’s unyielding responsibility to defend and preserve Social Security and Medicare for generations to come and to affirm that it is the position of the House to reject any cuts to these vital programs.” *A vote for the motion was a vote to block consideration of the bill.* The motion was agreed to by a vote of 219-204. [H.Res. 241, [Vote #146](#), 3/23/23; CQ, [3/23/23](#); Congressional Record, [3/23/23](#)]

**15. March 8, 2023: Lawler Voted For Blocking Consideration Of Affirming Commitment To Protect Social Security And Medicare And To Reject Cuts To The Programs.** In March 2023, Lawler voted for: “Massie, R-Ky., motion to order the previous question (thus ending debate and possibility of amendment).” According to the Congressional Record, Rep. McGovern said, “Madam Speaker, I urge that we defeat the previous question, and if we do, I will offer an amendment to the rule to provide for consideration of a resolution that affirms the House’s unwavering commitment to protect and strengthen Social Security and Medicare and states that it is the position of the House to reject any cuts in the program.” *A vote for the motion was a vote to block consideration of the bill.* The motion was agreed to by a vote of 217-205. [H.Res. 199, [Vote #134](#), 3/8/23; CQ, [3/8/23](#); Congressional Record, [3/8/23](#)]

**16. February 28, 2023: Lawler Voted For Blocking Consideration Of Affirming Commitment To Protect And Strengthen Social Security And Medicare And Reject Cuts To The Programs.** In February 2023, Lawler voted for: “Burgess, R-Texas, motion to order the previous question (thus ending debate and possibility of amendment).” According to the Congressional Record, Rep. McGovern said, “Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to provide for consideration of a resolution that affirms the House’s unwavering commitment to protect and strengthen Social Security and Medicare and states that it is the position of the House to reject any cuts to the programs.” *A vote for the motion was a vote to block consideration of the bill.* The motion was agreed to by a vote of 213-201. [H.Res. 166, [Vote #122](#), 2/28/23; CQ, [2/28/23](#); Congressional Record, [2/28/23](#)]

**17. February 7, 2023: Lawler Voted For Blocking Consideration Of Certification That A Bill Won’t Decrease Social Security Benefits Before It Can Take Effect.** In February 2023, Lawler voted for: “Langworthy, R-N.Y., motion to order the previous question (thus ending debate and possibility of amendment).” According to the Congressional Record, Rep. Scanlon said, “Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to ensure that H.R. 185 does not take effect unless it is certified that it won’t decrease Social Security benefits.” *A vote for the motion was a vote to block consideration of the bill.* The motion was agreed to by a vote of 217-208. [H.Res. 97, [Vote #108](#), 2/7/23; CQ, [2/7/23](#); Congressional Record, [2/7/23](#)]

**18. February 1, 2023: Lawler Voted For Blocking Consideration Of Preventing Bills Under Consideration From Decreasing Social Security Benefits.** In January 2023, Lawler voted for: “Reschenthaler, R-Pa., motion to order the previous question (thus ending debate and possibility of amendment).” According to the Congressional Record, Rep. McGovern said, “Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to this rule to include this important amendment and give every Member on the floor the opportunity to clarify that existing Federal programs like Social

Security and Medicare are not under attack by this new Congress.” *A vote for the motion was a vote to block consideration of the bill.* The motion was agreed to by a vote of 219-207. [H. Res. 83, [Vote #101](#), 2/1/23; CQ, [2/1/23](#); Congressional Record, [2/1/23](#)]

**19. January 31, 2023: Lawler Voted For Blocking Consideration Of Preventing Bills Under Consideration From Decreasing Social Security Benefits.** In January 2023, Lawler voted for: “Burgess, R-Texas, motion to order the previous question (thus ending debate and possibility of amendment).” According to the Congressional Record, Rep. McGovern said, “Madam Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to ensure that none of the bills in this rule take effect unless it is certified that they do not decrease Social Security benefits.” *A vote for the motion was a vote to block consideration of the bill.* The motion was agreed to by a vote of 218-209. [H.Res. 75, [Vote #95](#), 1/31/23; CQ, [1/31/23](#); Congressional Record, [1/31/23](#)]

### ...And Opposed Capping The Cost Of The Lifesaving Drug Insulin.

**August 2022: Lawler Said, “I Would Not Have Supported The Quote Unquote Inflation Reduction Act.”** “ASTORINO: “Mike, let me ask you. You’ve got inflation running rampant, right now, people can’t afford it. Let’s talk about that first. What are some of the things that you would do to stop this economy from spinning out of control?” LAWLER: “Well you know, first and foremost I would not have supported the quote unquote Inflation Reduction Act. It is nothing more than a slimmed down version of Build Back Better which was, you know, the progressive pipedream and incorporated a lot of the Green New Deal into it. Sean Patrick Maloney was a proud original cosponsor, he tells everybody, original cosponsor of the Green New Deal.” [Mike Lawler, Facebook, 7:03, [8/22/22](#)] (VIDEO)

- **IRA Capped Copays For Insulin At \$35 For Medicare Patients.** “A new legislative package signed into law by President Joe Biden on Tuesday is a big win for Medicare patients who struggle to cover the cost of insulin to manage their diabetes. But the bill, called the Inflation Reduction Act, falls short of applying those cost controls to the broader patient population who rely on insulin. The bill limits insulin copays to \$35 per month for Medicare Part D beneficiaries starting in 2023. Notably, seniors covered by Medicare also have a \$2,000 annual out-of-pocket cap on Part D prescription drugs starting in 2025. Medicare will also now have the ability to negotiate the costs of certain prescription drugs.” [CNBC, [8/16/22](#)]

**August 2022: Lawler Called Build Back Better A “Progressive Pipedream” That “Incorporated A Lot Of The Green New Deal Into It.”** “ASTORINO: “Mike, let me ask you. You’ve got inflation running rampant, right now, people can’t afford it. Let’s talk about that first. What are some of the things that you would do to stop this economy from spinning out of control?” LAWLER: “Well you know, first and foremost I would not have supported the quote unquote Inflation Reduction Act. It is nothing more than a slimmed down version of Build Back Better which was, you know, the progressive pipedream and incorporated a lot of the Green New Deal into it. Sean Patrick Maloney was a proud original cosponsor, he tells everybody, original cosponsor of the Green New Deal.” [Mike Lawler, Facebook, 07:03, [8/22/22](#)] (VIDEO)

- **Build Back Better Would Have Capped Insulin Copays For Patients On Medicare And Private Insurance Plans At \$35 Per Month.** “The BBBA would require insurers, including Medicare Part D plans and private group or individual health plans, to charge patient cost-sharing of no more than \$35 per month for insulin products. Private group or individual plans would not be required to cover all insulin products, just one of each dosage form (vial, pen) and insulin type (rapid-acting, short-acting, intermediate-acting, and long-acting), for no more than \$35.” [KFF, [11/23/21](#)]

## If Lawler Had His Way, Insurance Companies Would Be Able To Deny People Health Care If They Have Pre-Existing Conditions Like Cancer And Diabetes.

**October 2013: Lawler Tweeted That “Obamacare [Was] An Absolute Disaster.”** Lawler wrote, “After the shutdown two things remain: Obamacare’s an absolute disaster and our debt is \$17 trillion. Obama has no plan to address either.” [Mike Lawler, Twitter, [10/17/13](#)]



[Mike Lawler, Twitter, [10/17/13](#)]

**Prior To The ACA, Insurers Labeled Cancer, Diabetes, And Asthma As Pre-Existing Conditions That Could Result In Denial Of Coverage Or Higher Premiums.** “A ‘pre-existing condition’ is a health condition that exists before someone applies for or enrolls in a new health insurance policy. Insurers generally define what constitutes a pre-existing condition. Some are obvious, like currently having heart disease or cancer. Others are less so – such as having asthma or high blood pressure. While insurers generally determine the presence of a pre-existing condition based on an applicant’s current health status, sometimes a healthy applicant can be deemed to have a pre-existing condition based on a past health problem or evidence of treatment for a particular condition. Prior to the Affordable Care Act, in the vast majority of States, insurance companies in the individual and small group markets could deny coverage, charge higher premiums, and/or limit benefits to individuals based on pre-existing conditions. A recent national survey found that 36 percent of those who tried to purchase health insurance directly from an insurance company in the individual insurance market were turned down, were charged more, or had a specific health problem excluded from their coverage. Another survey found that 54 percent of people with individual market insurance were worried that their insurer would drop their coverage if they got really sick.” [Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, [9/6/23](#)]

**2018: 3.2 Million New Yorkers Had A Preexisting Condition That Could Have Led Them To Be Denied Health Insurance If The ACA Was Repealed.** “In 2018, 26 percent of all New Yorkers ages 18 to 64 (3,200,000 New Yorkers) and 28 percent of New York women ages 18 to 64 had a preexisting condition that could have denied them health coverage in the individual health insurance marketplace prior to the ACA’s passage – including pregnancy.” [Children’s Defense Fund New York, ACA Repeal Fact Sheet, accessed [8/26/24](#)]

## Mondaire Jones Message #1 Backup

*Mondaire Jones is not afraid to stand up to his own party to tackle the border crisis head-on. He supports legislation that would give the President emergency powers to shut down the border and fund more security and personnel at the border. In Congress, he voted for increased funding for border security and border patrol agents to keep us safe.*

## Mondaire Jones Is Not Afraid To Stand Up To His Own Party To Tackle The Border Crisis Head-On.

**Jones Criticized Biden For Acting Too Slowly To Secure The Border.** “Asked if he had any criticism of how the Biden administration had handled immigration, Jones did: he said it acted too slowly to secure the border. ‘People understand — Democrats, Republicans, independents alike — that we ought to have a secure border,’ he said.” [LoHud, [10/2/24](#)]

## He Supports Legislation That Would Give The President Emergency Powers To Shut Down The Border And Fund More Security And Personnel At The Border.

**2024: Jones Endorsed The Bipartisan Border Deal In The Senate, Which Gave The President New Authority To Close The Border.** “Jones, who represented a different configuration of the 17th District in 2021 and 2022, is squarely behind a different border-and-immigration bill: the bipartisan Senate plan that stalled this year after Donald Trump objected and Republican support dried up as a result. Among other things, it would empower the president to close the border if migration surges.” [LoHud, [9/26/24](#)]

**Sen. Lankford: Immigration Deal Would Fund A Border Wall, Add More Border Agents, And Increase Deportation Flights.** “Senator James Lankford (R-OK) issued the following statement today to announce significant border security policy to the supplemental national security request from the White House: ‘The border security bill will put a huge number of new enforcement tools in the hands of a future administration and push the current Administration to finally stop the illegal flow. The bill provides funding to build the wall, increase technology at the border, and add more detention beds, more agents, and more deportation flights. The border security bill ends the abuse of parole on our southwest border that has waived in over a million people. It dramatically changes our ambiguous asylum laws by conducting fast screenings at a higher standard of evidence, limited appeals, and fast deportation.’” [Sen. Lankford, Press Release, [2/4/24](#)]

- **NBC News: The Bipartisan Border Package Would Have Been “The Most Aggressive Border Security And Migration Overhaul Bill In Decades If It Pass[ed] Congress.”** “Senators released the long-awaited text of a bipartisan agreement to impose tougher immigration and asylum laws Sunday, as Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer eyes votes on the package this week. The \$118 billion package includes a series of provisions aimed at reducing record high crossings at the southern border and tightening an asylum system that has been overwhelmed by migrants fleeing their homes to seek refuge. It also includes critical aid to Israel, Ukraine and Taiwan, which Republicans have said they’ll only support if it is paired with significant new U.S. immigration restrictions. The agreement — reached by Sens. James Lankford, R-Okla., Chris Murphy, D-Conn., and Kyrsten Sinema, I-Ariz. — would be the most aggressive border security and migration overhaul bill in decades if it passes Congress. It would raise the standard to get asylum, send away those who don’t qualify and expedite cases for those who do.” [NBC News, [2/4/24](#)]

## In Congress, He Voted For Increased Funding For Border Security And Border Patrol Agents To Keep Us Safe.

**2022: Jones Voted For \$36.09 Billion CBP Funding.** [H.R. 2617, [Vote #549](#), CQ Fact Sheet, [12/22/22](#); H.R. 2471, [Vote #65](#); CQ Fact Sheet, [3/9/22](#)]

| Bill | Area | Amount | Citation |
|------|------|--------|----------|
|------|------|--------|----------|

|                                    |  |                        |  |
|------------------------------------|--|------------------------|--|
| Fiscal 2023 Omnibus Appropriations | U.S. Customs and Border Protection                       | \$16.7 billion         | H.R. 2617, <a href="#">Vote #549</a> , CQ Fact Sheet, <a href="#">12/22/22</a> |
|                                    | U.S. Customs and Border Protection (Fee-Funded Programs) | \$2.0 billion          |  |
| Fiscal 2022 Omnibus Appropriations | U.S. Customs and Border Protection                       | \$14.8 billion         | H.R. 2471, <a href="#">Vote #65</a> ; CQ Fact Sheet, <a href="#">3/9/22</a>    |
|                                    | U.S. Customs and Border Protection (Fee-Funded Programs) | \$1.6 billion          |  |
|                                    | U.S. Customs and Border Protection (border management)   | \$994 million          |  |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                       |  | <b>\$36.09 billion</b> |  |

[H.R. 2617, [Vote #549](#), CQ Fact Sheet, [12/22/22](#); H.R. 2471, [Vote #65](#); CQ Fact Sheet, [3/9/22](#)]

**The FY 2023 Omnibus Included A 12 Percent Funding Increase For CBP, In Addition To A \$1.9 Billion Allocation For Border Management.** “Exclusive of fee-funded programs, the measure provides \$16.7 billion for Customs and Border Protection (12% more than FY 2022) and \$8.4 billion for Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE; 2% more), although it separately provides an additional \$1.9 billion to those and other agencies for border management.. For ICE it increases funding for immigration enforcement and removal activities by \$6 million, while providing 3% more for homeland security investigations.” [H.R. 2617, [Vote #549](#), CQ Fact Sheet, [12/22/22](#)]

- **The FY 2023 Budget Included Funding For 19,855 Border Patrol Agents, An Increase Of 300 Agents.** “Border Patrol Hiring.-The agreement provides funding for 19,855 Border Patrol agents, an increase of 300 above the level funded in fiscal year 2022. In light of the Border Patrol's ongoing recruitment and attrition challenges, funding that is unable to be executed for new hiring in fiscal year 2023 is available for additional targeted Border Patrol Agent hiring and retention efforts; hiring processing coordinators and professional staff that relieve agents of administrative duties; and for morale efforts, to include increasing the uniform allowance.” [House Appropriations Committee, Statement on Division F – Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, [12/19/22](#)]

