Mariannette Miller-Meeks Overview Backup

Iowans are paying the price for Mariannette Miller-Meeks selling us out. She is beholden to the drug and insurance companies – and does their bidding.

Iowans Are Paying The Price For Mariannette Miller-Meeks Selling Us Out. She Is Beholden To The Drug And Insurance Companies – And Does Their Bidding

See Backup Below

Mariannette Miller-Meeks Message #1 Backup

On the very same day Miller-Meeks opposed capping the price of insulin at $35/month for seniors on Medicare, she received a campaign contribution from a PAC for the largest insulin manufacturer in the country. As health care and drug prices skyrocket, Miller-Meeks has taken over $680,000 from the drug and insurance industries – while giving them over $8 billion in special handouts. Worse, Miller-Meeks did not disclose renting a Washington home owned by two Pharma lobbyists – using over twenty five thousand of our taxpayer dollars to pay for it.

On The Very Same Day Miller-Meeks Opposed Capping The Price Of Insulin At $35/Month For Seniors On Medicare, She Received A Campaign Contribution From A PAC For The Largest Insulin Manufacturer In The Country

HEADLINE: "Miller-Meeks Took Money From Insulin Maker, Then Voted Against Insulin Caps." [Iowa Starting Line, 8/9/24]

August 12, 2022: Mariannette Miller-Meeks Accepted $1,000 From Eli Lilly And Company PAC The Day She Voted Against The Inflation Reduction Act. "Before voting against a bill that would cap insulin costs and allow the government to negotiate Medicare drug costs, Republican Rep. Marianette Miller-Meeks, who represents Iowa's First Congressional District in southeast Iowa, took thousands from an insulin manufacturer and other pharmaceutical companies. Records from the Federal Election Commission show Miller-Meeks received $1,000 from Eli Lilly and Company PAC on Aug. 12, 2022, the day the Inflation Reduction Act was voted on in the US House of Representatives." [Iowa Starting Line, 8/9/24]

- **The Inflation Reduction Act Capped The Cost Of Insulin To $35 Per Month For Seniors.** "The Inflation Reduction Act caps out-of-pocket spending at $35 per month's supply of each insulin product covered under Medicare. These provisions are making insulin more affordable for many people covered by Medicare." [Department of Health and Human Services, 8/16/23]

- **2025: Eli Lilly Was The Largest Insulin Manufacturer And Supplier In The US.** "Here is the updated list of the top insulin manufacturers and suppliers, or the largest manufacturers of insulin in the US in 2025: […] 1. Eli Lilly and Company." [US Exports Blogs, 4/17/25]

As Health Care And Drug Prices Skyrocket, Miller-Meeks Has Taken Over $680,000 From The Drug And Insurance Industries – While Giving Them Over $8 Billion In Special Handouts

Health Care And Prescription Drug Prices Were Increasing

January 2026: Prices Increased For At Least 350 Prescription Drugs In The US

HEADLINE: "Drugmakers Raise US Prices On 350 Medicines Despite Pressure From Trump." [Reuters, 1/1/26]

Reuters: "Drugmakers Plan To Raise U.S. Prices On At Least 350 Branded Medications Including Vaccines Against COVID, RSV And Shingles And Blockbuster Cancer Treatment Ibrance." "Drugmakers plan to raise U.S. prices on at least 350 branded medications including vaccines against COVID, RSV and shingles and blockbuster cancer treatment Ibrance, even as the Trump administration pressures them for cuts, according to data provided exclusively by healthcare research firm 3 Axis Advisors. The number of price increases for 2026 is up from the same point last year, when drugmakers unveiled plans for raises on more than 250 drugs. The median of this year's price hikes is around 4% - in line with 2025." [Reuters, 1/1/26]

2026: Health Insurance Premiums Increased By An Average Of 58%

KFF: Premiums Had Increased By An Average Of 58% In 2026. "This analysis draws on data from the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) and state-based Marketplace (SBM) Open Enrollment reports, as well as KFF survey data and individual market enrollment estimates from Wakely Consulting Group, to examine early indicators of how the expiration of enhanced premium tax credits has affected effectuated enrollment levels (i.e., enrollment among people who have paid their premiums), plan selections, and out-of-pocket costs in 2026. […] Premium payments from enrollees increased by an average of 58% from $113 to $178 per month. This is lower than the 114% increase KFF projected if everyone had stayed in the same plan because many people bought down to higher-deductible plans and because those just past the subsidy cliff with the steepest increases dropped ACA coverage at higher rates. Additionally, the 114% increase was among people receiving a tax credit whereas the 58% increase is among all consumers, including the most number who did not receive a tax credit in 2025." [KFF, 5/19/26]

Miller-Meeks Has Taken Over $680,000 From Pharma And Insurance Companies

2009-2004: Miller-Meeks Campaign Had Accepted $261,698 From The Pharmaceutical/Health Products Industry. [OpenSecrets, accessed 8/18/26]

2009-2004: Miller-Meeks Campaign Accepted $303,330 From The Insurance Industry. [OpenSecrets, accessed 8/18/26]

Q1-Q2 2025: Miller-Meeks Campaign Accepted $35,000 From Pharma And Health Insurance Company PACs. [FEC, Miller-Meeks for Congress Q1 2025 Report, Line 11C, filed 4/15/25; Q2 2025 Report, Line 11C, filed 7/15/25; Q3 Report, Line 11C, filed 10/15/25]

Q1-Q3 2025 Contributions From Pharma And Insurance Company PACs To Mariannette Miller-Meeks

Corporation PAC	Industry	Date	Amount
Bayer	Pharma	3/4/25	$1,000
EMD Serono	Pharma	3/4/25	$1,000
Amgen Inc	Pharma	3/4/25	$5,000
Elevance Health Inc.	Health Insurance	3/18/25	$2,500
Vertex Pharmaceuticals	Pharma	3/30/25	$2,500
Takeda Pharmaceutical	Pharma	3/31/25	$2,500
Elil Lilly	Pharma	3/31/25	$5,000
Genentech Inc.	Pharma	5/28/25	$2,500
Molina Healthcare Inc.	Health Insurance	6/2/25	$2,500
Vertex Pharmaceuticals	Pharma	6/3/25	$2,500
Johnson & Johnson PAC	Pharma	6/30/25	$1,000
Alnylam Pharmaceuticals	Pharma	6/30/25	$2,500
Merck & Co Inc.	Pharma	6/30/25	$1,000
Highmark Inc	Health Insurance	9/17/25	$1,000
EMD Serono	Pharma	9/30/25	$2,500
TOTAL			**$35,000**

Q4 2025: Miller-Meeks Campaign Accepted "$45,000 From The Insurance And Pharmaceutical Lobby." "U.S. Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks' (R-IA) campaign finance records show she took at least $45,500 from the insurance and pharmaceutical lobby after repeatedly opposing extending the Affordable Care Act's (ACA) premium tax credits." [Heartland Signal, 3/23/26]

