

MCSALLY CLAIMS TO PROTECT PEOPLE WITH PRE-EXISTING CONDITIONS WHEN SHE REPEATEDLY VOTED TO UNDERMINE OR ELIMINATE PREEXISTING CONDITIONS COVERAGE PROTECTION

MCSALLY HAS RUN ADS ON HER FALSE CLAIM THAT SHE SUPPORTS PROTECTING PEOPLE WITH PRE-EXISTING CONDITIONS



[Advertising Analytics, "Protecting Arizonans," [6/09/20](#)]

BUT MCSALLY HAS REPEATEDLY VOTED TO ELIMINATE OR UNDERMINE COVERAGE PROTECTIONS FOR PRE-EXISTING CONDITIONS

Feb 2015: McSally Voted For A Full Repeal Of The ACA. In February 2015, McSally voted to repeal the ACA. "The House voted ... to abolish the 2010 health care law in Congress' first repeal vote of the year ... The House has voted more than 50 times to roll back all or portions of the law." The bill passed 239 to 186. [HR 596, [Vote #58](#), 2/03/15; CQ News, [2/03/15](#)]

- **Repealing The ACA Would Have Allowed Insurance Companies To Deny Coverage To People With Pre-Existing Conditions.** "Once again, House Republicans voted to repeal or undermine the Affordable Care Act and take health coverage away from millions of Americans. Today's vote adds yet another tally mark to the more than 50 times they have tried -- and failed -- to repeal or undermine health care reform. [...] The ACA requires insurance companies to provide coverage for Americans with pre-existing conditions. If Republicans repealed that requirement, the up to 129 million Americans, including 17 million children, with pre-existing conditions could be denied the coverage in the individual market." [Obama White House, [2/03/15](#)]

Oct 2015: McSally Voted For A Budget Package That Would Repeal Portions Of The Affordable Care Act. In October 2015, McSally voted for "a budget reconciliation package that would repeal core components of the Affordable Care Act and cut off government funding of

Planned Parenthood.” It passed 240 to 189. [HR 3762, [Vote #568](#), 10/23/15; New York Times, [10/23/15](#)]

- **McSally Voted To Concur With The Senate Version Of The Bill.** In January 2016, McSally voted for a motion to concur with the Senate version of the bill. “As its opening move in the newly convened Congress, the House voted Wednesday to repeal the Affordable Care Act, the 62nd such vote but the first time that a bill will make it to President Obama’s desk, forcing a rare veto to protect his signature domestic achievement. The measure passed easily, 240 to 181.” [HR 3762, [Vote #6](#), 1/06/16; New York Times, [1/06/16](#)]
- **McSally Voted To Overturn Obama’s Veto.** In February 2016, McSally voted to overturn President Obama’s veto. “House Republicans are moving on to a new round of budget fights after failing on Tuesday to overturn President Obama’s veto of legislation to repeal Obamacare and defund Planned Parenthood. Republicans were not able to rally the support of two-thirds of the House necessary to overturn the veto, leaving conservatives to turn their attention to a final year of budget fights with the president. The 241-186 vote, appropriately scheduled for Groundhog Day, was the 63rd time the House has voted to overturn all or part of Obama’s signature health care law.” [HR 3762, [Vote #53](#), 2/02/16; Washington Post, [2/02/16](#)]

May 2017: McSally Voted For The American Health Care Act (AHCA). In May 2017, McSally voted for: “Passage of the bill that would make extensive changes to the 2010 health care overhaul law, by effectively repealing the individual and employer mandates as well as most of the taxes that finance the current system. It would, in 2020, convert Medicaid into a capped entitlement that would provide fixed federal payments to states and end additional federal funding for the 2010 law's joint federal-state Medicaid expansion. It would prohibit federal funding to any entity, such as Planned Parenthood, that performs abortions and receives more than \$350 million a year in Medicaid funds. As amended, it would give states the option of receiving federal Medicaid funding as a block grant with greater state flexibility in how the funds are used, and would require states to establish their own essential health benefits standards. It would allow states to receive waivers to exempt insurers from having to provide certain minimum benefits, would provide \$8 billion over five years for individuals with pre-existing conditions whose insurance premiums increased because the state was granted a waiver to raise premiums based on an individual's health status, and would create a \$15 billion federal risk sharing program to cover some of the costs of high medical claims.” The bill passed, 217-213. [H.R. 1628, [Vote #256](#), 5/4/17; CQ, [5/4/17](#)]