**The FY 2022 Omnibus Included A 26 Percent Increase In Funding For Border Patrol Operations.** “Exclusive of fee-funded programs, the measure provides \$14.8 billion for Customs and Border Protection (3% less than FY 2021) and \$8.3 billion for Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE; 4% more), although it separately provides an additional \$1.4 billion to those and other agencies for border management. Senate Republican appropriators say that with the additional funding, \$6.16 billion is provided for U.S. Border Patrol operations, 26% more than FY 2021.” [H.R. 2471, [Vote #65](#); CQ Fact Sheet, [3/9/22](#)]

## Mondaire Jones Message #2 Backup

*After Mondaire’s grandfather died of cancer, he saw his grandmother work well past the retirement age just to pay for the high costs of prescription drugs and procedures not fully covered by Medicare. It is why Mondaire fought to make life-saving medications more affordable for seniors and why he will also fight to preserve Social Security for our future generations so our seniors can retire with dignity.*

**After Mondaire’s Grandfather Died Of Cancer, He Saw His Grandmother Work Well Past The Retirement Age Just To Pay For The High Costs Of Prescription Drugs And Procedures Not Fully Covered By Medicare.**

**Jones: “After My Grandfather Died Of Cancer, I Watched Helplessly As My Grandmother Worked Well Past The Age Of Retirement Just To Pay For The High Cost Of Prescription Drugs**

**And Medical Procedures Not Fully Covered By Medicare As We Know It.”** “After my grandfather died of cancer, I watched helplessly as my grandmother worked well past the age of retirement just to pay for the high cost of prescription drugs and medical procedures not fully covered by Medicare as we know it. When I quit my job to try to better my community by running for Congress, I lost my health insurance. I believe health care should be a human right in the richest nation on Earth, not tied to employment status or economic means.” [Nyack, NY Patch, [6/16/20](#)]

## **It Is Why Mondaire Fought To Make Life-Saving Medications More Affordable For Seniors...**

**August 2022: Jones Voted For Passing The Inflation Reduction Act Through Reconciliation.** In August 2022 Jones voted for: “Yarmuth, D-Ky., motion to concur in the Senate amendment to the bill comprising a package of climate, tax and health care provisions. Among drug pricing provisions, the bill would require the Health and Human Services Department to negotiate a ‘maximum fair price’ with drug manufacturers for certain Medicare-eligible, brand-name drugs that do not have generic competition; cap cost-sharing for insulin products covered under Medicare at \$35 a month; and require single-source drug manufacturers to provide rebates to HHS for the price of drugs under Medicare Parts B and D for which price increases outpace inflation. For Medicare Part D, it would cap the annual out-of-pocket limit at \$2,000. It would extend through 2025 tax subsidies toward Affordable Care Act marketplace insurance premiums for individuals under a certain income level. The bill would provide for approximately \$270 billion in new or expanded tax credits to incentivize actions by businesses and individuals to mitigate climate change, including production credits for electricity produced by renewable and nuclear facilities; investment tax credits for certain renewable energy equipment and facilities; and credits for advanced energy manufacturing projects, including in areas where a coal mine or power plant has closed. To incentivize emission reduction and clean fuel production, it would create or extend tax credits for carbon oxide sequestration facilities; biodiesel, renewable diesel and alternative fuels; and clean hydrogen facilities. For most of its corporate tax credits, it would add prevailing wage and apprenticeship requirements and establish bonus credits for using domestic materials in facility construction. It would also expand individual tax credits for residential energy efficiency improvements and renewable energy expenses; increase credits for new energy efficient homes; and create credits for the purchase of used electric vehicles by individuals under a certain income level. It would reinstate the Superfund tax on crude oil at a rate of 16.4 cents per barrel. Among other tax provisions, the bill would establish a 15 percent alternative minimum tax for corporations with a book income of at least \$1 million annually and institute a 1 percent excise tax on corporate stock buybacks. It would authorize \$79.3 billion for IRS operations, including enforcement activities and systems modernization. The bill would provide funding for various activities to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, promote energy-efficient technologies and mitigate the impacts of climate change, including \$27 billion for grants to state, local and nonprofit entities for greenhouse gas emission reduction activities; \$9.7 billion for zero-emission or carbon capture rural electric systems; \$5 billion for loan guarantees to replace or reduce emissions of energy infrastructure; \$3 billion for zero-emission vehicles for the Postal Service; and \$1.6 billion for methane emissions reduction and mitigation. It would provide \$9 billion for residential energy efficiency improvement rebates; \$3 billion for new EPA environmental and climate justice block grants for community-led activities to address pollution, emission reduction, climate resiliency and public engagement; and \$3 billion for Federal Highway Administration grants for projects that address surface transportation facilities that disconnect or negatively impact communities. It would provide \$4 billion for drought mitigation in Western states; \$2.15 billion for hazardous fuel reduction and restoration projects; and \$1 billion to improve energy and water efficiency or climate resilience of affordable housing. It would require the Interior Department to accept bids for certain canceled oil and gas leases on the outer continental shelf. It would authorize wind lease sales adjacent to U.S. territories but prohibit new wind or

solar development rights on federal lands for 10 years unless the department completes certain oil or gas lease sales.” The bill passed by a vote of 220-207. [H.R. 5376, [Vote #420](#), 8/12/22; CQ, [8/12/22](#)]

**NBC: The Inflation Reduction Act “Is Set To Lower The Cost Of Prescription Drugs.”** “The Inflation Reduction Act, signed into law by President Joe Biden, is set to lower the cost of prescription drugs — including cancer medications, blood thinners and insulin — for millions of Americans, experts say. Exorbitant drug prices in the United States are a key reason many people in the U.S. are forced to skip or delay filling their needed prescriptions. A Kaiser Family Foundation poll published last month found that nearly 1 in 2 adults report difficulty affording their health care expenses, including their prescribed medications.” [NBC, [8/16/22](#)]

**The Inflation Reduction Act Capped Out-Of-Pocket Costs At \$2,000 For Seniors Under Medicare Part D.** “Medicare is poised to renegotiate the prices of some of its most expensive drugs through a historic expansion of its power, which could reduce costs for many seniors as well as federal spending on its prescription drug plan. The changes are tucked inside a massive spending-and-tax bill in Congress that includes \$433 billion in investments in health-care and clean energy. House Democrats passed the Inflation Reduction Act on Friday in a 220 to 207 vote along party lines, ending a tortured legislative process that took more than a year. The bill empowers the Health and Human Services Secretary to negotiate prices for certain drugs covered under two different parts of Medicare and punish pharmaceutical companies that don’t play by the rules. The legislation also caps out-of-pocket costs at \$2,000 starting in 2025 for people who participate in Medicare Part D, the prescription drug plan for seniors.” [CNBC, [8/12/22](#)]

- **AARP CEO Jo Ann Jenkins On The Inflation Reduction Act: Millions Of Older Adults Are Now “One Step Closer To Real Relief From Out-Of-Control Prescription Drug Prices.”** “Medicare is poised to renegotiate the prices of some of its most expensive drugs through a historic expansion of its power, which could reduce costs for many seniors as well as federal spending on its prescription drug plan. The changes are tucked inside a massive spending-and-tax bill in Congress that includes \$433 billion in investments in health-care and clean energy. House Democrats passed the Inflation Reduction Act on Friday in a 220 to 207 vote along party lines, ending a tortured legislative process that took more than a year. [...] The American Association of Retired Persons, which represents 38 million people, described the legislation as a historic victory for older adults. AARP CEO Jo Ann Jenkins said the group has fought for nearly two decades to allow Medicare to negotiate drug prices. Millions of older adults are now “one step closer to real relief from out-of-control prescription drug prices,” Jenkins said earlier this week.” [CNBC, [8/12/22](#)]

**The IRA Allowed Medicare To Negotiate Drug Prices, Reducing Drug Costs For Seniors And Federal Spending.** “Medicare is poised to renegotiate the prices of some of its most expensive drugs through a historic expansion of its power, which could reduce costs for many seniors as well as federal spending on its prescription drug plan. The changes are tucked inside a massive spending-and-tax bill in Congress that includes \$433 billion in investments in health-care and clean energy. House Democrats passed the Inflation Reduction Act on Friday in a 220 to 207 vote along party lines, ending a tortured legislative process that took more than a year. The bill empowers the Health and Human Services Secretary to negotiate prices for certain drugs covered under two different parts of Medicare and punish pharmaceutical companies that don’t play by the rules. The legislation also caps out-of-pocket costs at \$2,000 starting in 2025 for people who participate in Medicare Part D, the prescription drug plan for seniors.” [CNBC, [8/12/22](#)]

**The IRA Required Drug Companies That Raised Prices More Than The Rate Of Inflation To Rebate Medicare The Amount Over The Inflation Rate.** “President Joe Biden signed the Inflation Reduction Act of 2022 on Aug. 16. This historic legislation will help millions of Medicare enrollees





better afford their life-sustaining medications, and millions more Americans will be able to pay their Affordable Care Act premiums. [...] Here are the main elements of the health care portions of the new law. [...] Beginning in October, if the price of a Part D prescription drug is raised by more than the rate of general inflation, the drugmaker will have to rebate to Medicare the amount of the increase above the inflation rate. Rebates for higher-than-inflation price hikes for medications covered under Medicare Part B (usually office-based infusions, such as for cancer drugs) will begin in January 2023.” [AARP, [8/16/22](#)]

**IRA Capped Copays For Insulin At \$35 For Medicare Patients.** “A new legislative package signed into law by President Joe Biden on Tuesday is a big win for Medicare patients who struggle to cover the cost of insulin to manage their diabetes. But the bill, called the Inflation Reduction Act, falls short of applying those cost controls to the broader patient population who rely on insulin. The bill limits insulin copays to \$35 per month for Medicare Part D beneficiaries starting in 2023. Notably, seniors covered by Medicare also have a \$2,000 annual out-of-pocket cap on Part D prescription drugs starting in 2025. Medicare will also now have the ability to negotiate the costs of certain prescription drugs.” [CNBC, [8/16/22](#)]

**...And Why He Will Also Fight To Preserve Social Security For Our Future Generations So Our Seniors Can Retire With Dignity.**

**May 2024: Jones Called For “Defend[ing] Social Security And Medicare.”** [Mondaire Jones, Twitter, [5/5/24](#)]



There is so much on the line this election. We must:

- ✓ Restore Roe v. Wade
- ✓ Ban assault weapons
- ✓ Pass a universal background checks law
- ✓ Protect the ACA
- ✓ Defend Social Security and Medicare
- ✓ Save our democracy

We must defeat Mike Lawler and take back the House.



7:11 PM · May 5, 2024 · 15.2K Views

[Mondaire Jones, Twitter, [5/5/24](#)]

## Mondaire Jones Message #3 Backup

*Mondaire believes too many politicians get elected and then forget about the people who elected them. That's why he cosponsored a law to prevent members of Congress from getting rich off the stock market and why he doesn't take a penny from corporate PACs. Mondaire is running for Congress to give a voice to people like his grandparents, a janitor and a house cleaner, and all of the other hard-working people in our area.*

**Mondaire Believes Too Many Politicians Get Elected And Then Forget About The People Who Elected Them.**

*Substantiated below*



## **That's Why He Cosponsored A Law To Prevent Members Of Congress From Getting Rich Off The Stock Market...**

**January 2021: Jones Cosponsored The TRUST In Congress Act.** [H.R.336, cosponsored [1/15/21](#)]

**The TRUST In Congress Act Would Require Members Of Congress, As Well As Their Spouses And Dependent Children, To Place Investments In A Blind Qualified Trust.** “This bill requires a Member of Congress, as well as any spouse or dependent child of a Member, to place specified investments into a qualified blind trust (i.e., an arrangement in which certain financial holdings are placed in someone else's control to avoid a possible conflict of interest) until 180 days after the end of their tenure as a Member of Congress. [H.R.336, introduced [1/15/21](#)]

## **...And Why He Doesn't Take A Penny From Corporate PACs.**

**Jones: “I Don't Take Corporate PAC Money.”** “While Mike Lawler was getting caught defunding law enforcement and blocking a bipartisan border security bill, our grassroots campaign has raised nearly \$4 million thus far this cycle because of the incredible support from everyday people across the Lower Hudson Valley,’ Jones said in a statement. ‘And unlike my oil and gas lobbyist opponent, I don't take corporate PAC money.’” [Politico, [4/9/24](#)]

**Nyack News & Views Jones Op-Ed Headline: “Why I'm Not Taking Corporate PAC Money”**  
[Mondaire Jones Op-Ed, Nyack News & Views, [6/20/20](#)]

## **Mondaire Is Running For Congress To Give A Voice To People Like His Grandparents, A Janitor And A House Cleaner, And All Of The Other Hard-Working People In Our Area.**

**Jones: “My Grandfather Was A Janitor At Our Local Middle School, And Later, He Was A Small Business Owner. My Grandmother Cleaned Homes, And When Day Care Was Too Expensive, She Took Me To Work With Her.”** “My mom got help from my grandparents. My grandfather was a janitor at our local middle school, and later, he was a small business owner. My grandmother cleaned homes, and when day care was too expensive, she took me to work with her. Now, I'm running to represent the same people whose homes I watched my grandmother clean growing up. When we talk about the fight for universal child care, that's a fight I'm invested in based on my own experience.” [Nyack, NY Patch, [6/16/20](#)]

## **Mondaire Jones Message #4 Backup**

*Mondaire is endorsed by Planned Parenthood because he is a champion for reproductive rights. He will tirelessly defend a woman's right to make her own health care decisions, protect access to birth control and IVF, and fight against the push for a national abortion ban that would end abortion even in New York.*

## **Mondaire Is Endorsed By Planned Parenthood Because He Is A Champion For Reproductive Rights.**

**February 2024: Planned Parenthood Action Fund Endorsed Jones.** “Today, Planned Parenthood



Action Fund announced its endorsement of 19 sexual and reproductive health champions running for the House of Representatives. These candidates are the Action Fund's first non-incumbent House endorsements this election cycle: [...] New York: Mondaire Jones, NY-17, and Josh Riley, NY-19." [Planned Parenthood Action Fund, Press Release, [2/15/24](#)]

## **He Will Tirelessly Defend A Woman's Right To Make Her Own Health Care Decisions, Protect Access To Birth Control And IVF, And Fight Against The Push For A National Abortion Ban That Would End Abortion Even In New York.**