Q1-Q2 2026: Miller-Meeks Campaign Accepted $40,500 From Pharma And Health Insurance Industry PACs. [FEC, Miller-Meeks for Congress Q1 2026 Report, filed 4/15/26; Q2 2026 Report, filed 7/15/26]

Q1-Q2 2026 Contributions From Pharma And Insurance Industry PACs To Mariannette Miller-Meeks			
Corporation PAC	**Industry**	**Date**	**Amount**
Eli Lilly	Pharma	3/10/26	$5,000
Genentech Inc.	Pharma	3/10/26	$2,500
Alkermes Inc.	Pharma	3/25/26	$2,000
Molina Healthcare Inc.	Health Insurance	3/31/26	$500
Johnson & Johnson	Pharma	5/8/26	$5,000
EMD Serono	Pharma	6/11/26	$2,500
GSK	Pharma	6/19/26	$1,000
Alnylam Pharmaceuticals	Pharma	6/19/26	$2,500
Takeda Pharmaceutical	Pharma	6/30/26	$2,500
Pharmaceutical Research & Manufacturers of America (PhRMA)	Pharma	6/30/26	$2,500
Novartis Corporation	Pharma	6/30/26	$2,500
Amgen Inc.	Pharma	6/30/26	$2,500
Gilead Sciences Inc	Pharma	6/30/26	$1,000
Otsuka America Pharmaceutical	Pharma	6/30/26	$1,000
Bristol-Myers Squibb Company	Pharma	6/30/26	$2,500

Vertex Pharmaceuticals	Pharma	6/30/26	$2,500
Vertex Pharmaceuticals	Pharma	6/30/26	$2,500
TOTAL			**$40,500**

RESEARCH NOTE: $261,698 + $303,330 + $35,000 + $45,000 + $40,500 = $685,528

2025: Miller-Meeks Voted For The Big Beautiful Bill Which Was A Massive Giveaway To Big Pharma By Cutting Their Taxes And Undermining Medicare's Ability To Negotiate Drug Prices

Miller-Meeks Voted Twice For The Big Beautiful Bill

May 22, 2025: Miller-Meeks Voted For Initial Passage Of The Big Beautiful Bill. On May 22, 2025, Representative Mariannette Miller-Meeks voted for: "Passage of the bill that would provide for approximately $3.8 trillion in net tax cuts and $321 billion in military, border enforcement and judiciary spending, offset by $1.5 trillion in spending reductions, as instructed in the fiscal 2025 budget resolution (H Con Res 14). It would raise the statutory debt limit by $4 trillion and provide for increased spending on defense and border security, spending cuts on social safety net programs, such as Medicaid and the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program. It also includes a mix of tax breaks for businesses and individuals; tax increases on universities and foundations; and a phase-down of clean energy tax credits. It would reduce spending on Medicaid by $625 billion over a 10-year period and modify eligibility and cost provisions for enrollees and health providers and impose work, volunteer and education requirements on adults ages 19 to 64 who are covered by the program. It would appropriate "such sums as necessary" for reducing cost-sharing payments for low-income individuals who've purchased "silver" plans on the 2010 health care law's exchanges. But payments to plans that cover abortions would be mostly barred. It would extend and make permanent individual tax brackets and rates included in the 2017 tax overhaul law (PL 115-97) and provide for the adjustment of the lower bounds of each tier based on inflation. It would reduce federal spending on the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program by requiring states to shoulder more of the cost, expand work requirements for SNAP, extend programs authorized under the 2018 farm bill, and prohibit the U.S. Department of Agriculture from increasing the cost of the Thrifty Food Program. As amended, it would cap state and local tax deductions at $40,000 for households with incomes below $500,000 and prohibit Medicaid funding for gender transition therapies or procedures for minors and adults, among other provisions." The bill passed by a vote of 215-214. [H.R. 1, Vote #145, 5/22/25; CQ, 5/22/25]

July 3, 2025: Miller-Meeks Voted For The Final Passage Of The Big Beautiful Bill. On July 3, 2025, Representative Mariannette Miller-Meeks voted for: "Motion to concur in the Senate amendment to the bill that would permanently extend nearly $4 trillion in expiring individual and business tax cuts, create several new tax breaks and fund border and immigration enforcement and air traffic control upgrades. It would cut Medicaid and other safety net programs to partly offset the cost. Among other provisions, it would raise the statutory debt ceiling by $5 trillion and appropriate more than $448 billion in mandatory funding for Trump administration priorities and other needs, including $153 billion for defense, $89 billion for immigration enforcement, and $89.5 billion for border control and security. It also would increase the state and local tax deduction cap to $40,000 annually for five years for households making up to $500,000 a year until 2030, when it would permanently revert to $10,000." Motion agreed to 218-214. [H.R.1, Vote #190, 7/3/25; CQ, 7/3/25]

The Big Beautiful Bill Cut Taxes For Corporations, Including Big Pharma Companies

Institute On Taxation And Economic Policy: The Big Beautiful Bill "Pushed Through" Tax Cuts For Corporations. *"*At least 88 of the largest corporations in America paid no federal corporate income taxes in their most recent fiscal year despite enjoying substantial pretax profits in the U.S. While the biggest U.S. corporations have avoided taxes in this way for decades, it appears that corporate tax avoidance has increased in the most recent year. This is at least in part due to two separate packages of corporate tax cuts pushed through by the Trump administration: last year's *'*One Big Beautiful Bill Act*'* and the 2017 Tax Cuts and Jobs Act (TCJA).*" [*Institute on Taxation and Economic Policy, 4/14/26]

- **The Big Beautiful Bill Made The Tax Cuts And Jobs Act "Permanent."** "On July 4, 2025, President Trump signed H.R. 1, the One Big Beautiful Bill Act (OBBB), into law. OBBB permanently extends trillions of dollars of 2017 tax cuts that were scheduled to expire on December 31, 2025, adds new tax cuts into the mix like no tax on overtime and an additional senior deduction, and partially pays for these tax cuts with changes to Medicaid, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), and student loan programs. If you'd like to learn more about the law, check out what's in the Republican tax law and what's in the entire OBBB." [Bipartisan Policy Center, 7/23/25]

- **Washington Post: The Tax Cuts And Jobs Act Included "A Massive Tax Cut For Corporations."** "A new tax cut for the rich: The final plan lowers the top tax rate for top earners. Under current law, the highest rate is 39.6 percent for married couples earning over $470,700. The GOP bill would drop that to 37 percent and raise the threshold at which that top rate kicks in, to $500,000 for individuals and $600,000 for married couples. This amounts to a significant tax break for the very wealthy, a departure from repeated claims by Trump and his top officials that the bill would not benefit the rich. […] A massive tax cut for corporations 'A massive tax cut for corporations: Starting on Jan. 1, 2018, big businesses' tax rate would fall from 35 percent to just 21 percent, the largest one-time rate cut in U.S. history for the nation's largest companies." [Washington Post, 12/15/17]