- **PolitiFact Found That AHCA “Would Weaken Protections” For Those With Pre-Existing Conditions, “Would Allow States To Give Insurers The Power To Charge People Significantly More.”** In May 2017, PolitiFact reported: “An ad by the American Action Network says that under the American Health Care Act ‘people with pre-existing conditions are protected.’ The only kernel of truth here is that the amendment has language that states insurers can’t limit access to coverage for individuals with pre-existing conditions. However, the ad omits that the House GOP health plan would weaken protections for these patients. The legislation would allow states to give insurers the power to charge people significantly more if they had a pre-existing condition. While Republicans point to the fact that those patients could get help through high-risk pools, experts question their effectiveness. Current law does not allow states to charge people with pre-existing conditions significantly more. We rate this claim Mostly False.” [PolitiFact, [5/24/17](#)]

March 2017: McSally Voted For A Bill To Allow Small Businesses To Use Association Health Plans. “The Small Business Health Fairness Act, H.R. 1101, sponsored by Rep. Sam Johnson (R-Texas), would allow small businesses to join together through association health

plans (AHPs) to provide employees with more affordable health insurance coverage. ObamaCare has caused the cost of health insurance coverage to rise, making it difficult for small businesses to continue offering health insurance coverage to employees. The Small Business Health Fairness Act would help level the playing field for small businesses, which don't have the negotiating power of larger firms and exemptions under Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA), and lower administrative costs related to health insurance." [Freedom Works, 2017; HR1101, Vote 186, 3/22/17]

- **Arizona Republic: Association Health Plans Could “Skirt Law’s Consumer Protections And Coverage Requirements.”** “Trump's move to cut the payments came on the heels of his Thursday executive order allowing consumers to buy insurance through association health plans across states lines. The move could help millions of consumers find access to cheaper insurance plans, but it could drive them into alternative plans that skirt the law's consumer protections and coverage requirements.” [Arizona Republic, 10/15/17]

October 2019: McSally Voted Against A Resolution That Disapproved Of HHS Guidance Allowing States To Include “Junk Plans” In ACA Marketplace Plans. On October 30, 2019, McSally voted against “Passage of the joint resolution that would provide for congressional disapproval of the Oct. 2018 guidance released by the Health and Human Services and Treasury departments regarding criteria for evaluating Section 1332 state health care plan waivers under the 2010 health care overhaul. Under the measure, the guidance would have no force or effect.” The resolution was rejected by a vote of 43-52. [CQ, [10/30/19](#); Vote 337, SJ Res 52, [10/30/19](#)]

- **The Resolution Would Have Prohibited States From Subsidizing Health Insurance Plans With Limited Protections For People With Pre-Existing Conditions.** “U.S. Senate Democrats failed on Wednesday to overturn a Trump administration policy that allows states to ignore certain requirements of the Obama administration’s Affordable Care Act. Democrats forced a Senate floor vote on a resolution that sought to unravel the controversial Trump administration health care rule. Maine Republican Sen. Susan Collins was the lone Republican to vote for the resolution, which failed by a vote of 43-52. Arizona’s senators split: Democrat Kyrsten Sinema supported the resolution, while Republican Martha McSally opposed it [...] The policy in question allows states to skirt certain requirements in the Affordable Care Act. It would allow states, for example, to use federal cash to subsidize some short-term insurance plans with limited protections for people with pre-existing conditions, The New York Times reported last year when the policy was rolled out.” [Arizona Mirror, [10/30/19](#)]

WHILE HUNDREDS OF THOUSANDS OF ARIZONANS ARE LOSING THEIR JOBS, AND MANY THEIR EMPLOYER-PROVIDED HEALTH INSURANCE DUE TO THE PANDEMIC, MCSALLY PUTS POLITICS AND HER CORPORATE DONORS AHEAD OF PEOPLE, STANDING BY HER LEADERSHIP’S PLAN THAT WOULD INCREASE PREMIUMS, ELIMINATE COVERAGE PROTECTIONS FOR PEOPLE WITH PRE-EXISTING CONDITIONS AND THREATEN COVERAGE FOR AN ADDITIONAL 400,000 ARIZONANS.