**June 2021: Jones Cosponsored The Women's Health Protection Act.** [H.R.3755, cosponsored [6/8/21](#)]

- **July 2022: Jones Voted For The Women's Health Protection Act To Establish The Statutory Right For Patients To Receive And For Providers To Provide Abortions And To Prohibit Certain State Restrictions On Abortion.** In July 2022, Jones voted for: "Passage of the bill that would statutorily establish that health care providers have a right to provide and patients have a right to receive abortion services, and it would prohibit certain restrictions related to abortion services. The bill would specify that rights established by the bill may not be restricted by certain requirements or limitations related to abortion services, including prohibitions on abortion prior to fetal viability, or after fetal viability if a provider determines that continuation of a pregnancy would pose a risk to a patient's life or health; requirements that patients disclose reasons for seeking an abortion or make medically unnecessary in-person appointments; requirements that providers provide medically inaccurate information or perform specific medical tests or procedures in connection with the provision of abortion services; limitations on providers' ability to prescribe drugs based on good-faith medical judgment, provide services via telemedicine or provide immediate services when a delay would pose a risk to a patient's health; and requirements for facilities and personnel that would not apply to facilities providing medically comparable procedures. It would also prohibit requirements or limitations that are similar to those established by the bill or that impede access to abortion services and expressly or implicitly single out abortion services, providers or facilities. It would specify factors that courts may consider to determine whether a requirement or limitation impedes access to abortion services, including whether it interferes with providers' ability to provide services; poses a risk to patients' health; is likely to delay or deter patients in accessing services or necessitate in-person visits that would not otherwise be required; is likely to result in a decreased availability of services in a state or region; is likely to result in increased costs of providing or obtaining services; or imposes penalties that are not imposed on other health care providers for comparable conduct. It would require a party defending a requirement or limitation to establish that it significantly advances the safety of abortion services or patient health and that such goals cannot be advanced by a less restrictive alternative measure. It would authorize the Justice Department, health care providers and private individuals and entities to bring a civil action in U.S. district court for injunctive relief against any state or government official charged with implementing or enforcing a requirement or limitation challenged as a violation of rights established by the bill. It would authorize district courts to award appropriate equitable relief, including temporary, preliminary or permanent injunctive relief, and to award costs of litigation to a prevailing plaintiff. It would require courts to 'liberally construe' provisions of the bill to effectuate its purposes. The bill is substantively identical to HR 3755, which the House passed in September 2021, but adds findings related to the June 2022 Supreme Court decision in *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization*." The bill passed by a vote of 219-210. [H.R. 8296, [Vote #360](#), 7/15/22; CQ, [7/15/22](#)]
- **The Women's Health Protection Act Would Federally Codify Protections From *Roe V. Wade*.** "As a leaked draft opinion of a Supreme Court ruling shows a conservative majority of justices appear poised to overturn federal protections of abortion rights, Senate Majority Leader Chuck

Schumer said Thursday the Senate will hold a procedural vote to begin debate on the Women's Health Protection Act next week. WHPA is a bill that aims to codify Roe v. Wade, the landmark decision that grants protections for a woman's right to abortion, at the federal level. The bill prohibits governmental restrictions on access to abortion services, according to the Congressional Research Service.” [ABC, [5/7/22](#)]

- **Federally Codifying Protections From Roe Would Prevent States From Passing “Full Bans” On Abortion Following The Overturning Of Roe.** “Congressional Democrats have mulled options to guarantee the 1973 Roe v. Wade ruling’s protections since a leaked majority draft indicated in May that the Supreme Court would reverse the decision. The majority conservative court indeed overturned Roe last week, sparking nationwide tumult among abortion-rights advocates and celebrations by their anti-abortion counterparts. The reversal returns the power to state legislatures to pass full bans on abortion. The ruling, which stood for nearly 50 years, had nullified broad bans on the procedure and established it as a constitutional right. Now Democrats are pushing to effectively restore that right by ‘codifying’ Roe v. Wade.” [USA Today, [6/30/22](#)]

**July 2022: Jones Cosponsored The Right To Contraception Act.** [H.R.8373, [7/14/22](#)]

- **July 2022: Jones Voted For The Right To Contraception Act To Establish A Statutory Right For Individuals To Obtain And Health Care Providers To Provide Contraceptives.** In July 2022 Jones voted for: “Passage of the bill that would establish that individuals have a statutory right to obtain contraceptives and health care providers have a right to provide contraceptives, contraception and related information. It would prohibit any limitation or infringement of these rights that impedes access to or singles out the provision or providers of contraceptives, contraception or related information. It would supersede any federal and state law that conflicts with its provisions. It would allow the U.S. attorney general or a harmed individual to bring a civil action in U.S. district court for equitable relief against an individual who violates these provisions. It would allow health care providers to bring action on behalf of themselves, their staff or their patients.” The bill passed by a vote of 228-195. [H.R. 8373, [Vote #385](#), 7/21/22; CQ, [7/21/22](#)]
- **The Right To Contraception Act Would Codify Contraception Rights Federally And Prevent States From Restricting Access To Birth Control Pills, IUDs, And Emergency Contraception.** “A Democratic effort to codify the right to contraception in federal law sputtered at the Senate on partisan lines Wednesday. Failure in the tightly divided chamber was predictable, as Democrats attempted to fast-track the Right to Contraception Act by a process called unanimous consent, which allows a bill to go to the floor and pass if all senators agree. [...] Today the federal right to contraceptives is accepted in the United States because the Supreme Court decided in the 1965 case Griswold v. Connecticut that married couples have a constitutional right to buy and use contraceptives without government intrusion. The Right to Contraception Act would enshrine that understanding into federal statutory law. It would ban states from restricting access to the pill, IUDs and emergency contraceptives, while also giving both the attorney general and medical providers the authority to bring civil lawsuits against governments that restrict contraception access.” [Courthouse News Service, [7/27/22](#)]

**August 2024: Jones: IVF Should Be “Safe And Secure For Every American.”** “Jones repeatedly stressed this anti-choice voting as it is a well known Achilles heel of the Republican Party. Abortion is a hot-button issue, one that Jones seems to believe will unify and energize not only Democrats but New Yorkers overall with the majority of New York residents believing abortion should be legal in all or most cases. According to a poll conducted by the Siena College Research Institute, 64% of New Yorkers would support a constitutional amendment protecting the right to an abortion. Jones also criticized Lawler’s

new IVF legislation as a political ploy and stated that IVF should be ‘safe and secure for every American.’” [Rockland County Times, [8/18/24](#)]

**April 2024: Jones: “We Must Take Back The House To Stop Republicans From Passing A National Abortion Ban.”** [Mondaire Jones, Twitter, [4/16/24](#)]



[Mondaire Jones, Twitter, [4/16/24](#)]

- **Vox: A National Abortion Ban Would Supersede State Laws Meant To Protect Abortion Access.** “The repeal of Roe v. Wade left the United States with a patchwork of state laws governing abortion. In parts of the South, someone seeking an abortion would need to travel hundreds of miles to get one. But a national ban would supersede even permissive state laws in states that have been working to expand access to abortion. One estimate found that denying all wanted abortions would increase pregnancy-related deaths by 21 percent nationwide if there aren’t effective means for pregnant people to self-manage their abortions.” [Vox, [6/25/22](#)]

## Mondaire Jones Quick Messages Backup

### Jones Quick Message #1 Backup

*Mondaire was raised in Section 8 housing and on food stamps in Spring Valley by a single mom. When child care was too expensive, Mondaire’s grandmother took him to work with her cleaning homes in Hillcrest and Congers.*

## **Mondaire Was Raised In Section 8 Housing And On Food Stamps In Spring Valley By A Single Mom.**

**Mondaire Was Raised In Section 8 Housing And On Food Stamps In Spring Valley By A Single Mom.** “Jones was born in Rockland County, and he often talks about growing up in Spring Valley, a working-class suburban village with a large Black population, where he was raised by a single mother. She juggled multiple jobs, and they lived in Section 8 housing and relied on food stamps.” [City & State, [11/9/20](#)]

## **When Child Care Was Too Expensive, Mondaire’s Grandmother Took Him To Work With Her Cleaning Homes In Hillcrest And Congers.**

**Jones: “My Grandmother Cleaned Homes In Congers And Hillcrest, And When Day Care Was Too Expensive, She Took Me To Work With Her.”** “My mom got help raising me from my grandparents. My grandfather was a janitor at Pomona Middle School. My grandmother cleaned homes in Congers and Hillcrest, and when day care was too expensive, she took me to work with her. Now, I get to run to represent the same people whose homes I watched my grandmother clean growing up.” [Mondaire Jones Op-Ed, Nyack News & Views, [10/27/20](#)]

## **Jones Quick Message #2 Backup**

*Mondaire graduated from East Ramapo public schools and went on to earn his bachelor’s degree from Stanford University and graduate from Harvard Law School. Mondaire worked as a litigator in the Westchester County Attorney’s Office, where he defended correctional officers and took guns away from dangerous people.*

## **Mondaire Graduated From East Ramapo Public Schools And Went On To Earn His Bachelor’s Degree From Stanford University And Graduate From Harvard Law School.**

**Jones Attended East Ramapo Public Schools, Stanford University For His Undergraduate Education, And Harvard Law School.** “A product of East Ramapo public schools, Mr. Jones was raised in Section 8 housing and on food stamps in Spring Valley, NY by a single mother who worked multiple jobs to provide for their family. After graduating from Stanford University, Mr. Jones worked in the U.S. Department of Justice Office of Legal Policy, where he vetted candidates for federal judgeships and worked to reform our criminal legal system to make it more fair and equitable. He later graduated from Harvard Law School.” [U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, accessed [9/30/24](#)]

## **Mondaire Worked As A Litigator In The Westchester County Attorney’s Office, Where He Defended Correctional Officers And Took Guns Away From Dangerous People.**

**Jones Worked As A Litigator In The Westchester County Attorney’s Office, Where He Defended Correctional Officers And Took Guns Away From Dangerous People.** “Mondaire worked as a litigator in the Westchester County Attorney’s Office, where he defended correctional officers and took guns away from dangerous people.” [Mondaire Jones for Congress, accessed [9/30/24](#)]

## **Jones Quick Message #3 Backup**

*Mondaire Jones is running for Congress to lower costs, stop Republicans from banning abortion, protect Social Security and Medicare, secure our border, and get weapons of war off of our street.*

**Mondaire Jones Is Running For Congress To Lower Costs, Stop Republicans From Banning Abortion, Protect Social Security And Medicare, Secure Our Border, And Get Weapons Of War Off Of Our Street.**

**Jones Pledged To Lower Costs And Stop Republicans From Banning Abortion.** “Now Mondaire is running to return to Congress to finish the work he started to lower costs for Lower Hudson Valley residents, defend our democracy, raise wages, and stop Republicans from banning abortion.” [Mondaire Jones for Congress, accessed [9/30/24](#)]

**Jones Pledged To “Save Social Security & Medicare, Secure Our Border, And Get Assault Weapons Off Our Streets.”** [Mondaire Jones, Twitter, [8/11/24](#)]



[Mondaire Jones, Twitter, [8/11/24](#)]

**Jones Quick Message #4 Backup**

*After Mondaire’s grandfather died of cancer, he saw his grandmother work well past the retirement age just to pay for the high costs of prescription drugs and procedures not fully covered by Medicare. It is why Mondaire fought to make life-saving medications more affordable for seniors and why he will also fight to preserve Social Security for our future generations so our seniors can retire with dignity.*



## **After Mondaire’s Grandfather Died Of Cancer, He Saw His Grandmother Work Well Past The Retirement Age Just To Pay For The High Costs Of Prescription Drugs And Procedures Not Fully Covered By Medicare.**

**Jones: “After My Grandfather Died Of Cancer, I Watched Helplessly As My Grandmother Worked Well Past The Age Of Retirement Just To Pay For The High Cost Of Prescription Drugs And Medical Procedures Not Fully Covered By Medicare As We Know It.”** “After my grandfather died of cancer, I watched helplessly as my grandmother worked well past the age of retirement just to pay for the high cost of prescription drugs and medical procedures not fully covered by Medicare as we know it. When I quit my job to try to better my community by running for Congress, I lost my health insurance. I believe health care should be a human right in the richest nation on Earth, not tied to employment status or economic means.” [Nyack, NY Patch, [6/16/20](#)]

## **It Is Why Mondaire Fought To Make Life-Saving Medications More Affordable For Seniors...**

**August 2022: Jones Voted For Passing The Inflation Reduction Act Through Reconciliation.** In August 2022 Jones voted for: “Yarmuth, D-Ky., motion to concur in the Senate amendment to the bill comprising a package of climate, tax and health care provisions. Among drug pricing provisions, the bill would require the Health and Human Services Department to negotiate a ‘maximum fair price’ with drug manufacturers for certain Medicare-eligible, brand-name drugs that do not have generic competition; cap cost-sharing for insulin products covered under Medicare at \$35 a month; and require single-source drug manufacturers to provide rebates to HHS for the price of drugs under Medicare Parts B and D for which price increases outpace inflation. For Medicare Part D, it would cap the annual out-of-pocket limit at \$2,000. It would extend through 2025 tax subsidies toward Affordable Care Act marketplace insurance premiums for individuals under a certain income level. The bill would provide for approximately \$270 billion in new or expanded tax credits to incentivize actions by businesses and individuals to mitigate climate change, including production credits for electricity produced by renewable and nuclear facilities; investment tax credits for certain renewable energy equipment and facilities; and credits for advanced energy manufacturing projects, including in areas where a coal mine or power plant has closed. To incentivize emission reduction and clean fuel production, it would create or extend tax credits for carbon oxide sequestration facilities; biodiesel, renewable diesel and alternative fuels; and clean hydrogen facilities. For most of its corporate tax credits, it would add prevailing wage and apprenticeship requirements and establish bonus credits for using domestic materials in facility construction. It would also expand individual tax credits for residential energy efficiency improvements and renewable energy expenses; increase credits for new energy efficient homes; and create credits for the purchase of used electric vehicles by individuals under a certain income level. It would reinstate the Superfund tax on crude oil at a rate of 16.4 cents per barrel. Among other tax provisions, the bill would establish a 15 percent alternative minimum tax for corporations with a book income of at least \$1 million annually and institute a 1 percent excise tax on corporate stock buybacks. It would authorize \$79.3 billion for IRS operations, including enforcement activities and systems modernization. The bill would provide funding for various activities to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, promote energy-efficient technologies and mitigate the impacts of climate change, including \$27 billion for grants to state, local and nonprofit entities for greenhouse gas emission reduction activities; \$9.7 billion for zero-emission or carbon capture rural electric systems; \$5 billion for loan guarantees to replace or reduce emissions of energy infrastructure; \$3 billion for zero-emission vehicles for the Postal Service; and \$1.6 billion for methane emissions reduction and mitigation. It would provide \$9 billion for residential energy efficiency improvement rebates; \$3 billion for new EPA environmental and climate justice block grants for community-led activities to address pollution, emission reduction, climate resiliency and public engagement; and \$3 billion for Federal Highway Administration grants for projects that address surface

transportation facilities that disconnect or negatively impact communities. It would provide \$4 billion for drought mitigation in Western states; \$2.15 billion for hazardous fuel reduction and restoration projects; and \$1 billion to improve energy and water efficiency or climate resilience of affordable housing. It would require the Interior Department to accept bids for certain canceled oil and gas leases on the outer continental shelf. It would authorize wind lease sales adjacent to U.S. territories but prohibit new wind or solar development rights on federal lands for 10 years unless the department completes certain oil or gas lease sales.” The bill passed by a vote of 220-207. [H.R. 5376, [Vote #420](#), 8/12/22; CQ, [8/12/22](#)]