PharmTech: Lower Corporate Tax Rates "May Incentivize Pharmaceutical Firms To Pursue Acquisitions Of Emerging Biotech Companies, Platform Developers, And Contract Development And Manufacturing Organizations." "Lower corporate tax rates and greater cash reserves may incentivize pharmaceutical firms to pursue acquisitions of emerging biotech companies, platform developers, and contract development and manufacturing organizations, or CDMOs. This replicates the post-2017 tax cut trend, which saw a surge in life sciences deal activity." [PharmTech, 7/7/25]

The Big Beautiful Bill Included Reforms To The Medicare Drug Price Negotiation Program Which Would Provide $8.8 Billion For Big Pharma

---

The Congressional Budget Office Estimated The One Big Beautiful Bill's Delay And Exemption Of Certain Pharmaceutical Drugs From The Medicare Drug Price Negotiation Program Would Cost $8.8 Billion Over 10 Years. "You have asked the Congressional Budget Office to provide a revised estimate of the budgetary effects of section 71203 of the 2025 reconciliation act. That section delays or exempts certain drugs from selection for the Medicare Drug Price Negotiation Program, which directed the Department of Health and Human Services to negotiate with pharmaceutical manufacturers for the prices that Medicare will pay for certain drugs covered under Part B and Part D of the program. CBO's July 2025 estimate did not include the effects of the policy on price negotiation for several orphan drugs, including Darzalex (daratumumab) Keytruda (pembrolizumab), and Opdivo (nivolumab). […] After accounting for the effect of the policy on those additional drugs, CBO now estimates the cost of section 71203 at $8.8 billion for the 2025–2034 period, $3.9 billion more than the original estimate." [Congressional Budget Office, Revised Estimate of Changes Under the 2025 Reconciliation Act for

Exemptions From Medicare Price Negotiations for Orphan Drugs, 10/20/25]

- **Congressional Budget Office: The Medicare Drug Price Negotiation Program "Directed The Department Of Health And Human Services To Negotiate With Pharmaceutical Manufacturers For The Prices That Medicare Will Pay For Certain Drugs."** "You have asked the Congressional Budget Office to provide a revised estimate of the budgetary effects of section 71203 of the 2025 reconciliation act. That section delays or exempts certain drugs from selection for the Medicare Drug Price Negotiation Program, which directed the Department of Health and Human Services to negotiate with pharmaceutical manufacturers for the prices that Medicare will pay for certain drugs covered under Part B and Part D of the program." [Congressional Budget Office, Revised Estimate of Changes Under the 2025 Reconciliation Act for Exemptions From Medicare Price Negotiations for Orphan Drugs, 10/20/25]

Office Of Congressman Frank Pallone Jr: "A New Report From The Congressional Budget Office Found A Provision Hidden Away In Trump's Signature Bill Will Give An Enormous $8.8 Billion Sweetheart Deal To Big Pharma Companies At The Expense Of Seniors." "The details of Trump's so-called 'Big Beautiful Bill' keep getting uglier. A new report from the Congressional Budget Office found a provision hidden away in Trump's signature bill will give an enormous $8.8 billion sweetheart deal to Big Pharma companies at the expense of seniors. While Republicans were drafting the largest health care cut in history, they quietly tucked in language to weaken Medicare's ability to negotiate lower drug prices for seniors. This is a trojan horse policy that will undermine efforts to lower prescription drug prices for years to come. According to CBO, the provision will give a windfall to pharmaceutical companies by preventing Medicare from negotiating prices for certain drugs, including cancer treatments like Keytruda, Opdivo, and Darzalex that seniors rely on." [Office Of Congressman Frank Pallone Jr, Press Release, 10/20/25]

- **Press Release: "New CBO Report: Trump's Big Ugly Bill Includes $8.8 Billion Handout For Pharmaceutical Companies."** [Office Of Congressman Frank Pallone Jr, Press Release, 10/20/25]

September 2025: Miller-Meeks Said Pharma Companies Were Going To Benefit From The Big Beautiful Bill

September 2025: Miller-Meeks Said That "Pharmaceutical Companies Are One That's Gonna Benefit" From The Big Beautiful Bill. MILLER-MEEKS: "What Congress did, and what the president signed, is the One, Big Beautiful Bill. So, when it comes to manufacturing and support for manufacturing, all of those provisions, the tax provisions, the capital expensing, the keeping the corporate interest rate down, the, the bonus depreciation, immediate expensing 100 percent for research and development, or R&D. All of those are things that help us build manufacturing here in Iowa and in the United States. But more importantly, it helps any kind of company, and pharmaceutical companies are one that's gonna benefit." [Real America's Voice, Just The News, 02:36, 9/5/25] (VIDEO)

Worse, Miller-Meeks Did Not Disclose Renting A Washington Home Owned By Two Pharma Lobbyists – Using Over Twenty Five Thousand Of Our Taxpayer Dollars To Pay For It

Miller-Meeks Spent As Much As $26,000 In Taxpayer Funds To Rent Her DC Apartment From Two Pharma Lobbyists

HEADLINE: "Rep. Miller-Meeks Spent As Much As $26,000 In Taxpayer Funds To Rent DC Apartment From Pharma Lobbyists." [Iowa Starting Line, 4/13/26]

Miller-Meeks Rented A DC Apartment From Two Lobbyists Whose Firm Was Paid $1.8 Million "To Lobby Congress On Behalf Of One Of The Pharmaceutical Industry's Main Trade Groups." "While sitting on a House subcommittee that oversees drug pricing, Iowa Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks was renting her DC apartment from lobbyists paid millions to fight prescription drug cost reforms on behalf of the pharmaceutical industry. Iowa Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks rented a Washington, D.C. apartment from two lobbyists whose firm was paid $1.8 million to lobby Congress on behalf of one of the pharmaceutical industry's main trade groups. Records from the US House of Representatives show she used $26,000 in congressional office funds to pay for housing in DC." [Iowa Starting Line, 4/13/26]

- **Iowa Starting Line: The Lobbyists That Miller-Meeks Rented From Lobbied Against Two Bipartisan Bills That Would Lower The Cost Of Prescription Drugs.** "From 2011 to 2025, Thorsen French Advocacy received $30,000 per quarter—$1.8 million in total—from PhRMA, according to US Senate lobbying disclosure records. The firm specifically lobbied on 'issues related to drug pricing.' The firm lobbied against the Affordable Prescriptions for Patients Act and the Drug Competition Enhancement Act, two bipartisan bills aimed at lowering drug costs by targeting practices employed by the pharmaceutical industry." [Iowa Starting Line, 4/13/26]

Iowa Starting Line: "Records From The US House Of Representatives Show She Used $26,000 In Congressional Office Funds To Pay For" The DC Apartment. "While sitting on a House subcommittee that oversees drug pricing, Iowa Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks was renting her DC apartment from lobbyists paid millions to fight prescription drug cost reforms on behalf of the pharmaceutical industry. Iowa Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks rented a Washington, D.C. apartment from two lobbyists whose firm was paid $1.8 million to lobby Congress on behalf of one of the pharmaceutical industry's main trade groups. Records from the US House of Representatives show she used $26,000 in congressional office funds to pay for housing in DC." [Iowa Starting Line, 4/13/26]