600,000 UNEMPLOYMENT CLAIMS WERE FILED IN ARIZONA BECAUSE OF THE PANDEMIC, WHICH MEANS MANY PEOPLE ARE LIKELY NOW UNINSURED

More Than 600,000 Unemployment Claims Were Filed In Arizona Because Of The Pandemic. “Nearly 25,000 Arizonans filed first-time claims for unemployment benefits last week. The addition of 24,723 new claims brings the total since the COVID-19 outbreak to 601,518. That amounts to 17 percent of the total state workforce.” [Daily Star, [5/27/20](#)]

According To A Study By The National Center For Coverage Innovation, 47,000 Arizonans Have Lost Their Health Insurance Due To Job Losses Between February And May 2020. [Families USA, [7/17/20](#)]

Arizona Republic: In A Country Where Health Insurance Is Largely Tied To Employment, The Staggering Unemployment Numbers Mean Many Have Now Lost Health Coverage. “Millions of workers across the country have lost their jobs as the economy tanked because of the continued spread of COVID-19 and subsequent social distancing orders that closed businesses. In Arizona, tens of thousands have flocked to the state's unemployment website to sign up for benefits. In a country where health insurance is largely tied to employment, the staggering unemployment numbers mean many have now lost health coverage during a pandemic.” [Arizona Republic, [4/06/20](#)]

- **The Kaiser Family Foundation Estimated That 27 Million Americans Could Lose Employer Sponsored Insurance And Become Uninsured As A Result Of Job Loss.** “We estimate that, as of May 2nd, 2020, nearly 27 million people could potentially lose ESI and become uninsured following job loss (Figure 1). This total includes people who lost their own ESI and those who lost dependent coverage when a family member lost a job and ESI. Additionally, some people who otherwise would lose ESI are able to retain job-based coverage by switching to a plan offered to a family member: we estimate that 19 million people switch to coverage offered by the employer of a working spouse or parent. A very small number of people who lose ESI (1.6 million) also had another source of coverage at the same time (such as Medicare) and retain that other coverage. These coverage loss estimates are based on our assumptions about who likely filed for UI as of May 2nd, 2020 and the availability of other ESI options in their family.” [Kaiser Family Foundation, [5/13/20](#)]

MCSALLY HAS SAID “IT’S NOT HER ROLE” TO OPPOSE THE GOP LAWSUIT THAT WOULD INCREASE PREMIUMS, ELIMINATE PROTECTIONS FOR PRE-EXISTING CONDITIONS, AND THREATEN COVERAGE FOR 400,000 ARIZONANS

MCSALLY HAS SAID IT’S NOT HER “ROLE” TO OPPOSE THE GOP LAWSUIT TO THROW OUT THE ACA

McSally Said “It’s Not My Role” To Take An Opinion On The Trump Administration’s Support For A Lawsuit To Throw Out The Affordable Care Act. INTERVIEWER: “Do you support the Trump administration’s support, they’re asking a federal judge to throw out the Affordable Care Act and declare it unconstitutional. Do you support that?” MCSALLY: “It’s not my role, but in my view if we could start over again, we would do it differently, but we are where we are.” [YouTube, 12 News, 00:10:00, [5/17/19](#)]

McSally Said She Had “Nothing To Do With The Lawsuit” To Overturn The Affordable Care Act And “Fully Support[ed] People With Preexisting Conditions.” “On the Thursday call with constituents, McSally was asked why she was 'still supporting the Trump administration's lawsuit to end preexisting condition coverage in the middle of this crisis.' The

question referred to a lawsuit filed by several Republican-led states and supported by the Trump administration that is aimed at declaring the Affordable Care Act unconstitutional. 'That's actually not accurate,' McSally responded. 'I have nothing to do with the lawsuit, and I fully support people with preexisting conditions, ensuring that they cannot be denied health insurance. So, it's just not accurate.'" [American Independent, [4/7/20](#)]

The Hill: McSally Did Not Take A Position On The Lawsuit Threatening The Affordable Care Act, Said It Was A “Judicial Proceeding.” “Vulnerable Senate Republicans are dodging questions about whether they support a lawsuit seeking to overturn the Affordable Care Act (ACA) [...] McSally, while not directly taking a position on the lawsuit, did criticize the Affordable Care Act, saying that ‘ObamaCare is not working’ for some people who have pre-existing conditions and still struggle to afford the high cost of health care. ‘There are better ways for us to provide insurance options to people while protecting pre-existing conditions,’ she said. Asked if that criticism meant she supports the lawsuit to overturn the law, McSally responded: ‘That’s not what I said, that’s a judicial proceeding.’” [The Hill, [3/6/20](#)]