**NBC: The Inflation Reduction Act “Is Set To Lower The Cost Of Prescription Drugs.”** “The Inflation Reduction Act, signed into law by President Joe Biden, is set to lower the cost of prescription drugs — including cancer medications, blood thinners and insulin — for millions of Americans, experts say. Exorbitant drug prices in the United States are a key reason many people in the U.S. are forced to skip or delay filling their needed prescriptions. A Kaiser Family Foundation poll published last month found that nearly 1 in 2 adults report difficulty affording their health care expenses, including their prescribed medications.” [NBC, [8/16/22](#)]

**The Inflation Reduction Act Capped Out-Of-Pocket Costs At \$2,000 For Seniors Under Medicare Part D.** “Medicare is poised to renegotiate the prices of some of its most expensive drugs through a historic expansion of its power, which could reduce costs for many seniors as well as federal spending on its prescription drug plan. The changes are tucked inside a massive spending-and-tax bill in Congress that includes \$433 billion in investments in health-care and clean energy. House Democrats passed the Inflation Reduction Act on Friday in a 220 to 207 vote along party lines, ending a tortured legislative process that took more than a year. The bill empowers the Health and Human Services Secretary to negotiate prices for certain drugs covered under two different parts of Medicare and punish pharmaceutical companies that don’t play by the rules. The legislation also caps out-of-pocket costs at \$2,000 starting in 2025 for people who participate in Medicare Part D, the prescription drug plan for seniors.” [CNBC, [8/12/22](#)]

- **AARP CEO Jo Ann Jenkins On The Inflation Reduction Act: Millions Of Older Adults Are Now “One Step Closer To Real Relief From Out-Of-Control Prescription Drug Prices.”** “Medicare is poised to renegotiate the prices of some of its most expensive drugs through a historic expansion of its power, which could reduce costs for many seniors as well as federal spending on its prescription drug plan. The changes are tucked inside a massive spending-and-tax bill in Congress that includes \$433 billion in investments in health-care and clean energy. House Democrats passed the Inflation Reduction Act on Friday in a 220 to 207 vote along party lines, ending a tortured legislative process that took more than a year. [...] The American Association of Retired Persons, which represents 38 million people, described the legislation as a historic victory for older adults. AARP CEO Jo Ann Jenkins said the group has fought for nearly two decades to allow Medicare to negotiate drug prices. Millions of older adults are now “one step closer to real relief from out-of-control prescription drug prices,” Jenkins said earlier this week.” [CNBC, [8/12/22](#)]

**The IRA Allowed Medicare To Negotiate Drug Prices, Reducing Drug Costs For Seniors And Federal Spending.** “Medicare is poised to renegotiate the prices of some of its most expensive drugs through a historic expansion of its power, which could reduce costs for many seniors as well as federal spending on its prescription drug plan. The changes are tucked inside a massive spending-and-tax bill in Congress that includes \$433 billion in investments in health-care and clean energy. House Democrats passed the Inflation Reduction Act on Friday in a 220 to 207 vote along party lines, ending a tortured legislative process that took more than a year. The bill empowers the Health and Human Services Secretary to negotiate prices for certain drugs covered under two different parts of Medicare and punish pharmaceutical companies that don’t play by the rules. The legislation also caps out-of-pocket costs at



\$2,000 starting in 2025 for people who participate in Medicare Part D, the prescription drug plan for seniors.” [CNBC, [8/12/22](#)]

**The IRA Required Drug Companies That Raised Prices More Than The Rate Of Inflation To Rebate Medicare The Amount Over The Inflation Rate.** “President Joe Biden signed the Inflation Reduction Act of 2022 on Aug. 16. This historic legislation will help millions of Medicare enrollees better afford their life-sustaining medications, and millions more Americans will be able to pay their Affordable Care Act premiums. [...] Here are the main elements of the health care portions of the new law. [...] Beginning in October, if the price of a Part D prescription drug is raised by more than the rate of general inflation, the drugmaker will have to rebate to Medicare the amount of the increase above the inflation rate. Rebates for higher-than-inflation price hikes for medications covered under Medicare Part B (usually office-based infusions, such as for cancer drugs) will begin in January 2023.” [AARP, [8/16/22](#)]

**IRA Capped Copays For Insulin At \$35 For Medicare Patients.** “A new legislative package signed into law by President Joe Biden on Tuesday is a big win for Medicare patients who struggle to cover the cost of insulin to manage their diabetes. But the bill, called the Inflation Reduction Act, falls short of applying those cost controls to the broader patient population who rely on insulin. The bill limits insulin copays to \$35 per month for Medicare Part D beneficiaries starting in 2023. Notably, seniors covered by Medicare also have a \$2,000 annual out-of-pocket cap on Part D prescription drugs starting in 2025. Medicare will also now have the ability to negotiate the costs of certain prescription drugs.” [CNBC, [8/16/22](#)]

**...And Why He Will Also Fight To Preserve Social Security For Our Future Generations So Our Seniors Can Retire With Dignity.**

**May 2024: Jones Called For “Defend[ing] Social Security And Medicare.”** [Mondaire Jones, Twitter, [5/5/24](#)]



[Mondaire Jones, Twitter, [5/5/24](#)]

## Jones Quick Message #5 Backup

*Mondaire is endorsed by Planned Parenthood because he is a champion for reproductive rights. He will tirelessly defend a woman’s right to make her own health care decisions, protect access to birth control and IVF, and fight against the push for a national abortion ban that would end abortion even in New York.*

## Mondaire Is Endorsed By Planned Parenthood Because He Is A Champion For Reproductive Rights.

**February 2024: Planned Parenthood Action Fund Endorsed Jones.** “Today, Planned Parenthood Action Fund announced its endorsement of 19 sexual and reproductive health champions running for the House of Representatives. These candidates are the Action Fund’s first non-incumbent House endorsements this election cycle: [...] New York: Mondaire Jones, NY-17, and Josh Riley, NY-19.” [Planned Parenthood Action Fund, Press Release, [2/15/24](#)]

**He Will Tirelessly Defend A Woman's Right To Make Her Own Health Care Decisions, Protect Access To Birth Control And IVF, And Fight Against The Push For A National Abortion Ban That Would End Abortion Even In New York.**

**June 2021: Jones Cosponsored The Women's Health Protection Act.** [H.R.3755, cosponsored [6/8/21](#)]

- **July 2022: Jones Voted For The Women's Health Protection Act To Establish The Statutory Right For Patients To Receive And For Providers To Provide Abortions And To Prohibit Certain State Restrictions On Abortion.** In July 2022, Jones voted for: "Passage of the bill that would statutorily establish that health care providers have a right to provide and patients have a right to receive abortion services, and it would prohibit certain restrictions related to abortion services. The bill would specify that rights established by the bill may not be restricted by certain requirements or limitations related to abortion services, including prohibitions on abortion prior to fetal viability, or after fetal viability if a provider determines that continuation of a pregnancy would pose a risk to a patient's life or health; requirements that patients disclose reasons for seeking an abortion or make medically unnecessary in-person appointments; requirements that providers provide medically inaccurate information or perform specific medical tests or procedures in connection with the provision of abortion services; limitations on providers' ability to prescribe drugs based on good-faith medical judgment, provide services via telemedicine or provide immediate services when a delay would pose a risk to a patient's health; and requirements for facilities and personnel that would not apply to facilities providing medically comparable procedures. It would also prohibit requirements or limitations that are similar to those established by the bill or that impede access to abortion services and expressly or implicitly single out abortion services, providers or facilities. It would specify factors that courts may consider to determine whether a requirement or limitation impedes access to abortion services, including whether it interferes with providers' ability to provide services; poses a risk to patients' health; is likely to delay or deter patients in accessing services or necessitate in-person visits that would not otherwise be required; is likely to result in a decreased availability of services in a state or region; is likely to result in increased costs of providing or obtaining services; or imposes penalties that are not imposed on other health care providers for comparable conduct. It would require a party defending a requirement or limitation to establish that it significantly advances the safety of abortion services or patient health and that such goals cannot be advanced by a less restrictive alternative measure. It would authorize the Justice Department, health care providers and private individuals and entities to bring a civil action in U.S. district court for injunctive relief against any state or government official charged with implementing or enforcing a requirement or limitation challenged as a violation of rights established by the bill. It would authorize district courts to award appropriate equitable relief, including temporary, preliminary or permanent injunctive relief, and to award costs of litigation to a prevailing plaintiff. It would require courts to 'liberally construe' provisions of the bill to effectuate its purposes. The bill is substantively identical to HR 3755, which the House passed in September 2021, but adds findings related to the June 2022 Supreme Court decision in *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization*." The bill passed by a vote of 219-210. [H.R. 8296, [Vote #360](#), 7/15/22; CQ, [7/15/22](#)]
- **The Women's Health Protection Act Would Federally Codify Protections From *Roe V. Wade*.** "As a leaked draft opinion of a Supreme Court ruling shows a conservative majority of justices appear poised to overturn federal protections of abortion rights, Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer said Thursday the Senate will hold a procedural vote to begin debate on the Women's Health Protection Act next week. WHPA is a bill that aims to codify *Roe v. Wade*, the landmark decision that grants protections for a woman's right to abortion, at the federal level. The bill prohibits governmental restrictions on access to abortion services, according to the Congressional Research Service." [ABC, [5/7/22](#)]

- **Federally Codifying Protections From Roe Would Prevent States From Passing “Full Bans” On Abortion Following The Overturning Of Roe.** “Congressional Democrats have mulled options to guarantee the 1973 Roe v. Wade ruling’s protections since a leaked majority draft indicated in May that the Supreme Court would reverse the decision. The majority conservative court indeed overturned Roe last week, sparking nationwide tumult among abortion-rights advocates and celebrations by their anti-abortion counterparts. The reversal returns the power to state legislatures to pass full bans on abortion. The ruling, which stood for nearly 50 years, had nullified broad bans on the procedure and established it as a constitutional right. Now Democrats are pushing to effectively restore that right by ‘codifying’ Roe v. Wade.” [USA Today, [6/30/22](#)]

**July 2022: Jones Cosponsored The Right To Contraception Act.** [H.R.8373, [7/14/22](#)]

- **July 2022: Jones Voted For The Right To Contraception Act To Establish A Statutory Right For Individuals To Obtain And Health Care Providers To Provide Contraceptives.** In July 2022 Jones voted for: “Passage of the bill that would establish that individuals have a statutory right to obtain contraceptives and health care providers have a right to provide contraceptives, contraception and related information. It would prohibit any limitation or infringement of these rights that impedes access to or singles out the provision or providers of contraceptives, contraception or related information. It would supersede any federal and state law that conflicts with its provisions. It would allow the U.S. attorney general or a harmed individual to bring a civil action in U.S. district court for equitable relief against an individual who violates these provisions. It would allow health care providers to bring action on behalf of themselves, their staff or their patients.” The bill passed by a vote of 228-195. [H.R. 8373, [Vote #385](#), 7/21/22; CQ, [7/21/22](#)]
- **The Right To Contraception Act Would Codify Contraception Rights Federally And Prevent States From Restricting Access To Birth Control Pills, IUDs, And Emergency Contraception.** “A Democratic effort to codify the right to contraception in federal law sputtered at the Senate on partisan lines Wednesday. Failure in the tightly divided chamber was predictable, as Democrats attempted to fast-track the Right to Contraception Act by a process called unanimous consent, which allows a bill to go to the floor and pass if all senators agree. [...] Today the federal right to contraceptives is accepted in the United States because the Supreme Court decided in the 1965 case Griswold v. Connecticut that married couples have a constitutional right to buy and use contraceptives without government intrusion. The Right to Contraception Act would enshrine that understanding into federal statutory law. It would ban states from restricting access to the pill, IUDs and emergency contraceptives, while also giving both the attorney general and medical providers the authority to bring civil lawsuits against governments that restrict contraception access.” [Courthouse News Service, [7/27/22](#)]

**August 2024: Jones: IVF Should Be “Safe And Secure For Every American.”** “Jones repeatedly stressed this anti-choice voting as it is a well known Achilles heel of the Republican Party. Abortion is a hot-button issue, one that Jones seems to believe will unify and energize not only Democrats but New Yorkers overall with the majority of New York residents believing abortion should be legal in all or most cases. According to a poll conducted by the Siena College Research Institute, 64% of New Yorkers would support a constitutional amendment protecting the right to an abortion. Jones also criticized Lawler’s new IVF legislation as a political ploy and stated that IVF should be ‘safe and secure for every American.’” [Rockland County Times, [8/18/24](#)]

**April 2024: Jones: “We Must Take Back The House To Stop Republicans From Passing A National Abortion Ban.”** [Mondaire Jones, Twitter, [4/16/24](#)]



Mondaire Jones   
@MondaireJones



Honored to be endorsed by Reproductive Freedom For All. We must take back the House to stop Republicans from passing a national abortion ban. I am running for Congress to enshrine Roe v. Wade into law and protect reproductive freedom for all.