- **January 2023-September 2025: Miller-Meeks Reimbursed Herself $26,796 In Taxpayer Dollars "For Her Rent Payments."** "While the lease was not made available, the House does publish an account of funds used for office expenditures, including lodging. A review of these records found Miller-Meeks reimbursed herself $26,796 from her congressional office budget for lodging between January 2023 and September 2025. January 2023 was the first month these funds were available under a 2023 rule change. Under it, members can voluntarily use taxpayer-funded office budgets to cover DC lodging costs; money that is otherwise used for staff salaries, office expenses, travel, and constituent services. The system was designed to offset the cost of maintaining a second living arrangement in Washington, DC. Miller-Meeks used that system to reimburse herself for her rent payments." [Iowa Starting Line, 4/13/26]

Miller-Meeks Tried To Hide The Fact She Rented From Pharma Lobbyists And Refused To Answer Questions About It

Iowa Starting Line: Miller-Meeks Rental Agreement With Two Pharma Lobbyists Did Not Appear On Multiple Financial Disclosures. "Miller-Meeks' rental agreement with Thorsen and French does not appear anywhere in her annual House financial disclosure reports for 2023 or 2024—the two filing years that cover the period in question. Those filings, which she certified as 'true, complete, and correct,' list her investment accounts, her mortgage on an out-of-district property in Ottumwa, and other financial relationships in detail, but contain no reference to Thorsen, French, or the Capitol Hill apartment. Iowa Starting Line reviewed all of Miller-Meeks' financial disclosures dating back to her first filing in 2020—none of them reference the rental arrangement." [Iowa Starting Line, 4/13/26]

- **April 2026: "Iowa Starting Line Reviewed All Of Miller-Meeks' Financial Disclosures Dating Back To Her First Filing In 2020 – None Of Them Reference The Rental Agreement."** "Miller-Meeks' rental agreement with Thorsen and French does not appear anywhere in her annual House financial disclosure reports for 2023 or 2024—the two filing years that cover the period in question. Those filings, which she certified as 'true, complete, and correct,' list her investment accounts, her mortgage on an out-of-district property in Ottumwa, and other financial relationships in detail, but contain no reference to Thorsen, French, or the Capitol Hill apartment. Iowa Starting Line reviewed all of Miller-Meeks' financial disclosures dating back to her first filing in 2020—none of them reference the rental arrangement." [Iowa Starting Line, 4/13/26]

HEADLINE: "Rep. Miller Meeks Ducks Question About Renting a Condo from Lobbyists." [MeidasTouch News, 4/24/26]

April 2026: Miller-Meeks Dodged A Question Asking "Why Didn't You Tell Iowans You Were Renting From Pharma Lobbyists?" MAN: "Congresswoman Miller-Meeks, why didn't you tell Iowans you were renting from pharma lobbyists." [MeidasTouch News, 00:01, 4/24/26] (VIDEO)

Mariannette Miller-Meeks Message #2 Backup

Mariannette Miller-Meeks is bought and paid for by the drug companies. On the very same day she opposed capping the price of insulin at $35/month for seniors on Medicare – she received a campaign contribution from a PAC for the largest insulin manufacturer in the country. She also took a contribution from a drug company lobbyist. Then the very next day, Miller-Meeks voted to restrict Medicare's ability to negotiate lower drug prices, giving the big drug companies over $8 billion in special hand-outs. Miller-Meeks' corruption is costing us.

Mariannette Miller-Meeks Is Bought And Paid For By The Drug Companies

See Backup Below

On The Very Same Day She Opposed Capping The Price Of Insulin At $35/Month For Seniors On Medicare – She Received A Campaign Contribution From A PAC For The Largest Insulin Manufacturer In The Country

See Above In Mariannette Miller-Meeks Message #1 Backup

She Also Took A Contribution From A Drug Company Lobbyist. Then The Very Next Day, Miller-Meeks Voted To Restrict Medicare's Ability To Negotiate Lower Drug Prices…

May 21, 2025: Miller-Meeks Accepted $1,000 From A Drug Company Lobbyist

May 21, 2025: Miller-Meeks Campaign Accepted $1,000 From Vertex Pharmaceuticals Employee Matthew Schumaker. [FEC, Mariannette Miller-Meeks Q2 2025 Report, Receipts, filed 7/15/25]

- **Q2 2025: Matthew Schumaker Lobbied Congress For Vertex Pharmaceuticals On "Issues Regarding The One Big Beautiful Bill Act."** [Vertex Pharmaceuticals Q2 2025 Congressional Lobbying Report, filed 7/16/25]

- **Vertex Was A "Global Biotechnology Company" Who Made And Commercialized Prescription Drugs.** "Vertex Pharmaceuticals, Inc. is a global biotechnology company, which engages in the business of discovering, developing, manufacturing, and commercializing small molecule drugs for patients with serious diseases." [Forbes, accessed 8/18/26]

May 22, 2025: Miller-Meeks Voted For The Big Beautiful Bill Which Restricted Medicare's Ability To Negotiate Lower Prescription Drug Costs

May 22, 2025: Miller-Meeks Voted For Initial Passage Of The Big Beautiful Bill. On May 22, 2025, Representative Mariannette Miller-Meeks voted for: "Passage of the bill that would provide for approximately $3.8 trillion in net tax cuts and $321 billion in military, border enforcement and judiciary spending, offset by $1.5 trillion in spending reductions, as instructed in the fiscal 2025 budget resolution (H Con Res 14). It would raise the statutory debt limit by $4 trillion and provide for increased spending on defense and border security, spending cuts on social safety net programs, such as Medicaid and the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program. It also includes a mix of tax breaks for businesses and individuals; tax increases on universities and foundations; and a phase-down of clean energy tax credits. It would reduce spending on Medicaid by $625 billion over a 10-year period and modify eligibility and cost provisions for enrollees and health providers and impose work, volunteer and education requirements on adults ages 19 to 64 who are covered by the program. It would appropriate "such sums as necessary" for reducing cost-sharing payments for low-income individuals who've purchased "silver" plans on the 2010 health care law's exchanges. But payments to plans that cover abortions would be mostly barred. It would extend and make permanent individual tax brackets and rates included in the 2017 tax overhaul law (PL 115-97) and provide for the adjustment of the lower bounds of each tier based on inflation. It would reduce federal spending on the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program by requiring states to shoulder more of the cost, expand work requirements for SNAP, extend programs authorized under the 2018 farm bill, and prohibit the U.S. Department of Agriculture from increasing the cost of the Thrifty Food Program. As amended, it would cap state and local tax deductions at $40,000 for households with incomes below $500,000 and prohibit Medicaid funding for gender transition therapies or procedures for minors and adults, among other provisions." The bill passed by a vote of 215-214. [H.R. 1, Vote #145, 5/22/25; CQ, 5/22/25]