- **The Hill: McSally Criticized The Affordable Care Act, Said “Obamacare Is Not Working” When Asked Whether She Supported A Lawsuit That Would Get Rid Of The Affordable Care Act.** “Vulnerable Senate Republicans are dodging questions about whether they support a lawsuit seeking to overturn the Affordable Care Act (ACA) [...] McSally, while not directly taking a position on the lawsuit, did criticize the Affordable Care Act, saying that ‘ObamaCare is not working’ for some people who have pre-existing conditions and still struggle to afford the high cost of health care. ‘There are better ways for us to provide insurance options to people while protecting pre-existing conditions,’ she said. Asked if that criticism meant she supports the lawsuit to overturn the law, McSally responded: ‘That’s not what I said, that’s a judicial proceeding.’” [The Hill, [3/6/20](#)]
- **HEADLINE: “Vulnerable Republicans Dodge Questions On Support For Obamacare Lawsuit.”** [The Hill, [3/6/20](#)]

When Asked If She Supported The Trump Administration Backing Lawsuit That Would Repeal The Affordable Care Act, McSally Said “That’s Their Decision.” ANCHOR: “Do you support the Trump administration’s decision to back that lawsuit that would repeal the Affordable Care Act? [...] Do you support that decision to back the lawsuit?” MCSALLY: “That’s their decision. What I am focusing on is making sure people have affordable health insurance, that we bring down the cost, that there’s more choices.” [Twitter, @PaulGerke, [4/5/19](#)] (VIDEO)

THE LAWSUIT WOULD UNDERMINE PROTECTIONS FOR ARIZONANS WITH PRE-EXISTING CONDITIONS AND ALLOW INSURANCE COMPANIES TO RAISE PREMIUMS

The Lawsuit Would Allow Insurance Companies Increase Premiums For Or Refuse Coverage To People With Pre-Existing Conditions. “AARP strongly opposes any attempts to take away the ACA’s protection for people with preexisting health conditions or to bring back an

unfair age tax on older adults,’ says Nancy LeaMond, AARP executive vice president and chief advocacy and engagement officer. ‘Allowing insurance companies to once again charge people with high blood pressure, heart disease, cancer, diabetes or other conditions up to 10 times more than what others pay for the same coverage — or deny them coverage altogether — would be devastating to the estimated 25 million older adults with a preexisting condition.’” [AARP, [6/15/18](#)]

Arizona Republic’s EJ Montini: The Lawsuit Would “Put The Screws To The Roughly 2.8 Million Arizonans With Pre-Existing Medical Conditions.” “If the lawsuit succeeds (it may well end up at the Supreme Court) the state of Arizona, represented by Brnovich and supported by Gov. Doug Ducey and the Republican-controlled Legislature, will have put the screws to the roughly 2.8 million Arizonans with pre-existing medical conditions. Because prohibitions against being denied health-care coverage for pre-existing conditions will disappear. And that’s just the beginning. If the lawsuit were to prevail, and Obamacare would suddenly cease to exist, more than 20 million Americans could find themselves without health insurance. Just like that.” [Arizona Republic, EJ Montini, [7/10/19](#)]

- **According To An Analysis By Center For American Progress, 2.8 Million Arizonans Have A Preexisting Condition.** [Center for American Progress, [4/5/17](#)]

THE LAWSUIT WOULD ALLOW INSURANCE COMPANIES TO IMPOSE AN “AGE TAX” ON OLDER ARIZONANS

The Lawsuit Would Allow Insurance Companies To Impose An “Age Tax” On Older Arizonans. “If Texas prevails, the health care of people between the ages of 50 and 64 who buy insurance in the private marketplace would be jeopardized, AARP says. The ACA provides affordable health care for these pre-Medicare adults because it forbids insurance companies to refuse to cover people with preexisting conditions, and it limits how much they can charge older Americans — what [AARP calls an age tax](#). Under the ACA, insurers are allowed to charge 50- to 64-year-olds up to three times what they charge younger policyholders.” [AARP, [6/15/18](#)]