 Reproductive Freedom for All

12:45 PM · Apr 16, 2024 · 4,055 Views

[Mondaire Jones, Twitter, [4/16/24](#)]

- **Vox: A National Abortion Ban Would Supersede State Laws Meant To Protect Abortion Access.** “The repeal of Roe v. Wade left the United States with a patchwork of state laws governing abortion. In parts of the South, someone seeking an abortion would need to travel hundreds of miles to get one. But a national ban would supersede even permissive state laws in states that have been working to expand access to abortion. One estimate found that denying all wanted abortions would increase pregnancy-related deaths by 21 percent nationwide if there aren’t effective means for pregnant people to self-manage their abortions.” [Vox, [6/25/22](#)]

## Jones Quick Message #6 Backup

*Mondaire believes both parties are failing to secure our southern border and stop the flow of migrants to New York. Mondaire supports a comprehensive immigration plan that includes hiring more border agents, giving new powers to law enforcement to stop the flow of fentanyl from Mexico, immediately removing migrants without valid asylum claims, and creating a path to citizenship for those who pass a background check and pay a fine.*

## Mondaire Believes Both Parties Are Failing To Secure Our Southern Border And Stop The Flow Of Migrants To New York.

**April 2024: Jones Called For “Leaders Willing To Stand Up To The Extremes In Both Parties” To Secure The Border And Address The Migrant Crisis.** “It is a travesty that Republicans in Congress are



refusing to work with Democrats on a realistic proposal to secure our border and address the migrant crisis. We need leaders willing to stand up to the extremes in both parties, and who will meet this moment with urgency and resolve. I intend to be that leader yet again for the Lower Hudson Valley, which means defeating Mike Lawler in November.” [Mondaire Jones Op-Ed, Rockland County Times, [4/12/24](#)]

**Mondaire Supports A Comprehensive Immigration Plan That Includes Hiring More Border Agents, Giving New Powers To Law Enforcement To Stop The Flow Of Fentanyl From Mexico, Immediately Removing Migrants Without Valid Asylum Claims, And Creating A Path To Citizenship For Those Who Pass A Background Check And Pay A Fine.**

**Jones Backed The Bipartisan Immigration Deal Negotiated In The Senate.** “Jones supports the bipartisan Senate bill, which a conservative Republican helped write, and vows to vote for it if given the chance. But when asked if he supports releasing asylum seekers into the U.S. after initial interviews at the border, he suggested that would be unnecessary if enough judges are hired. Their claims could be decided after only a brief detention at the border, he said.” [LoHud, [9/26/24](#)]

**NBC News: The Bipartisan Border Package Would Have Been “The Most Aggressive Border Security And Migration Overhaul Bill In Decades If It Pass[ed] Congress.”** “Senators released the long-awaited text of a bipartisan agreement to impose tougher immigration and asylum laws Sunday, as Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer eyes votes on the package this week. The \$118 billion package includes a series of provisions aimed at reducing record high crossings at the southern border and tightening an asylum system that has been overwhelmed by migrants fleeing their homes to seek refuge. It also includes critical aid to Israel, Ukraine and Taiwan, which Republicans have said they’ll only support if it is paired with significant new U.S. immigration restrictions. The agreement — reached by Sens. James Lankford, R-Okla., Chris Murphy, D-Conn., and Kyrsten Sinema, I-Ariz. — would be the most aggressive border security and migration overhaul bill in decades if it passes Congress. It would raise the standard to get asylum, send away those who don’t qualify and expedite cases for those who do.” [NBC News, [2/4/24](#)]

**The Border Package Would Fund Over 1,500 New U.S. Customs And Border Protection (CBP) Personnel, Including Border Patrol Agents And CBP Officers.** “The Biden-Harris Administration strongly supports the bipartisan agreement announced in the Senate that would address a number of pressing national security issues. President Biden has repeatedly said he is willing to work in a bipartisan way to secure the border and fix our broken immigration system. [...] Over 1,500 new U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) personnel including Border Patrol Agents and CBP Officers.” [White House, Fact Sheets, [2/4/24](#)]

**The Bipartisan Senate Border Package Gave The President Authority To Impose Sanctions On Non-Americans Involved In Trafficking Of Fentanyl By A Transnational Criminal Organization.** “The Biden-Harris Administration strongly supports the bipartisan agreement announced in the Senate that would address a number of pressing national security issues. President Biden has repeatedly said he is willing to work in a bipartisan way to secure the border and fix our broken immigration system. [...] Strengthens Federal Law Against Fentanyl Trafficking: Declares that international trafficking of fentanyl is a national emergency and gives the President authority to impose sanctions on any foreign person knowingly involved in significant trafficking of fentanyl by a transnational criminal organization.” [White House, Fact Sheets, [2/4/24](#)]

**The Bill Would Mandate The Removal Of Migrants Who Tried To Enter The U.S. Outside Of Official Ports Of Entry Without Valid Asylum Claims.** “The bill would also end the practice of ‘catch



and release.’ If passed into law, the bill would allow migrants who come to the border through lawful ports of entry and families to enter the U.S. under federal supervision for 90 days while they complete asylum interviews. Those who pass would receive work permits as they await adjudication of their claims. Those who fail would be removed from the U.S. and repatriated to their home countries or to Mexico. The bill would mandate detaining migrants who try to enter the U.S. outside of official ports of entry, pending any asylum claims. Those who fail would also be removed.” [NBC News, [2/4/24](#)]

**LoHud: “Jones Also Supports Creating A Path To Citizenship For Immigrants With No Criminal Records, As Part Of A Larger Immigration Overhaul.”** [LoHud, [9/26/24](#)]

## Lawler Quick Messages Backup

### Lawler Quick Message #1

*With Mike Lawler, you have to watch what he does, and not what he says on TV and social media. His actions show that his words are empty. His time in Congress has been marked by broken promises. He consistently sides with Donald Trump and Washington Republicans over his constituents in the Lower Hudson Valley.*

**With Mike Lawler, You Have To Watch What He Does, And Not What He Says On TV And Social Media. His Actions Show That His Words Are Empty. His Time In Congress Has Been Marked By Broken Promises.**

*Substantiated below*

**He Consistently Sides With Donald Trump And Washington Republicans Over His Constituents In The Lower Hudson Valley.**

**Lawler Has “Has Worked For The Trump Political Operation” As A 2016 Trump Delegate And The Principal Of A Consulting Firm Paid \$4 Million For Direct Mail From A “Trump-Aligned” PAC.** “A Republican political strategist by trade, Lawler was executive director of the New York State Republican Committee in the early 2010s and has worked for the Trump political operation. He was a principal in the consulting company, Checkmate Strategies, when it landed a \$4 million direct-mail deal from a Trump-aligned political action committee to attack Joe Biden in the 2020 campaign cycle.” [Lohud, [4/8/24](#)]

**VIDEO: April 2024: Lawler Said He Voted F Donald Trump In The New York Republican Primary.** HOST: “New York obviously held its primary last week. Did you vote for Donald Trump in that by the way?” LAWLER: “I voted in the Primary and I did vote for the former President, yes.” [CNN The Source, 6:05, [4/10/24](#)] (VIDEO)

**Trump Praised Lawler, Saying, I Don’t Know What Happened To Him But Boy He Like Me A Lot Better Now Than He Used To: Michael Lawler ... I Like That Because He Is A Good Man, Great Man.”** TRUMP: “Somebody who has been really spectacular, especially the last few months, I don’t know what happened to him but boy he likes me a lot better now than he used to; Michael Lawler. I am correct with that? Where is Michael? Something happened, he likes be better than he used to. I like that because he is a good man, great man.” [The Times via YouTube, uploaded, 17:03, [9/19/24](#)] (VIDEO)

**April 2024: VIDEO: Lawler: “I Want Mike Johnson To Be Speaker. He’s Doing A Phenomenal Job.”** LAWLER: “Look I want Mike Johnson to be Speaker. He's doing a phenomenal job. He is leading this conference. He is leading this country and that is the objective here.” [Fox News Cavuto Coast to Coast, 5:36, [4/20/24](#)] (VIDEO)

**Johnson: “The Road To The Majority Runs Through New York, And It’s Going To Go Through The Hands Of Mike Lawler. I’m Here To Support Him.”** JOHNSON: “Hi it’s Speaker Mike Johnson here in New York with our favorite Congressman Mike Lawler. He is doing an extraordinary job in Congress leading for the people of New York. He works on Financial Services, he works on the Foreign Affairs Committee, he does lots of important things because he’s really qualified – he served in the state assembly, he’s done a lot of great work and we need him to come back. This is a critical district to keep and grow the house majority. The road to the majority runs through New York, and it’s going to go through the hands of Mike Lawler. I’m here to support him and I hope you will as well.” [Mike Lawler, Twitter, :00, [6/23/24](#)] (VIDEO)

**June 2024: Lawler Thanked Johnson For Coming To The Hudson Valley, Adding, “I Am Proud To Have Your Backing.”** [Mike Lawler, Twitter, [6/23/24](#)]



[Mike Lawler, Twitter, [6/23/24](#)]

## Lawler Quick Message #2

*Mike Lawler has voted repeatedly against a woman’s right to an abortion. He recently said he wants to ban nearly every abortion in New York. Lawler is part of an extreme group of Republicans that would seek to ban abortion in New York, even in cases of rape and incest.*

## Mike Lawler Has Voted Repeatedly Against A Woman's Right To An Abortion.

### January 2023: Lawler Voted For Blocking Consideration Of The Women's Health Protection Act.

In January 2023, Lawler voted for: "Cole, R-Okla., motion to order the previous question (thus ending debate and possibility of amendment)." According to the Congressional Record, Rep. McGovern said, "Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up the Women's Health Protection Act." **A vote for the motion was a vote to block consideration of the bill.** The motion was agreed to by a vote of 211-205. [H. Res. 5, [Vote #21](#), 1/9/23; CQ, [1/9/23](#); Congressional Record, [1/9/23](#)]

- **The Women's Health Protection Act Would Federally Codify Protections From Roe V. Wade.** "As a leaked draft opinion of a Supreme Court ruling shows a conservative majority of justices appear poised to overturn federal protections of abortion rights, Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer said Thursday the Senate will hold a procedural vote to begin debate on the Women's Health Protection Act next week. WHPA is a bill that aims to codify Roe v. Wade, the landmark decision that grants protections for a woman's right to abortion, at the federal level. The bill prohibits governmental restrictions on access to abortion services, according to the Congressional Research Service." [ABC, [5/7/22](#)]
- **Federally Codifying Protections From Roe Would Prevent States From Passing "Full Bans" On Abortion Following The Overturning Of Roe.** "Congressional Democrats have mulled options to guarantee the 1973 Roe v. Wade ruling's protections since a leaked majority draft indicated in May that the Supreme Court would reverse the decision. The majority conservative court indeed overturned Roe last week, sparking nationwide tumult among abortion-rights advocates and celebrations by their anti-abortion counterparts. The reversal returns the power to state legislatures to pass full bans on abortion. The ruling, which stood for nearly 50 years, had nullified broad bans on the procedure and established it as a constitutional right. Now Democrats are pushing to effectively restore that right by 'codifying' Roe v. Wade." [USA Today, [6/30/22](#)]

**May 2022: Lawler Voted Against S09039A.** In May 2022, Lawler voted against S09039 in a floor vote in the New York State Assembly. [New York State Assembly, S09039A, [5/31/22](#)]

- **S09039A Passed The Assembly By A Vote Of 100 To 49 And Was Signed Into Law.** [New York State Assembly, S09039A, [6/13/22](#)]
- **S09039A Protected "The Rights Of Individuals Seeking Abortion Care Or Gender Affirming Care In New York State."** "Other bills signed into law today as part of the comprehensive effort to protect reproductive rights in New York include: [...] Freedom from Interference with Reproductive Healthcare Access: S.9039A will protect the rights of individuals seeking abortion care or gender affirming care in New York State. This legislation also creates a civil cause of action for unlawful interference with the protected rights to reproductive healthcare." [New York State Senator Anna M. Kaplan, Press Release, [6/13/22](#)]

**May 2022: Lawler Voted Against S09077A.** In May 2022, Lawler voted against S09077A in a floor vote in the New York State Assembly. [New York State Assembly, S09077A, [5/31/22](#)]

- **S09077A Passed The Assembly By A Vote Of 100 To 49 And Was Signed Into Law.** [New York State Assembly, S09077A, [6/13/22](#)]

- **S09077A Prohibited “New York State From Cooperating With Out-Of-State Legal Cases Involving Abortion Except In Limited Circumstances.”** “Other bills signed into law today as part of the comprehensive effort to protect reproductive rights in New York include: [...] Extradition and Discovery Non-Cooperation: S.9077A forbids New York State from cooperating with out-of-state legal cases involving abortion except in limited circumstances.” [New York State Senator Anna M. Kaplan, Press Release, [6/13/22](#)]
  - **Defendants From States Where Abortion Was Illegal Could Not Be Extradited Unless “The Defendant Was Present In That State At The Time Of The Alleged Offense And That They Later Fled.”** “For criminal cases, this bill prohibits New York from extraditing a defendant to another state to face abortion-related charges unless the governor of that state alleges in writing that the defendant was present in that state at the time of the alleged offense and that they later fled.” [New York State Senator Anna M. Kaplan, Press Release, [6/13/22](#)]
  - **Courts Could Not Comply With Out-Of-State Subpoenas “If The Out-Of-State Case Relates To Abortion Services Legally Performed In New York State.”** “For civil cases, the bill prohibits a New York court from honoring a subpoena request from the court of another state if the out-of-state case relates to abortion services legally performed in New York State. A New York court may still honor an out-of-state subpoena if the case is brought by the patient.” [New York State Senator Anna M. Kaplan, Press Release, [6/13/22](#)]

**July 2022: Lawler Voted Against S51002 Which Passed The Assembly By A Vote Of 95 To 45.** [New York State Assembly, S51002, [7/2/22](#)]

- **S51002 Sought To Ensure That The State Constitution Anti-Discrimination Provision Applied To All New Yorkers.** “The purpose of this amendment is to ensure that our state constitution extends to all New Yorkers the equality right to be free from discrimination, and in particular those who have faced severe and pervasive injustice. It does so by expanding the list of classes protected by the New York Constitution in recognition of the need for comprehensive and intersectional equality under the law.” [New York State Assembly, S51002, [7/2/22](#)]
- **S51002 Would Add Anti-Discrimination Protections For Disability, Including Pregnancy, To The State Constitution.** “Discrimination with respect to, for instance, disability or pregnancy would include the failure to provide reasonable accommodations. This amendment is intended to promote equality of opportunity for people with disabilities both by banning disability discrimination and by affording enforceable legal rights to people with disabilities. The term "disability" means a physical, mental or medical impairment resulting from anatomical, physiological, genetic or neurological conditions which prevents the exercise of a normal bodily function or is demonstrable by medically accepted clinical or laboratory diagnostic techniques or a record of such an impairment or a condition regarded by others as such an impairment. No person because of disability should be subjected to any discrimination, including but not limited to actions which prevent them exercising their right to live in the community, to lead an independent life, and to be free from institutionalization. Discrimination with respect to, for instance, disability or pregnancy would include the failure to provide reasonable accommodations.” [New York State Assembly, S51002, [7/2/22](#)]
- **S51002 Would Add Anti-Discrimination Protections For Sex, Including Issues Relating To Pregnancy And Abortion, To The State Constitution.** “Further, by including a prohibition on sex discrimination, this amendment inherently prohibits discrimination on the basis of pregnancy, pregnancy outcomes, and reproductive healthcare and reproductive autonomy. The amendment’s explicit clarification however is critical. While federal courts, Congress, and the EEOC have

recognized that sex discrimination includes discrimination based on pregnancy (including abortion), a lack of clarity on whether pregnancy discrimination transgresses the federal constitution still exists. See e.g. *Geduldig v. Aiello*, 417 U.S. 484 (1974). This translates into New York law as well. For example, New York State courts have failed to recognize the New York State Patient Bill of Rights as applying to pregnant patients, as well as constitutional and common law protections to privacy, bodily integrity, and medical decision-making throughout pregnancy. See, e.g., *Dray v. Staten Island University Hospital, Order, Genine Edwards*, Supreme Court of the State of New York, Kings County, October 4, 2019. And increasingly across the country in virtually every state, including New York, women face criminal and civil consequences in relationship to their pregnancies and pregnancy outcomes, including abortions, miscarriages, stillbirths, or other adverse outcomes. This is particularly important for women at the intersection of multiple marginalized identities, namely Black women and women of color, who are not only wrongly seen as less deserving of or fit for motherhood but further experience disproportionate discrimination in our criminal law system and health disparities likely to lead to adverse outcomes that put them under scrutiny and surveillance.” [New York State Assembly, S51002, [7/2/22](#)]