- **The Congressional Budget Office Estimated The One Big Beautiful Bill's Delay And Exemption Of Certain Pharmaceutical Drugs From The Medicare Drug Price Negotiation Program Would Cost $8.8 Billion Over 10 Years.** "You have asked the Congressional Budget Office to provide a revised estimate of the budgetary effects of section 71203 of the 2025 reconciliation act. That section delays or exempts certain drugs from selection for the Medicare Drug Price Negotiation Program, which directed the Department of Health and Human Services to negotiate with pharmaceutical manufacturers for the prices that Medicare will pay for certain drugs covered under Part B and Part D of the program. CBO's July 2025 estimate did not include the effects of the policy on price negotiation for several orphan drugs, including Darzalex (daratumumab) Keytruda (pembrolizumab), and Opdivo (nivolumab). […] After accounting for the effect of the policy on those additional drugs, CBO now estimates the cost of section 71203 at $8.8 billion for the 2025–2034 period, $3.9 billion more than the original estimate." [Congressional Budget Office, Revised

Estimate of Changes Under the 2025 Reconciliation Act for Exemptions From Medicare Price Negotiations for Orphan Drugs, 10/20/25]

- **Congressional Budget Office: The Medicare Drug Price Negotiation Program "Directed The Department Of Health And Human Services To Negotiate With Pharmaceutical Manufacturers For The Prices That Medicare Will Pay For Certain Drugs."** "You have asked the Congressional Budget Office to provide a revised estimate of the budgetary effects of section 71203 of the 2025 reconciliation act. That section delays or exempts certain drugs from selection for the Medicare Drug Price Negotiation Program, which directed the Department of Health and Human Services to negotiate with pharmaceutical manufacturers for the prices that Medicare will pay for certain drugs covered under Part B and Part D of the program." [Congressional Budget Office, Revised Estimate of Changes Under the 2025 Reconciliation Act for Exemptions From Medicare Price Negotiations for Orphan Drugs, 10/20/25]

…Giving The Big Drug Companies Over $8 Billion In Special Hand-Outs

See Backup Above In Mariannette Miller-Meeks Message #1 Backup

Miller-Meeks' Corruption Is Costing Us

See Backup Above

Mariannette Miller-Meeks Message #3 Backup

Miller-Meeks repeatedly voted to defund public education. She voted to threaten the jobs of more than 100,000 teachers and staff and cut $7 billion in funding for education. Instead, she supports giving billions of our tax dollars to private schools.

Miller-Meeks Repeatedly Voted To Defund Public Education. She Voted To Threaten The Jobs Of More Than 100,000 Teachers And Staff And Cut $7 Billion In Funding For Education

September 2023: Miller-Meeks Voted For An Appropriations Bill Which Threatened Over 100,000 Teachers Jobs

September 2023: Miller-Meeks Voted For A Republican Appropriations Bill. On September 29, 2023, Representative Mariannette Miller-Meeks voted for: "Passage of the bill, as amended, that would provide funding for federal government operations and services through Oct. 31, 2023, with a 29.9 percent cut from fiscal 2023 levels for most programs. It would fund veterans' programs, the Department of Homeland Security, national security programs and disaster assistance at full fiscal 2023 levels. It would also implement nearly all provisions of House Republicans' border security and immigration bill (HR 2), which the House passed in May 2023. It would provide an increase in funding for the Defense Department at rates set forth in House Republicans' fiscal 2024 defense appropriations bill (HR 4365), which would provide for a 3.6 percent funding increase over fiscal 2023. It would also provide funding increases for the Agriculture Department and provide an additional $220 million above fiscal 2023 levels for Energy Department nuclear programs. Among its border security and immigration provisions, it would require DHS, within seven days of enactment, to resume all activities related to "border wall" construction on the U.S.-Mexico border that were underway or planned prior to Jan. 20, 2021; require

DHS to reopen or restore, no later than Sept. 30, 2023, the use of all Immigration and Customs Enforcement detention facilities that were in operation on Jan. 20, 2021; and require DHS to return all unaccompanied children to their country of origin, regardless of whether they are from a contiguous country to the U.S. In addition to provisions of HR 2, it would place limitations on the use of DHS funding provided by the bill, including prohibitions on removing existing U.S.-Mexico border barriers, transporting inadmissible adults into the U.S., and the use of Customs and Border Protection's "CBP One" app to facilitate the parole of an individual into the U.S. It also would prohibit the use of funds provided by the bill to initiate or resume any project or activity not funded during fiscal 2023 and would establish a congressional fiscal commission tasked with identifying policies to 'improve the fiscal situation.'" The bill was rejected by a vote of 198-232. [H.R. 5525, Vote #511, 9/29/23; CQ, 9/29/23]

- **White House: The Appropriations Bill Could Lead To 145,000 Fewer Teachers And 100,000 Less Students With Pell Grants.** "With one day before the end of the fiscal year, instead of following the bipartisan lead of the Senate to keep the government open, 90% of House Republicans just voted for a partisan bill to eviscerate programs millions of hardworking families count on—with a devastating 30% cut to law enforcement, Meals on Wheels, Head Start, and more. They are breaking their word, abandoning the bipartisan deal that two-thirds of them voted for just four months ago, and marching our country toward an Extreme Republican Shutdown that will damage our economy, our communities, and national security. Here's what it would mean for the American people if extreme House Republicans' 30% cuts were extended for the entire year. […] Up to 145,000 teachers and staff could be removed from classrooms and school 100,000 students would lose access to Pell Grants." [The White House, 9/29/23]

April 2023: Miller-Meeks Voted For An Appropriations Bill Which Threatened To Cut Over $7 Billion In Funding For Education Nationwide

April 2023: Miller-Meeks Voted For The "Limit, Save, Grow Act" Which Was Also Known As The Republican Debt Limit Package. On April 26, 2023, Mariannette Miller-Meeks voted for: "Passage of the bill, as amended, that would suspend the statutory limit on federal debt through March 31, 2024, or until an additional $1.5 trillion has been borrowed — whichever occurs first. It would also include a range of provisions to limit federal spending, as well as the text of a previously passed energy and permitting policy package. The bill would set base discretionary spending limits through fiscal 2033, capping spending for fiscal 2024 at the fiscal 2022 level of $1.47 trillion — a reduction from current spending levels — and raising the cap by 1 percent annually through fiscal 2033. It would also include similar annual cap adjustments for specified programs, including for wildfire suppression, disability reviews and redeterminations, health care fraud and abuse control, and disaster reemployment services and eligibility assessments. The bill would rescind unobligated amounts from various funds provided by the fiscal 2022 reconciliation package (PL 117-169) for COVID-19 relief, IRS enforcement, and certain climate- and infrastructure-focused initiatives, as well as all unobligated funding from the March 2021 coronavirus relief reconciliation package (PL 117-2) and earlier coronavirus response laws." The bill was passed by a vote of 217-215. [H.R. 2811, Vote #199, 4/26/23; CQ, 4/26/23]

The Plan Included Annual Appropriations Cuts "To Education." "The legislation Congressional Republicans introduced sets overall appropriations for Fiscal Year 2024 at the same level as FY 2022. At this level, all appropriated funding—including both defense and domestic programs—would be cut deeply. However, Congressional Republicans have indicated that they are not willing to cut defense funding at all, which means that everything else in annual appropriations—from cancer research, to education, to veterans' health care—would be cut by much more." [The White House, 4/20/23]