### **He Recently Said He Wants To Ban Nearly Every Abortion In New York.**

**LoHud: “Lawler Believes That The Right To Abortion Should Be Reserved To A Tiny Subset Of American Women: Those Who Face ‘Serious Health Issues’ When Pregnant Or Are The Victims Of Rape Or Incest.”** “On abortion, Lawler’s stance — what he calls his ‘commonsense, mainstream position’ — hasn’t changed, according to his campaign website. Lawler believes that the right to abortion should be reserved to a tiny subset of American women: those who face ‘serious health issues’ when pregnant or are the victims of rape or incest.” [LoHud, [9/9/24](#)]

### **Lawler Is Part Of An Extreme Group Of Republicans That Would Seek To Ban Abortion In New York, Even In Cases Of Rape And Incest.**

**April 2024: Lawler Filed To Run On The Conservative Party Line In The NY-17 Congressional Election.** [New York Board of Elections, filed [4/2/24](#)]

**The NY Conservative Party Supports Repealing New York’s Law Protecting Abortion Access And Only Allowing Abortion In Cases Of “Clearly Defined Conditions Hazardous To The Life Of The Mother.”** “We believe that New York’s expanded abortion law should be repealed and the legislature should re-adopt the prior statute permitting therapeutic abortions only under the most clearly defined conditions hazardous to the life of the mother. Tax dollars should not be used to prevent or end a pregnancy, nor should they be used for non-residents to travel to NY and pay for their abortion.” [Conservative Party of New York State, “2024 Legislative Program,” accessed [1/29/24](#)]

**The NY Conservative Party Supports Repealing New York’s Law Protecting Abortion Access And Only Allowing “Therapeutic Abortion” In Cases Of “Clearly Defined Conditions Hazardous To The Life Of The Mother.”** “We believe that New York’s expanded abortion law should be repealed and the legislature should re-adopt the prior statute permitting therapeutic abortions only under the most clearly defined conditions hazardous to the life of the mother. Tax dollars should not be used to prevent or end a pregnancy, nor should they be used for non-residents to travel to NY and pay for their abortion.” [Conservative Party of New York State, “2023 Legislative Program,” accessed [12/21/23](#)]

**1965: New York Amended Its Statute To Widen Life Of The Mother Exceptions.** [New York University Law Review, 66 (6), Samuel Buell, *Criminal Abortion Revisited*, pg. 1798, [1/1/1991](#)]

<sup>130</sup> New York amended its statute in 1965 to widen the therapeutic exceptions. See Means, supra note 25, at 498-500. California adopted the most progressive abortion reform in 1967 to close a perceived gulf between the legal and medical standards concerning justifications for abortion. See George, supra note 50, at 393-402 (discussing perceived gulf); Sands, supra note 52, at 286-88 (same); Note, Abortion Reform, supra note 59, at 530-34 (discussing California legislation); Note, Survey of Abortion Reform Legislation, 43 Wash. L. Rev. 644, 644-54 (1968) (discussing California legislation in comparison with Colorado, North Carolina, and Great Britain legislation). Then Governor Reagan signed the bill only after the legislature eliminated a provision permitting abortion of a greatly deformed child. See Note, Changing Abortion Laws, supra note 30, at 496-97. Arkansas, Colorado, Georgia, Maryland, New Mex-

[New York University Law Review, 66 (6), Samuel Buell, Criminal Abortion Revisited, pg. 1798, [1/1/1991](#)]

**19<sup>th</sup> Century: New York Fully Banned Abortion At All Phases Of Pregnancy, And Later Included A “Therapeutic Exception.”** [New York University Law Review, 66 (6), Samuel Buell, Criminal Abortion Revisited, pgs. 1784-85, [1/1/1991](#)]

- **Brittanica: A Therapeutic Abortion Can Take Place Because The Pregnancy Endangers The Mother’s Life.** “A therapeutic abortion is the interruption of a pregnancy before the 20th week of gestation because it endangers the mother’s life or health or because the baby presumably would not be normal.” [Encyclopedia Britannica, accessed [12/22/23](#)]
- **One Scholar, Cyrus Means, Argued That Therapeutic Exceptions In New York Were Driven Out Of Concern For The Life Of The Woman.** [New York University Law Review, 66 (6), Samuel Buell, Criminal Abortion Revisited, pgs. 1784-85, [1/1/1991](#)]

prequickening abortion in 1827.<sup>41</sup> And New York adopted its first statute in 1829, elevating postquickening abortion from a misdemeanor to a felony.<sup>42</sup> Over the next sixty years, other states adopted abortion legislation and increasingly restrictive amendments. By the end of the nineteenth century, every state had criminalized abortion by statute and, with three exceptions, had prohibited it during all phases of pregnancy.<sup>43</sup>

[...]

the nineteenth century.<sup>45</sup> New York was the first state to include a therapeutic exception in its statute, and one scholar, Cyril Means, uses this information to argue that New York’s legislature was motivated primarily by concern for the woman’s life.<sup>46</sup> In the late 1860s and 1870s, attitudes toward abortion in New York grew increasingly intolerant as the

[New York University Law Review, 66 (6), Samuel Buell, Criminal Abortion Revisited, pgs. 1784-85, [1/1/1991](#)]

**1872: New York Passed A Law Increasing Its Penalty For Abortion To Between Four Years And 20 Years Imprisonment.** [New York University Law Review, 66 (6), Samuel Buell, Criminal Abortion Revisited, pgs. 1784-85, [1/1/1991](#)]

prequickening abortion in 1827.<sup>41</sup> And New York adopted its first statute in 1829, elevating postquickening abortion from a misdemeanor to a felony.<sup>42</sup> Over the next sixty years, other states adopted abortion legislation and increasingly restrictive amendments. By the end of the nineteenth century, every state had criminalized abortion by statute and, with three exceptions, had prohibited it during all phases of pregnancy.<sup>43</sup>

[...]

the nineteenth century.<sup>45</sup> New York was the first state to include a therapeutic exception in its statute, and one scholar, Cyril Means, uses this information to argue that New York's legislature was motivated primarily by concern for the woman's life.<sup>46</sup> In the late 1860s and 1870s, attitudes toward abortion in New York grew increasingly intolerant as the

New York press widely publicized sensational cases of deaths from unskilled abortionists.<sup>47</sup> The legislature increased the penalty for abortion in 1872 to between four and twenty years imprisonment.<sup>48</sup>

[New York University Law Review, 66 (6), Samuel Buell, Criminal Abortion Revisited, pgs. 1784-85, [1/1/1991](#)]

**Dr. Alan F. Guttmacher, On New York's 1970 Legalization Of Abortion: "After 142 Years Of One Of The Most Restrictive Abortion Statutes — Allowing Abortions Only When Necessary To Preserve The Life Of The Mother — New York Suddenly Had The Most Liberal Abortion Law In The World."** "Three years before Roe v. Wade established a constitutional right to abortion, New York legalized the procedure in 1970, turning the state into a magnet for women who wanted to terminate their pregnancies but were barred from doing so where they lived. [...] The New York law allowed abortions to be performed within 24 weeks of pregnancy and at any time if the woman's life was at risk. [...] 'After 142 years of one of the most restrictive abortion statutes — allowing abortions only when necessary to preserve the life of the mother — New York suddenly had the most liberal abortion law in the world,' wrote Dr. Alan F. Guttmacher, a birth control pioneer who advocated legalizing abortion, in a 1972 report." [New York Times, [7/19/18](#)]

### Lawler Quick Message #3

*Lawler voted 19 times against protecting Social Security and Medicare benefits for people who spent a lifetime paying into the system. He opposed lowering prescription drug costs for seniors and protections for nursing home residents, and threatened to make it harder for New Yorkers to get the pensions they were promised.*

### Lawler Voted 19 Times Against Protecting Social Security And Medicare Benefits For People Who Spent A Lifetime Paying Into The System.

**1. October 3, 2023: Lawler Voted To Block Consideration For Protecting Social Security And Medicare.** In October 2023, Lawler voted for: "Reschenthaler, R-Pa. motion to order the previous question (thus ending debate and possibility of amendment)." According to the Congressional Record, Rep. Scanlon said, "Madam Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to provide for consideration of a resolution which clearly states that it is the people's House's duty to keep our promise to American workers and seniors to protect and preserve Social Security and Medicare and fight against any cuts to these vital programs." A vote *for the motion* was a vote to block consideration of the bill. The motion was agreed to by a vote of 218-207. [H.Res. 756, [Vote #516](#), 10/3/23; CQ, [10/3/23](#); Congressional Record, [10/3/23](#)]

**2. September 19, 2023: Lawler Voted For Blocking Consideration Of A Resolution To Protect Social Security And Medicare.** In September 2023 Lawler voted for: "Cole, R-Okla., motion to order the previous question (thus ending debate and possibility of amendment)." According to the Congressional Record, Rep. Fernandez said, "I am going to offer my friends, my dear friends, a chance to show the American people that they are serious about preserving Social Security and Medicare. I urge you all to join us in defeating the previous question. If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an

amendment to the rule to provide for consideration of a resolution which plainly states that the people's House won't cut a single cent from these crucial programs that so many of my constituents, so many of your constituents, rely on." *A vote for the motion was a vote to block consideration of the resolution.* The motion was agreed to by a vote of 217-209. [H. Res. 680, [Vote #397](#), 9/19/23; CQ, [9/19/23](#); Congressional Record, [9/19/23](#)]

**3. September 14, 2023: Lawler Voted For Blocking Consideration Of Protecting And Preserving Social Security And Medicare.** In September 2023, Lawler voted for: "Burgess, R-Texas, motion to order the previous question (thus ending debate and possibility of amendment)." According to the Congressional Record, Rep. Leger Fernandez said, "Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to provide for consideration of a resolution which clearly states that it is the people's House's duty to keep our promise to American workers and seniors to protect and preserve Social Security and Medicare and fight against any cuts to these vital programs." *A vote for the motion was a vote to block consideration of the bill.* The motion was agreed to by a vote of 214-198. [H.Res. 681, [Vote #388](#), 9/14/23; CQ, [9/14/23](#); Congressional Record, [9/14/23](#)]

**4. July 26, 2023: Lawler Voted For Blocking Consideration Of Protecting Social Security And Medicare.** In July 2023, Lawler voted for: "Reschenthaler, R-Pa., motion to order the previous question (thus ending debate and possibility of amendment)." According to the Congressional Record, Rep. Neguse said, "Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment that we have offered before to the rule to provide for consideration of a resolution which unambiguously states that it is the House's duty to keep our solemn promise to American workers and seniors to protect and preserve Social Security and Medicare and reject any cuts to these critical programs." *A vote for the motion was a vote to block consideration of the bill.* The motion was agreed to by a vote of 208-191. [H.Res. 614, [Vote #367](#), 7/26/23; CQ, [7/26/23](#); Congressional Record, [7/26/23](#)]

**5. July 18, 2023: Lawler Voted For Blocking Consideration Of A Resolution To Protect Social Security and Medicare.** In July 2023, Lawler voted for: "Houchin, R-Ind motion to order the previous question (thus ending debate and possibility of amendment)." According to the Congressional Record, Rep. Scanlon, D-\_\_\_ said, "Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to provide for consideration of a resolution which unequivocally states that it is the House's duty to keep our sacred promise to American workers and seniors to protect and preserve Social Security and Medicare and reject any cuts to those essential programs." *A vote for the motion was a vote to block consideration of the bill.* The motion was agreed to by a vote of 213-207. [H.Res. 597, [Vote #331](#), 7/18/23; CQ, [7/18/23](#); Congressional Record, [7/18/23](#)]

**6. June 22, 2023: Lawler Voted For Blocking Consideration Of A Resolution Stating It Is The House's Responsibility To Provide Social Security And Medicaid And To Reject Cuts To The Programs.** In June 2023, Lawler voted for: "Roy, R,Texas., motion to order the previous question (thus ending debate and the possibility of amendment)." According to the Congressional Record, Rep McGovern said, "Mr. Speaker, I urge that we defeat the previous question, and I will offer an amendment to the rule to provide for consideration of a resolution assuring our constituents that the people's House will protect and preserve Social Security and Medicare for our future generations and reject any cuts to these essential programs." *A vote for the motion was a vote to block consideration of the resolution.* The motion was agreed to 214-206. [H.Res. 463, [Vote #284](#), 6/22/23; CQ, [6/22/23](#); Congressional Record, [6/22/23](#)]

**7. June 13, 2023: Lawler Voted For Blocking Consideration Of A Joint Resolution Stating It Is The House's Responsibility To Provide Social Security And Medicaid And To Reject Cuts To The Programs.** In June 2023, Lawler voted for onal Record, Rep McGovern said "Mr. Speaker, I am going to urge that we defeat the previous question, and if we do, then I will offer an amendment to the rule to



provide for consideration of a resolution which states that it is the House's duty to protect and preserve Social Security and Medicare for our future generations and reject any cuts to these essential programs.”  
*A vote for the motion was a vote to block consideration of the bill.* The motion was agreed to 216-209. [H.Res. 495, [Vote #249](#), 6/13/23; CQ, [6/13/23](#); Congressional Record, [6/13/23](#)]

**8. June 6, 2023: Lawler Voted For Blocking Consideration Of A Resolution Stating It's The House's Responsibility To Protect And Preserve Social Security And Medicaid And To Reject Cuts To The Programs.** In February 2019, Lawler voted for: “Massie, R-Ky, motion to order the previous question (thus ending debate and the possibility of amendment).” According to the Congressional Record, Rep. Scanlon said “Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to provide for consideration of a resolution which states that it is the House's responsibility to protect and preserve Social Security and Medicaid for our future generations and reject any cuts to these essential programs.” *A vote for the motion was a vote to block consideration of the bill.* The motion was agreed to 215-203. [H. Res. 463, [Vote #247](#), 6/6/23; CQ, [6/6/23](#); Congressional Record, [6/6/23](#)]

**9. May 23, 2023: Lawler Voted For Blocking Consideration Of Protecting Social Security And Medicare And Rejecting Cuts To The Programs.** In May 2023, Lawler voted for: “Burgess, R-Texas, motion to order the previous question (thus ending debate and possibility of amendment).” According to the Congressional Record, Rep. Leger Fernandez said, “Madam Speaker, I point out that if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to provide for consideration of a resolution, which states that it is the House's responsibility to protect and preserve Social Security and Medicare for future generations and reject any cuts to these essential programs.” *A vote for the motion was a vote to block consideration of the bill.* The motion was agreed to by a vote of 219-208. [H.Res. 429, [Vote #230](#), 5/23/23; CQ, [5/23/23](#); Congressional Record, [5/23/23](#)]

**10. May 16, 2023: Lawler Voted For Blocking Consideration Of Protecting Social Security And Medicare And Rejecting Cuts To The Programs.** In May 2023, Lawler voted for: “Fischbach, R-Minn, motion to order the previous question (thus ending debate and possibility of amendment).” According to the Congressional Record, Rep. McGovern said, “Mr. Speaker, I urge that we defeat the previous question. If we do, I will offer an amendment to the rule for consideration of a resolution which states that it is the House's responsibility to protect and preserve Social Security and Medicare for future generations and reject any cuts to these essential programs.” *A vote for the motion was a vote to block consideration of the bill.* The motion was agreed to by a vote of 220-209. [H.Res. 398, [Vote #215](#), 5/16/23; CQ, [5/16/23](#); Congressional Record, [5/16/23](#)]

**11. April 26, 2023: Lawler Voted For Blocking Consideration Of Stating Responsibility To Defend And Preserve Social Security And Medicare And Reject Cuts To The Programs.** In April 2023, Lawler voted for: “Cole, R-Okla., motion to order the previous question (thus ending debate and possibility of amendment).” According to the Congressional Record, Rep. McGovern said, “Mr. Speaker, I urge that we defeat the previous question. If we do, then I will offer an amendment to the rule to provide for consideration of a resolution that allows the House to state unequivocally that it is our responsibility to defend and preserve Social Security and Medicare for generations to come and reject any cuts to these vital programs.” *A vote for the motion was a vote to block consideration of the bill.* The motion was agreed to by a vote of 218-210. [H. Res. 327, [Vote #195](#), 4/26/23; CQ, [4/26/23](#); Congressional Record, [4/26/23](#)]

**12. April 18, 2023: Lawler Voted For Blocking Consideration Of Affirming Commitment To Protect And Strengthen Social Security And Medicare And Reject Cuts To The Programs.** In April 2023, Lawler voted for: “Houchin, R-Ind., motion to order the previous question (thus ending debate and possibility of amendment).” According to the Congressional Record, Rep. Leger Fernandez said, “Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, which I hope we do, I will offer an amendment to the rule to

provide for consideration of a resolution that affirms the House’s unwavering commitment to protect and strengthen Social Security and Medicare and states that it is the position of the House to reject any cuts to the program.” *A vote for the motion was a vote to block consideration of the bill.* The motion was agreed to by a vote of 218-203. [H.Res. 298, [Vote #185](#), 4/18/23; CQ, [4/18/23](#); Congressional Record, [4/18/23](#)]

**13. March 28, 2023: Lawler Voted For Blocking Consideration Of Affirming Commitment To Protect And Strengthen Social Security And Medicare.**

In March 2023, Lawler voted for: “Reschenthaler, R-Pa., motion to order the previous question (thus ending debate and possibility of amendment).” According to the Congressional Record, Rep. McGovern said, “Mr. Speaker, I urge that we defeat the previous question. If we do, I will offer an amendment to the rule to provide for consideration of a resolution that affirms the House’s unwavering commitment to protect and strengthen Social Security and Medicare, and states that it is the position of the House of Representatives to reject any cuts to these programs.” *A vote for the motion was a vote to block consideration of the bill.* The motion was agreed to by a vote of 218-203. [H.Res. 260, [Vote #165](#), 3/28/23; CQ, [3/28/23](#); Congressional Record, [3/28/23](#)]

**14. March 23, 2023: Lawler Voted For Blocking Consideration Of A Resolution To Defend And Preserve Social Security And Medicare And Reject Cuts To The Programs.**

In March 2023, Lawler voted for: “Houchin, R-Ind., motion to order the previous question (thus ending debate and possibility of amendment).” According to the Congressional Record, Rep. Scanlon said, “Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to provide for consideration of a resolution that states the House’s unyielding responsibility to defend and preserve Social Security and Medicare for generations to come and to affirm that it is the position of the House to reject any cuts to these vital programs.” *A vote for the motion was a vote to block consideration of the bill.* The motion was agreed to by a vote of 219-204. [H.Res. 241, [Vote #146](#), 3/23/23; CQ, [3/23/23](#); Congressional Record, [3/23/23](#)]

**15. March 8, 2023: Lawler Voted For Blocking Consideration Of Affirming Commitment To Protect Social Security And Medicare And To Reject Cuts To The Programs.**

In March 2023, Lawler voted for: “Massie, R-Ky., motion to order the previous question (thus ending debate and possibility of amendment).” According to the Congressional Record, Rep. McGovern said, “Madam Speaker, I urge that we defeat the previous question, and if we do, I will offer an amendment to the rule to provide for consideration of a resolution that affirms the House’s unwavering commitment to protect and strengthen Social Security and Medicare and states that it is the position of the House to reject any cuts in the program.” *A vote for the motion was a vote to block consideration of the bill.* The motion was agreed to by a vote of 217-205. [H.Res. 199, [Vote #134](#), 3/8/23; CQ, [3/8/23](#); Congressional Record, [3/8/23](#)]

**16. February 28, 2023: Lawler Voted For Blocking Consideration Of Affirming Commitment To Protect And Strengthen Social Security And Medicare And Reject Cuts To The Programs.**

In February 2023, Lawler voted for: “Burgess, R-Texas, motion to order the previous question (thus ending debate and possibility of amendment).” According to the Congressional Record, Rep. McGovern said, “Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to provide for consideration of a resolution that affirms the House’s unwavering commitment to protect and strengthen Social Security and Medicare and states that it is the position of the House to reject any cuts to the programs.” *A vote for the motion was a vote to block consideration of the bill.* The motion was agreed to by a vote of 213-201. [H.Res. 166, [Vote #122](#), 2/28/23; CQ, [2/28/23](#); Congressional Record, [2/28/23](#)]

**17. February 7, 2023: Lawler Voted For Blocking Consideration Of Certification That A Bill Won’t Decrease Social Security Benefits Before It Can Take Effect.**

In February 2023, Lawler voted for: “Langworthy, R-N.Y., motion to order the previous question (thus ending debate and possibility of amendment).” According to the Congressional Record, Rep. Scanlon said, “Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to ensure that H.R. 185 does not take effect unless it is certified that it won’t decrease Social Security benefits.” *A vote for the motion was a vote to*

**block consideration of the bill.** The motion was agreed to by a vote of 217-208. [H.Res. 97, [Vote #108](#), 2/7/23; CQ, [2/7/23](#); Congressional Record, [2/7/23](#)]

**18. February 1, 2023: Lawler Voted For Blocking Consideration Of Preventing Bills Under Consideration From Decreasing Social Security Benefits.** In January 2023, Lawler voted for: “Reschenthaler, R-Pa., motion to order the previous question (thus ending debate and possibility of amendment).” According to the Congressional Record, Rep. McGovern said, “Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to this rule to include this important amendment and give every Member on the floor the opportunity to clarify that existing Federal programs like Social Security and Medicare are not under attack by this new Congress.” *A vote for the motion was a vote to block consideration of the bill.* The motion was agreed to by a vote of 219-207. [H. Res. 83, [Vote #101](#), 2/1/23; CQ, [2/1/23](#); Congressional Record, [2/1/23](#)]

**19. January 31, 2023: Lawler Voted For Blocking Consideration Of Preventing Bills Under Consideration From Decreasing Social Security Benefits.** In January 2023, Lawler voted for: “Burgess, R-Texas, motion to order the previous question (thus ending debate and possibility of amendment).” According to the Congressional Record, Rep. McGovern said, “Madam Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to ensure that none of the bills in this rule take effect unless it is certified that they do not decrease Social Security benefits.” *A vote for the motion was a vote to block consideration of the bill.* The motion was agreed to by a vote of 218-209. [H.Res. 75, [Vote #95](#), 1/31/23; CQ, [1/31/23](#); Congressional Record, [1/31/23](#)]

### He Opposed Lowering Prescription Drug Costs For Seniors...

**August 2022: Lawler Said, “I Would Not Have Supported The Quote Unquote Inflation Reduction Act.”** “ASTORINO: “Mike, let me ask you. You’ve got inflation running rampant, right now, people can’t afford it. Let’s talk about that first. What are some of the things that you would do to stop this economy from spinning out of control?” LAWLER: “Well you know, first and foremost I would not have supported the quote unquote Inflation Reduction Act. It is nothing more than a slimmed down version of Build Back Better which was, you know, the progressive pipedream and incorporated a lot of the Green New Deal into it. Sean Patrick Maloney was a proud original cosponsor, he tells everybody, original cosponsor of the Green New Deal.” [Mike Lawler, Facebook, 7:03, [8/22/22](#)] (VIDEO)

**NBC: The Inflation Reduction Act “Is Set To Lower The Cost Of Prescription Drugs.”** “The Inflation Reduction Act, signed into law by President Joe Biden, is set to lower the cost of prescription drugs — including cancer medications, blood thinners and insulin — for millions of Americans, experts say. Exorbitant drug prices in the United States are a key reason many people in the U.S. are forced to skip or delay filling their needed prescriptions. A Kaiser Family Foundation poll published last month found that nearly 1 in 2 adults report difficulty affording their health care expenses, including their prescribed medications.” [NBC, [8/16/22](#)]

**The IRA Capped Out-Of-Pocket Prescription Drug Costs Under Medicare At \$2,000 Per Year.** “The Inflation Reduction Act amends the design of the Part D benefit. For 2024, the law eliminates the 5% beneficiary coinsurance requirement above the catastrophic coverage threshold, effectively capping out-of-pocket costs at approximately \$3,250 that year. Beginning in 2025, the legislation adds a hard cap on out-of-pocket spending of \$2,000, indexed in future years to the rate of increase in per capita Part D costs (Figure 2). [...] Based on our analysis, 1.4 million Part D enrollees incurred annual out-of-pocket costs for their medications above \$2,000 in 2020, averaging \$3,355 per person. This estimate includes 1.3 million enrollees who had spending above the catastrophic coverage threshold (which equaled roughly \$2,700 in out-of-pocket costs that year for brand-name drugs alone). These estimates are a conservative

measure of how many beneficiaries will be helped by capping out-of-pocket drug spending under Medicare Part D starting in 2024 because they do not account for expected increases in annual out-of-pocket drug spending between 2020 and 2024/2025, the increase in the number of beneficiaries on Medicare, or higher utilization and spending associated with the increased affordability of prescription drugs due to this benefit improvement.” [KFF, [1/24/23](#)]

- **AARP CEO Jo Ann Jenkins On The Inflation Reduction Act: Millions Of Older Adults Are Now “One Step Closer To Real Relief From Out-Of-Control Prescription Drug Prices.”**  
“Medicare is poised to renegotiate the prices of some of its most expensive drugs through a historic expansion of its power, which could reduce costs for many seniors as well as federal spending on its prescription drug plan. The changes are tucked inside a massive spending-and-tax bill in Congress that includes \$433 billion in investments in health-care and clean energy. House Democrats passed the Inflation Reduction Act on Friday in a 220 to 207 vote along party lines, ending a tortured legislative process that took more than a year. [...] The American Association of Retired Persons, which represents 38 million people, described the legislation as a historic victory for older adults. AARP CEO Jo Ann Jenkins said the group has fought for nearly two decades to allow Medicare to negotiate drug prices. Millions of older adults are now “one step closer to real relief from out-of-control prescription drug prices,” Jenkins said earlier this week.” [CNBC, [8/12/22](#)]

**The IRA Allowed Medicare To Negotiate Drug Prices, Reducing Drug Costs For Seniors And Federal Spending.** “Medicare is poised to renegotiate the prices of some of its most expensive drugs through a historic expansion of its power, which could reduce costs for many seniors as well as federal spending on its prescription drug plan. The changes are tucked inside a massive spending-and-tax bill in Congress that includes \$433 billion in investments in health-care and clean energy. House Democrats passed the Inflation Reduction Act on Friday in a 220 to 207 vote along party lines, ending a tortured legislative process that took more than a year. The bill empowers the Health and Human Services Secretary to negotiate prices for certain drugs covered under two different parts of Medicare and punish pharmaceutical companies that don’t play by the rules. The legislation also caps out-of-pocket costs at \$2,000 starting in 2025 for people who participate in Medicare Part D, the prescription drug plan for seniors.” [CNBC, [8/12/22](#)]

**The IRA Required Drug Companies That Raised Prices More Than The Rate Of Inflation To Rebate Medicare The Amount Over The Inflation Rate.** “President Joe Biden signed the Inflation Reduction Act of 2022 on Aug. 16. This historic legislation will help millions of Medicare enrollees better afford their life-sustaining medications, and millions more Americans will be able to pay their Affordable Care Act premiums. [...] Here are the main elements of the health care portions of the new law. [...] Beginning in October, if the price of a Part D prescription drug is raised by more than the rate of general inflation, the drugmaker will have to rebate to Medicare the amount of the increase above the inflation rate. Rebates for higher-than-inflation price hikes for medications covered under Medicare Part B (usually office-based infusions, such as for cancer drugs) will begin in January 2023.” [AARP, [8/16/22](#)]

**IRA Capped Copays For Insulin At \$35 For Medicare Patients.** “A new legislative package signed into law by President Joe Biden on Tuesday is a big win for Medicare patients who struggle to cover the cost of insulin to manage their diabetes. But the bill, called the Inflation Reduction Act, falls short of applying those cost controls to the broader patient population who rely on insulin. The bill limits insulin copays to \$35 per month for Medicare Part D beneficiaries starting in 2023. Notably, seniors covered by Medicare also have a \$2,000 annual out-of-pocket cap on Part D prescription drugs starting in 2025. Medicare will also now have the ability to negotiate the costs of certain prescription drugs.” [CNBC, [8/16/22](#)]

## ...And Protections For Nursing Home Residents...

**March 2021: Lawler Voted Against A05684A.** In March 2021, Lawler voted against A05684A in a floor vote in the New York State Assembly. [New York State Assembly, A05684A, [3/9/21](#)]

- **A05684A Passed The Assembly By A Vote Of 112 To 36 And Was Signed Into Law.** New York State Assembly, A05684A, [4/24/21](#)]
- **A05684A Sought To Ensure That Nursing Home Operators Seeking Changes Of Ownership Or Operations Were Reviewed Before Being Entrusted With Additional Patient Care.** “To ensure that nursing home operators and owners who come before the Public Health and Health Planning Council (PHHPC) for change of ownership or operations are reviewed and approved based upon several quality metrics before they are entrusted with the care of additional individuals. The bill also enhances transparency around related assets and operations of nursing homes as well as of applications for changes to ownership and/or operation of a facility.” [New York State Assembly, A05684A, [3/9/21](#)]
- **A05684A Sought To Preclude Nursing Home Operations Applicants With “A History Of State Or Federal Violations Of Immediate Jeopardy Or Actual Harm.”** PHHPC shall adopt rules to guide its determination that "that a substantially consistent high level of care has been rendered" by an applicant. The rules would eliminate applicants that have a history of state or federal violations of immediate jeopardy or actual harm; receivership, revocation, or involuntary termination from Medicare or Medicaid; or conviction of patient abuse, neglect or exploitation.” [New York State Assembly, A05684A, [3/9/21](#)]
- **A05684A Sought To Preclude Nursing Home Operations Applicants With A History Of “Receivership, Revocation, Or Involuntary Termination From Medicare Or Medicaid.”** PHHPC shall adopt rules to guide its determination that "that a substantially consistent high level of care has been rendered" by an applicant. The rules would eliminate applicants that have a history of state or federal violations of immediate jeopardy or actual harm; receivership, revocation, or involuntary termination from Medicare or Medicaid; or conviction of patient abuse, neglect or exploitation.” [New York State Assembly, A05684A, [3/9/21](#)]
- **A05684A Sought To Preclude Nursing Home Operations Applicants With A History Of “Conviction Of Patient Abuse, Neglect, Or Exploitation.”** PHHPC shall adopt rules to guide its determination that "that a substantially consistent high level of care has been rendered" by an applicant. The rules would eliminate applicants that have a history of state or federal violations of immediate jeopardy or actual harm; receivership, revocation, or involuntary termination from Medicare or Medicaid; or conviction of patient abuse, neglect or exploitation.” [New York State Assembly, A05684A, [3/9/21](#)]
- **A05684A Required Operators To Make Public Disclosures Related To Changes In Ownership Or Contractual Agreements.** “The bill amends Public Health Law section 2803-x to ensure information on nursing home assets and operations, including familial ownership relationships, be made public. It requires operators to notify the Department 90 days prior to entering into any new common or family ownership of a services provider to the operator. It also requires notice of contractual agreements relative to a sale, mortgage, management, operations, and staffing agencies and prohibits delegating operational control to such contractors.” [New York State Assembly, A05684A, [3/9/21](#)]