- **NEA: "Title I Of The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) Would Lose $4 Billion."** "The Limit, Save, Grow Act would slash federal funding by $130 billion in FY2024. That translates to a 22 percent cut in essential programs, compounded by the imposition of spending caps for 10 more years. The cuts would be even bigger than 22 percent, and even more devastating, if certain programs are exempted—defense spending, for example. Here's what a 22 percent cut would mean for ongoing education programs: Title I of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) would lose $4 billion, impacting 25 million students—a cut equivalent to removing 60,000 educators from classrooms serving low-income students." [National Education Association, 4/25/23]

- **NEA: The Limit, Save, Grow Act Would Cut "Grants Used To Recruit And Retain Educators Would Be Cut By $9 Million, On Average, In Every State."** "The Limit, Save, Grow Act would slash federal funding by $130 billion in FY2024. That translates to a 22 percent cut in essential programs, compounded by the imposition of spending caps for 10 more years. The cuts would be even bigger than 22 percent, and even more devastating, if certain programs are exempted—defense spending, for example. Here's what a 22 percent cut would mean for ongoing education programs […] Title II grants used to recruit and retain educators would be cut by $9 million, on average, in every state." [National Education Association, 4/25/23]

- **NEA: The Limit, Save, Grow Act Cut Grants For Students With Disabilities By $3.1 Billion.** "The Limit, Save, Grow Act would slash federal funding by $130 billion in FY2024. That translates to a 22 percent cut in essential programs, compounded by the imposition of spending caps for 10 more years. The cuts would be even bigger than 22 percent, and even more devastating, if certain programs are exempted—defense spending, for example. Here's what a 22 percent cut would mean for ongoing education programs […] Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) grants would decline by $3.1 billion, impacting 7.5 million students with disabilities—a cut equivalent to eliminating 48,000 special education teachers and paraeducators." [National Education Association, 4/25/23]

Instead, She Supports Giving Billions Of Our Tax Dollars To Private Schools

2021: Miller-Meeks Introduced The CHOICE Act, Which Would Authorize Voucher Programs For Disabled Students To Attend Private Schools

November 2021: Miller-Meeks Introduced The Creating Hope And Opportunity For Individuals And Communities Through Education (CHOICE) Act. In November 2021, Miller-Meeks introduced HR 5959, a bill that "authorizes the Department of Education (ED) to award grants to support the design and implementation of state programs that allow the parent of a child with a disability to choose the appropriate public or private school for their child. It also outlines the requirements for program eligibility. Further, if the state has established a program that allows parents to use public or private funds to assist with the cost of their child attending a private school, then the state may supplement those funds with federal special education funds. Additionally, the Department of Defense must carry out a five-year pilot program to award scholarships to enable military dependent students who live on military installations to attend the public or private elementary or secondary schools their parents choose. The bill also requires ED to return to the Treasury specified amounts made available for salaries and expenses." As of December 8, 2021, the bill had been referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services. [HR 5959, Sponsored, 11/12/21; CQ, 11/12/21]

The CHOICE Act Would Have Redirected More Than $11 Billion Dollars Of Taxpayer Money To Private Schools

National Coalition For Public Education: "The CHOICE Act Would Funnel More Than $11 Billion Dollars Of Taxpayer Money To Private Schools." "The CHOICE Act would funnel more than $11 billion dollars of taxpayer money to private schools. It would turn IDEA into a voucher, reduce Impact Aid, and expand the failing DC voucher program, all the while, stripping vital civil rights protections and basic accountability standards. Instead, Congress should invest these dollars in the public schools, which serve all students regardless of gender, disability, economic status, or educational achievement." [National Coalition For Public Education, accessed 12/8/21]

Miller-Meeks Repeatedly Supported Voucher Programs That Sent Money To Private Schools

2008: Miller-Meeks Said She Supported Private School Vouchers. According to Vote Smart's Iowa Congressional Election 2008 Political Courage Test, Miller-Meeks said she supported letting parents use vouchers to send their children to any public, private, or religious school. [Vote Smart, Iowa Congressional Election 2008 Political Courage Test, accessed 4/27/26]

Indicate which principles you support (if any) regarding education.

	a) Support the federal government funding universal pre-K programs.
X	b) Allow parents to use vouchers to send their children to any public school.
X	c) Allow parents to use vouchers to send their children to any private or religious school.
X	d) Allow teachers and professionals to receive federal funding to establish charter or magnet schools.

Miller-Meeks: "Charter Schools And School Vouchers Will Improve The Quality Of An Education And Reduce Costs To Taxpayers." According to Miller-Meeks for Congress 2010 website under "Improving Education", Miller-Meeks said "I believe the answer is competition in education. Charter schools and school vouchers will improve the quality of an education and reduce costs to taxpayers. Increased accountability and merit pay based on classroom performance (rather than standardized tests) will reward our best public school teachers and raise classroom performance. I also firmly support parental rights, and those who choose to home-school their children." [Miller-Meeks for Congress 2010, accessed 6/15/20]

August 2025: Miller-Meeks Touted Iowa's New School Choice Voucher Program. MILLER-MEEKS: "We have one of the best managed states in the country. We were in the best financial position coming out of COVID. We've just instituted school choice." [WHO, Simon Conway Show, 04:48, 8/6/25] (AUDIO)

- **National School Boards Association: "School Vouchers Are Education Tax Dollars That Are Diverted From Public Schools To Help Subsidize The Tuition Of Private And Religious Schools."** "School vouchers are education tax dollars that are diverted from public schools to help subsidize the tuition of private and religious schools. Although some states and cities have limited voucher programs, the only federally funded program is in Washington, D.C. Many voucher proponents are also endorsing education savings accounts and tuition tax credits, which sound nice, but are fundamentally the same as voucher programs as they siphon limited resources away from our nation's public schools." [National School Boards Association, accessed 1/12/26]

- **NPR: Traditional School Vouchers Use Funding That "The State Would Have Otherwise Spent To Educate The Child In A Public School."** "What are they? Think of traditional vouchers as coupons, backed by state dollars, that parents can use to send their kids to the school of their choice, even private, religiously affiliated schools. The money is all or some of what the state would have otherwise spent to educate the child in a public school." [NPR, 12/7/16]

- **The Atlantic: School Vouchers Lead To Defunding And Closing Of Public Schools, Eventually Creating Education Deserts Where Parents And Children Have To Travel Miles And Hours For Their Children To Attend School.** "What much fewer people realize is that the argument over 'school of choice' is only the latest chapter in a decades-long political struggle between two models of freedom—one based on market choice and the other based on democratic participation. Neoliberals like DeVos often assume that organizing public spaces like a market must lead to beneficial outcomes. But in doing so, advocates of school of choice ignore the political ramifications of the marketization of shared goods like the educational system. […] In Detroit (where DeVos played a big role in introducing school choice) two decades of this marketization has led to extreme defunding and closing of public schools; the funneling of taxpayer money toward for-profit charter ventures; economically disadvantaged parents with worse options than when the neoliberal social experiment began; and finally, no significant increase in student performance. Indeed, some zones of Detroit are now educational deserts where parents and children have to travel exorbitant miles and hours for their children to attend school." [The Atlantic, 4/17/17]

Mariannette Miller-Meeks Message #4 Backup

Iowa has one of the strictest abortion bans in the country – because of Mariannette Miller-Meeks. Miller-Meeks calls herself "100% pro-life." She championed a bill that bans all abortions — nationwide, with no exceptions, even in cases of rape, incest, or to save a woman's life. Miller-Meeks would take away women's reproductive rights and freedoms. Mariannette Miller-Meeks does not share our values.

Iowa Has One Of The Strictest Abortion Bans In The Country – Because Of Mariannette Miller-Meeks

Miller-Meeks Supported Iowa's Six-Week Abortion Ban And Voted Against Protecting Abortion Rights Nationwide, Leading To The State Having One Of The Strictest Bans In The Country

2020: Miller-Meeks Expressed Support For Iowa's Six-Week Abortion Ban, One Of The Strictest In The Nation

2020: Miller-Meeks Supported Iowa's Six Week Abortion Ban, Which At The Time Of Passage Was The Strictest In The Nation

2020: Miller-Meeks "Said In A Statement That She 'Championed' Reynolds' Priorities In The State Legislature, Specifically Mentioning The 'Fetal Heartbeat' Bill." "When Miller-Meeks was a member, the Iowa Senate approved amending the Iowa Constitution to say it does not protect abortion rights. This was a direct response to the Iowa Supreme Court for holding up the 2018 'fetal heartbeat' bill. When Gov. Kim Reynolds endorsed Miller-Meeks in her 2020 bid for federal office, Miller-Meeks said in a statement that she 'championed' Reynolds' priorities in the state legislature, specifically mentioning the 'fetal heartbeat' bill." [Iowa Public Radio, 7/30/24]

- **2018: Governor Reynolds Signed A Bill That Banned In Abortion In Iowa At "About Six Weeks Of Pregnancy."** "Iowa Gov. Kim Reynolds signed one of the country's most restrictive abortion bills into law on Friday. The so-called 'heartbeat' legislation bans abortions once a fetal heartbeat has been detected, at about six weeks of pregnancy. Exceptions are made in cases of rape, incest or medical emergency." [NPR, 5/5/18]

- **PBS News: At The Time Of It's Passage, Iowa's Six-Week Abortion Ban "Would Be The Strictest Abortion Regulation In The Nation."** "Iowa Gov. Kim Reynolds said she plans to sign a six-week abortion ban into law on Friday that would be the strictest abortion regulation in the nation but set the state up for a lengthy court fight. The Republican governor announced in a news release that she would sign the bill in her formal office at the state Capitol. Reynolds had not previously said whether she would approve the legislation, but noted: 'I'm pro-life. I'm proud to be pro-life. I've made that very clear.'" [PBS News, 5/4/18]

2020: Miller-Meeks Voted For An Amendment To The State Constitution Repealing The Right To An Abortion In Direct Response To The Iowa Supreme Court "Holding Up" The 2018 Heartbeat Bill

---

February 2020: Miller-Meeks Voted Against SJR 2001. On February 13, 2020, Miller-Meeks voted against: "Senate Joint Resolution 2001, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the State of Iowa to protect life by declaring that the Constitution of the State of Iowa shall not be construed to recognize, grant, or secure a right to abortion or to require the public funding of abortion. BE IT RESOLVED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF IOWA: Section 1. The following amendment to the Constitution of the State of Iowa is proposed: Article I of the Constitution of the State of Iowa is amended by adding the following new section: Sec. 26. Protection of life. To defend the dignity of all human life, and to protect mothers and unborn children from efforts to expand abortion even to the day of birth, we the people of the State of Iowa declare that this Constitution shall not be construed to recognize, grant, or secure a right to abortion or to require the public funding of abortion. Sec. 2. REFERRAL AND PUBLICATION. The foregoing amendment to the Constitution of the State of Iowa is referred to the general assembly to be chosen at the next general election for members of the general assembly, and shall be published as provided by law for three consecutive months previous to the date of that election." The resolution passed by a vote of 32-18. [Iowa State Senate Journal, SJR 2001, voted 2/13/20]

SJR 2001 Was A Joint Resolution To Amend The Iowa Constitution To Remove The Right To An Abortion. "A Joint Resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the State of Iowa to protect life by declaring that the Constitution of the State of Iowa shall not be construed to recognize, grant, or secure a right to abortion or to require the public funding of abortion." [SJR 2001, introduced 1/27/20]

- **Des Moines Register Called The Proposed Constitutional Amendment "An Attempt To Overturn A 2018 Iowa Supreme Court Decision That Protected Abortion Rights In The State."** "In Iowa's Legislature, Republican lawmakers have passed numerous abortion restrictions and are working to pass a constitutional amendment saying that the Iowa Constitution does not secure a right to abortion. It's an attempt to overturn a 2018 Iowa Supreme Court decision that protected abortion rights in the state." [Des Moines Register, 9/25/21]

- **Iowa Public Radio: The Vote Was "A Direct Response To The Iowa Supreme Court For Holding Up The 2018 'Fetal Heartbeat' Bill."** "When Miller-Meeks was a member, the Iowa Senate approved amending the Iowa Constitution to say it does not protect abortion rights. This was a direct response to the Iowa Supreme Court for holding up the 2018 'fetal heartbeat' bill. When Gov. Kim Reynolds endorsed Miller-Meeks in her 2020 bid for federal office, Miller-Meeks said in a statement that she 'championed' Reynolds' priorities in the state legislature, specifically mentioning the 'fetal heartbeat' bill." [Iowa Public Radio, 7/30/24]

Miller-Meeks Repeatedly Voted Against The Women's Health Protection Act, Which Would Have Protected Abortion Access Nationwide

2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against The Women's Health Protection Act, Which Would Protect The Right To An Abortion Nationwide

September 2021: Miller-Meeks Voted Against The Women's Health Protection Act, A Bill Establishing Rights For Health Care Providers To Provide And Patients To Receive Abortions. On September 24, 2021, Representative Mariannette Miller-Meeks voted against the "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 passed by a vote of 218-211. [HR 3755, Vote #295, 9/24/21; CQ, 9/24/21]

- **Washington Post: The Women's Health Protection Act "Would Essentially Codify Roe V. Wade."** "The House on Friday passed legislation that would create a statutory right for health-care professionals to provide abortions, amid an intensifying legal battle over a Texas law that is the most restrictive in the nation. H.R. 3755, the Women's Health Protection Act, was approved by the House 218 to 211 but faces tough odds in the evenly divided Senate. The measure states that health-care providers have a statutory right to provide, and patients have a right to receive, abortion services without any number of limitations that states and opponents of the procedure have sought to impose. The measure would essentially codify Roe v. Wade, the 1973 Supreme Court decision guaranteeing the right to abortion before viability, usually around 22 to 24 weeks." [Washington Post, 9/24/21]