**March 2022: Lawler Voted Against S07726.** In March 2022, Lawler voted against S07726 in a floor vote in the New York State Assembly. [New York State Assembly, S07726, [3/10/22](#)]

**S07726 Passed The Assembly By A Vote Of 100 To 40 And Was Signed Into Law.** [New York State Assembly, S07726, [3/18/22](#)]

- **S07726 Directed The Commissioner Of Health To Implement An “Infection Inspection Control Audit” For Nursing Homes.** “Directs the commissioner of health to establish and implement an infection inspection control audit and checklist on nursing homes; provides civil penalties for nursing homes who violate infection control standards.” [New York State Assembly, S07726, [3/10/22](#)]

**June 2021: Lawler Voted Against S01783A.** In June 2021, Lawler voted against S01783A in a floor vote in the New York State Assembly [New York State Assembly, S01783A, [6/9/21](#)]

**S01783A Passed The Assembly By A Vote Of 105 To 43 And Was Signed Into Law.** [New York State Assembly, S01783A, [12/22/21](#)]

- **S01783A Directed The Commissioner Of Health To Establish An “Infection Inspection Audit” For Nursing Homes.** “Directs the commissioner of health to establish and implement an infection inspection audit and checklist on nursing homes.” [New York State Assembly, S01783A, [6/9/21](#)]

**March 2021: Lawler Voted Against A05685A.** In March 2021, Lawler voted against A05685A in a floor vote in the New York State Assembly. [New York State Assembly, A05685A, [3/9/21](#)]

- **A05685A Passed The Assembly By A Vote Of 101 To 47.** [New York State Assembly, A05685A, [3/9/21](#)]
- **A05685A Would Require Nursing Homes To Spend At Least 70% Of Operating Costs On Resident Care.** “Nursing homes must spend at least a 70% of total operating revenue on resident care. Within that required spend, 60% of that amount must be spent on direct nursing care. If a nursing home fails to meet the required percentages in a calendar year, it would owe the difference to DOH (to be collected, if necessary, by deducting from Medicaid payments or by lawsuit). The money would go to the Nursing Home Quality Improvement Demonstration Program under PHL § 2808-d(6).” [New York Assembly, A05685A, [3/9/21](#)]
- **A05685A Would Require That At Least 60% Of The Total Spent On Resident Care Be Spent On Direct Nursing Care.** “Nursing homes must spend at least a 70% of total operating revenue on resident care. Within that required spend, 60% of that amount must be spent on direct nursing care. If a nursing home fails to meet the required percentages in a calendar year, it would owe the difference to DOH (to be collected, if necessary, by deducting from Medicaid payments or by lawsuit). The money would go to the Nursing Home Quality Improvement Demonstration Program under PHL § 2808-d(6).” [New York Assembly, A05685A, [3/9/21](#)]

**...And Threatened To Make It Harder For New Yorkers To Get The Pensions They Were Promised.**

**September 2011 – January 2014: Lawler Was Executive Director Of The New York Republican State Committee.** According to his LinkedIn, Lawler was Executive Director of the New York Republican State Committee in the Greater New York City Area from September 2011 until January 2014. [Mike Lawler, LinkedIn, accessed [9/30/24](#)]



Mike Lawler  
Congressman, 17th District of New York



New York Republican State Committee

4 yrs 3 mos



Executive Director

Sep 2011 - Jan 2014 · 2 yrs 5 mos

Greater New York City Area

[Mike Lawler, LinkedIn, accessed [9/30/24](#)]

**January 2012 – November 2013: The New York Republican State Committee’s Website Had A Page Called “Pension Reform.”** [Republican Party of New York State via Internet Archive, Pension Reform, archived [1/14/12](#); Republican Party of New York State via Internet Archive, Pension Reform, archived [11/24/13](#)]

- **Suggested Reforms Included Raising The Retirement Age And Increasing Employee Contributions To The State Pension System.** “Gov. Cuomo recently said public-pension reform would be his top goal for 2012 — and then backtracked. But ignoring this crisis for another year simply isn’t an option; it won’t go away. [...] In its comprehensive Mandate Relief report (available at [nygop.org](#)), the New York State Association of Counties called for reform of the state-pension system to mirror what is available in the private sector. The report suggests an amendment to the state Constitution to restore benefits to pre-2000 levels and the creation of a sixth pension tier that replaces defined benefits with defined contributions and a floor on employee contributions of at least 7.5 percent. NYSAC also suggests other common-sense solutions, such as basing pensions on salaries without overtime, permitting employees to make contributions above the requirement and raising the minimum retirement age for new employees to mirror Social Security eligibility.” [Republican Party of New York State via Internet Archive, Pension Reform, archived [1/14/12](#); Republican Party of New York State via Internet Archive, Pension Reform, archived [11/24/13](#)]

## Lawler Quick Message #4

*Mike Lawler is playing politics instead of doing something about our border crisis. He opposed a border security deal agreed to by Republicans and President Biden because Trump wants to campaign on the border crisis. Lawler is just another politician who puts politics ahead of doing the right thing.*

### Mike Lawler Is Playing Politics Instead Of Doing Something About Our Border Crisis.

*Substantiated below*

### He Opposed A Border Security Deal Agreed To By Republicans And President Biden Because Trump Wants To Campaign On The Border Crisis.

**AUDIO: Lawler Opposed Moving Forward With the Bipartisan Border Deal That Was Negotiated In the Senate, Citing “Serious Concerns.”** HOST: “Republicans argue that funding for the US Mexico border is a top priority. They've insisted that it accompany funding for Ukraine. There's nothing for the border in this package because the Speaker called the bipartisan border deal dead on arrival. Was that a mistake? LAWLER: “I think it's a little more complicated than that, you know, House Republicans passed HR 2 back in May of last year. Chuck Schumer and Senate Democrats did absolutely nothing on the border for months and it wasn't until Speaker Johnson said that there needed to be border provisions with



a Ukraine aid package that the Senate finally started to negotiate. Oftentimes in Washington, the moment there's a bipartisan deal, everybody wants to jump on board without really looking at the details. I think there were serious concerns about some of the provisions of that border agreement, including enshrining into law, catch and release, which many of us objected to.” [NPR All Things Considered, 0:33, [4/19/24](#)] (AUDIO)

**January 2024: CNN Headline: “GOP Senators Seethe As Trump Blows Up Delicate Immigration Compromise”** [CNN, [1/25/24](#)]

- **January 2024: Trump Lobbied Republicans To Oppose The Bipartisan Immigration Deal To Avoid Granting Democrats A Political Win.** “Senior Senate Republicans are furious that Donald Trump may have killed an emerging bipartisan deal over the southern border, depriving them of a key legislative achievement on a pressing national priority and offering a preview of what’s to come with Trump as their likely presidential nominee. In recent weeks, Trump has been lobbying Republicans both in private conversations and in public statements on social media to oppose the border compromise being delicately hashed out in the Senate, according to GOP sources familiar with the conversations – in part because he wants to campaign on the issue this November and doesn’t want President Joe Biden to score a victory in an area where he is politically vulnerable.” [CNN, [1/25/24](#)]

**Lawler Is Just Another Politician Who Puts Politics Ahead Of Doing The Right Thing.**

*Substantiated above*

## **Lawler Quick Message #5**

*Because voters in NY-17 live in a swing district, voters cannot afford to vote for Mike Lawler. A vote for Mike Lawler is a vote for a Republican Congress and Donald Trump’s Project 2025 agenda.*

**Because Voters In NY-17 Live In A Swing District, Voters Cannot Afford To Vote For Mike Lawler. A Vote For Mike Lawler Is A Vote For A Republican Congress And Donald Trump’s Project 2025 Agenda.**

**Lawler Has “Has Worked For The Trump Political Operation” As A 2016 Trump Delegate And The Principal Of A Consulting Firm Paid \$4 Million For Direct Mail From A “Trump-Aligned” PAC.** “A Republican political strategist by trade, Lawler was executive director of the New York State Republican Committee in the early 2010s and has worked for the Trump political operation. He was a principal in the consulting company, Checkmate Strategies, when it landed a \$4 million direct-mail deal from a Trump-aligned political action committee to attack Joe Biden in the 2020 campaign cycle.” [Lohud, [4/8/24](#)]

- **VIDEO: April 2024: Lawler Said He Voted for Donald Trump in the New York Republican Primary.** HOST: “New York obviously held its primary last week. Did you vote for Donald Trump in that by the way?” LAWLER: “I voted in the Primary and I did vote for the former President, yes.” [CNN The Source, 6:05, [4/10/24](#)] (VIDEO)

**July 2024: AUDIO: Lawler Said Vance “Will Bring A Fresh Perspective, A Younger Voice, To The Conversation.”** HOST: “Mike Lawler is going to give us his very honest opinion about JD Vance. How do you feel about a Trump/Vance ticket? Do you think it’s a winning ticket?” LAWLER: “For starters I think I have a little bit better beard but, look I think this is a blue-collar working-class guy who will



appeal the rust belt voters in Wisconsin, Michigan, Pennsylvania which will determine the outcome of this election. [...] I think he will bring a fresh perspective, a younger voice, to the conversation, obviously coming from humble roots. His grandmother was a blue dog Democrat. This is somebody that I think will bring a much-needed perspective to the Republican Party and at the table when talking about economic issues, especially affordability issues for the working class.” [FOX, Your World with Neil Cavuto, 0:00 [7/15/24](#)] (AUDIO)

- **Lawler Reportedly “Said He Was ‘Not Concerned At All’ About Vance’s Positions In A Conversation With POLITICO.”** “House Foreign Affairs Committee member Rep. Mike Lawler (R-N.Y.) said Republicans are not “scared” of vice presidential nominee Sen. J.D. Vance’s (R-Ohio) skeptical stance on foreign policy and aid to Ukraine, responding to POLITICO’s reporting that some hawks were unhappy with Vance’s selection. Lawler said he was ‘not concerned at all’ about Vance’s positions in a conversation with POLITICO. ‘The foreign policy is going to be dictated by Donald Trump,’ he said. ‘Obviously Sen. Vance is going to have a seat at the table in this; we’ll see who becomes secretary of state, who becomes UN ambassador, who becomes Defense secretary ... I’m in the Republican Party, we have a big tent.’” [Politico, [7/17/24](#)]

**Johnson: “The Road To The Majority Runs Through New York, And It’s Going To Go Through The Hands Of Mike Lawler. I’m Here To Support Him.”** JOHNSON: “Hi it’s Speaker Mike Johnson here in New York with our favorite Congressman Mike Lawler. He is doing an extraordinary job in Congress leading for the people of New York. He works on Financial Services, he works on the Foreign Affairs Committee, he does lots of important things because he’s really qualified – he served in the state assembly, he’s done a lot of great work and we need him to come back. This is a critical district to keep and grow the house majority. The road to the majority runs through New York, and it’s going to go through the hands of Mike Lawler. I’m here to support him and I hope you will as well.” [Mike Lawler, Twitter, :00, [6/23/24](#)] (VIDEO)

- **June 2024: Lawler Thanked Johnson For Coming To The Hudson Valley, Adding, “I Am Proud To Have Your Backing.”** [Mike Lawler, Twitter, [6/23/24](#)]



11:31 AM · Jun 23, 2024 · 53K Views

[Mike Lawler, Twitter, [6/23/24](#)]

**Trump’s “Closest Allies” Wrote Project 2025 As A “Transition In Waiting,” Including A List Of Executive Orders To Be Made On Day One, Should He Win Another Term.** “KELLY: Just go straight to the heart of Project 2025. What is this all about? Why is it so controversial? ORDOÑEZ: It's effectively a transition in waiting, run by some of Trump's closest allies from his first presidency. And it really dates back to his disastrous first transition back in 2016. When he took office, he was widely criticized for being unprepared. Trump actually picked former New Jersey governor, Chris Christie, to make the plans. But Trump tossed all that work out when he was elected, and they really had to start from scratch. KELLY: OK. So this is designed to avoid that scenario again - to actually have a plan, should he have a second term? ORDOÑEZ: Exactly. His allies didn't want that to happen again if he wins a second term, so they got to work. And they got to work well before even the primaries, drafting plans for the next, quote, ‘conservative president.’ And I will note, to be clear, that's exactly what they'll say now. It's for any conservative president. But all along, it was written with Trump in mind. They've told me he was the embodiment of the program or the movement. You know, and they pulled together a huge personnel database. They also compiled a list of executive orders that can be rolled out on Day 1.” [NHPR, [9/5/24](#)]

**HEADLINE: "Trump Claims Not To Know Who Is Behind Project 2025. A CNN Review Found At Least 140 People Who Worked For Him Are Involved."** [CNN, [7/11/24](#)]

**J.D. Vance Had Close Ties To The Heritage Foundation, Which Developed Project 2025.** “Former President Donald Trump named Sen. JD Vance, R-Ohio, as his vice presidential candidate Monday—a pick that could complicate Trump’s effort to distance himself from the controversial policy agenda known as Project 2025, as Vance has close associations with the right-wing organization behind the project. [...]Vance, however, openly has close ties with the Heritage Foundation and its founder Kevin Roberts, who told reporters Monday the organization was privately ‘really rooting’ for Vance to be the VP pick and praised him on X, formerly known as Twitter, on Monday as ‘a man who personifies hope for our nation’s future.’ Vance has been a key champion of Roberts’ efforts to turn the Heritage Foundation ‘into

the de facto institutional home of Trumpism,' Politico reported in a March piece, in which Roberts said the senator 'is absolutely going to be one of the leaders — if not the leader — of our movement.'” [Forbes, [7/16/24](#)]

**Vance: “Most Americans Couldn't Care Less About Project 2025. There Are Some Good Ideas In There.”** [Heartland Signal, Twitter, [7/11/24](#)]



4:16 PM · Jul 11, 2024 · 28.3K Views

[Heartland Signal, Twitter, [7/11/24](#)]