    - **Pelosi: "This Ban Necessitates Codifying Roe V. Wade."** "In a statement, Pelosi said the Texas statute is 'the most extreme, dangerous abortion ban in half a century, and its purpose is to destroy Roe v. Wade, and even refuses to make exceptions for cases of rape and incest. This ban necessitates codifying Roe v. Wade.'" [NPR, 9/24/21]

- **Dobbs Eliminated The Constitutional Right To An Abortion.** "The Supreme Court on Friday overruled Roe v. Wade, eliminating the constitutional right to an abortion after almost 50 years in a 6-to-3 ruling." [New York Times, 6/24/22]

    - **CAP: 19 States Had Bans On Abortion Passed Either Pre- Or Post-Roe That Could Come Into Effect After Supreme Court Overturned Roe V Wade.** "If the U.S. Supreme Court overturns Roe v. Wade, as it is expected to do in the coming days, the U.S. Constitution will no longer be interpreted as protecting the right to abortion.1 As a result, states will be able to decide whether abortion is legal and under what circumstances. While some states already have extreme legislation in effect that bans nearly all abortion care, 19 states have bans on the books passed either pre- or post-Roe, many of which—while not currently in force—could come into effect if the Supreme Court overturns Roe." [CAP, 6/24/22]

    - **20.9 Million Women Lost Access To Nearly All Elective Abortions In Their Home States Two Months After Dobbs**. "Two months after the Supreme Court overturned Roe v. Wade, about 20.9 million women have lost access to nearly all elective abortions in their home states, and a slate of strict new trigger laws expected to take effect in the coming days will shut out even more." [Washington Post, 8/22/22]

2023: Miller-Meeks Blocked Consideration Of The Women's Health Protection Act

2023: Miller-Meeks Voted For Blocking Consideration Of The Women's Health Protection Act. In January 2023, Miller-Meeks 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]

2024: Iowa Had One Of The Strictest Abortion Bans In The Nation

Axios: Iowa Had One Of The Strictest Bans. "One of the strictest abortion bans in the nation came into force in Iowa on Monday." [Axios, 7/25/24]

- **Iowa Was One Of 17 States In The Whole Country To Ban Abortion Entirely Or At Six Weeks Of Pregnancy.** [Guttmacher, Table 1, updated 6/4/26]

Miller-Meeks Calls Herself "100 Pro-Life"

2020: Miller-Meeks Touted Her "100% Pro-Life Voting Record"

2020: Miller-Meeks Touted A "100 Pro-Life Voting Record." "This is Miller-Meeks' fourth attempt at the 2nd District seat. From my life as a journalist and Republican voter in the district, I have spoken with her and seen her speak to groups several times. Until recently, I knew her to be a pretty pragmatic policymaker, and I praised her leadership on drug reform in a column just several months ago. Now Miller-Meeks is 'the only reliable pro-Trump conservative' with a '100% pro-life voting record,' she says. Schilling disputes that, backed by video clips and social media posts." [The Gazette, Adam Sullivan Column, 3/31/20]

She Championed A Bill That Bans All Abortions – Nationwide, With No Exceptions, Even In Cases Of Rape, Incest, Or To Save A Woman's Life

2021: Miller-Meeks Co-Sponsored The Life At Conception Act And Affirmed Her Position As A Pro-Life Leader, Which Would Ban Abortion Nationwide With No Exceptions

May 2021: Miller-Meeks Co-Sponsored The Life At Conception Act, A Bill Defining Fetuses To Be People At The Moment Of Fertilization. On May 14, 2021, Miller-Meeks co-sponsored HR 1011, the Life At Conception Act, which "declares that the right to life guaranteed by the Constitution is vested in each human being at all stages of life, including the moment of fertilization, cloning, or other moment at which an individual comes into being. Nothing in this bill shall be construed to authorize the prosecution of any woman for the death of her unborn child." The bill was read twice and referred to House Judiciary. [HR 1011, Co-sponsored, 5/14/21; CQ, 3/18/21]

The Life At Conception Act Would Ban Abortion With No Exceptions For Rape, Incest, Or The Life Of The Woman

Los Angeles Times: The Life At Conception Act's Language "Leaves Little Room For Ambiguity On Abortion" And Would Constitute A Nationwide Ban On The Practice From The Moment Of Fertilization. "The Life at Conception Act is fewer than 300 words, but its language leaves little room for ambiguity on abortion. The bill, introduced in the U.S. House earlier in the congressional session, seeks 'equal protection for the right to life of each born and preborn human person,' specifying that it covers 'all stages of life, including the moment of fertilization, cloning, or other moment at which an individual member of the human species comes into being.' Put simply: 'It would be a nationwide abortion ban,' said Mary Ziegler, a professor at UC Davis School of Law who studies reproductive rights. Even California, which has positioned itself as a haven for abortion rights, would be affected." [Los Angeles Times, 8/29/22]

Rewire: The Life At Conception Act "Would Effectively Ban Abortion With No Exception For Rape, Incest, Or To Save The Life" Of The Woman. "H.R. 616 would grant equal protection under the 14th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States for the right to life of each born and 'preborn' human person. […] It would effectively ban abortion with no exception for rape, incest, or to save the life of the pregnant person. It would also ban birth control pills, IUDs, and emergency contraception. In addition, it would eliminate certain medical choices for women, including some cancer treatments and in vitro fertilization." [Rewire, 9/28/19]

The Life At Conception Act Could Severely Impact, And Potentially Eliminate, In Vitro Fertilization (IVF) Fertility Treatments

The Life At Conception Act Would Grant Equal Protection Under The 14th Amendment To Fetuses, Effectively Banning Abortion With No Exceptions And Eliminating Medical Choices Including In Vitro Fertilization. "H.R. 616 would grant equal protection under the 14th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States for the right to life of each born and 'preborn' human person. 'Human person' is defined as: […] each and every member of the species homo sapiens at all stages of life, including the moment of fertilization, cloning, or other moment at which an individual member of the human species comes into being. The bill would grant constitutional rights to fertilized eggs, embryos, fetuses, and clones. It would effectively ban abortion with no exception for rape, incest, or to save the life of the pregnant person. It would also ban birth control pills, IUDs, and emergency contraception. In addition, it would eliminate certain medical choices for women, including some cancer treatments and in vitro fertilization. The bill would not allow for prosecution of any pregnant person for the 'death' of their 'unborn child.'" [Rewire, 9/28/19]

Personhood Bills That Define Human Life To Begin At Conception Would Severely Impact Infertility Treatments, Especially IVF. "Personhood bills aim to define human life to begin at the moment of fertilization or conception and grant constitutional rights and privileges to all persons from that moment. If these proposals were to become personhood laws, they would severely impact infertility treatments, especially IVF." [Arc Fertility, What Do Personhood Bills & Laws Mean in IVF, accessed 2/23/24]

Miller-Meeks Would Take Away Women's Reproductive Rights And Freedoms

See Backup Above

Mariannette Miller-Meeks Does Not Share Our Values

Rhetoric