THE LAWSUIT WOULD CUT FUNDING FOR STATE MEDICAID PROGRAMS, THREATENING COVERAGE FOR 400,000 ARIZONANS

400,000 Arizonans Gained Coverage Under The ACA’s Medicaid Expansion. “A court ruling voiding the Affordable Care Act would have effects beyond the issue of pre-existing conditions that this proposal hopes to resolve. Arizona was one of the states that took of the provision which provided federal dollars to expand health coverage to anyone earning up to 138 percent of the federal poverty level, about \$29,400 for a family of three. Prior to that, Arizona law, as approved by voters, included coverage only up to the poverty level. That added about 400,000 people to the rolls of the Arizona Health Care Cost Containment System, the state’s Medicaid program, bringing the current total to close to 1.9 million. If the Affordable Care Act goes away, so does the federal cash which pays almost the entire cost of the expansion.” [Arizona Capitol Times, [11/08/19](#)]

The Lawsuit Would End Medicaid Expansion. “Striking down the ACA would increase the number of uninsured people by 20 million, or 65 percent, the Urban Institute estimates. (Urban also provides estimates by state and demographic group.) It would end not only the ACA’s major coverage expansions — such as Medicaid expansion, premium tax credits, and the health insurance marketplaces — but other important protections as well, harming tens of millions of people who would remain insured.” [Center for Budget and Policy Priorities, [3/06/20](#)]

The Lawsuit Would Cut Funding For State Medicaid Programs. “The Supreme Court of the United States ruling of Texas v. Azar could leave millions of Americans without health insurance. Arizona is one of the original 20 states challenging the Affordable Care Act (ACA) in the case. The states are challenging that the ACA is unconstitutional after a district court judge in Texas sided with them in December 2018. Today, the country awaits the decision from the Supreme Court. If the court sides with the states, then that would repeal the ACA, and therefore that would cut funding for state Medicaid programs and the costs would rise for health care.” [Arizona Big Media, [11/14/19](#)]

THE LAWSUIT WOULD STRIKE DOWN A NUMBER OF OTHER PROTECTIONS AND PROVISIONS IN THE ACA – INCLUDING CAPS ON LIFETIME COVERAGE

If The Lawsuit Succeeds, Insurers Could Once Again Impose Lifetime Limits On Coverage. “What Happens if Trump Administration Prevails? [...] Insurers could once again put annual and lifetime limits on coverage, including for people with employer plans.” [Center for Budget and Policy Priorities, [3/06/20](#)]

If The Lawsuit Succeeds, Young Adults Would Not Be Able To Stay On Their Parents’ Plans Up To Age 26. “What Happens if Trump Administration Prevails? [...] Young adults would no longer be able to stay on their parents’ plans up to age 26.” [Center for Budget and Policy Priorities, [3/06/20](#)]

The Lawsuit Could Re-Open The Medicare Prescription Drug “Doughnut Hole.” “The ACA also made other sweeping changes throughout the health care system including expanding Medicaid eligibility for low-income adults; requiring private insurance, Medicare, and Medicaid expansion coverage of preventive services with no patient cost sharing; phasing out the Medicare prescription drug doughnut hole coverage gap; reducing the growth of Medicare payments to health care providers and insurers; establishing new national initiatives to promote public health, care quality, and delivery system reforms; and authorizing a variety of tax increases to finance these changes. All of these provisions could be overturned if all or most of the ACA is struck down by the courts, and it would be enormously complex to disentangle these provisions from the overall health care system.” [Kaiser Family Foundation, [3/10/20](#)]

MCSALLY HAS TAKEN \$150,000 FROM HEALTH INSURANCE AND DRUG COMPANIES SINCE 2015

HEALTH INSURANCE COMPANY	RECIPIENT	RECEIPT DATE	AMOUNT
--------------------------	-----------	--------------	--------

BLUEPAC - BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD ASSOCIATION PAC	MCSALLY FOR SENATE INC	3/30/20	\$1,500
AFLAC POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE (AFLAC PAC)	MCSALLY FOR SENATE INC	3/30/20	\$5,000

CIGNA CORPORATION POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE	MCSALLY FOR SENATE INC	3/5/20	\$5,000
BLUEPAC - BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD ASSOCIATION PAC	MCSALLY FOR SENATE INC	12/31/19	\$1,000
AFLAC POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE (AFLAC PAC)	MCSALLY FOR SENATE INC	12/31/19	\$1,500
UNITEDHEALTH GROUP INCORPORATED PAC (UNITEDHEALTH GROUP PAC)	MCSALLY FOR SENATE INC	11/4/19	\$2,500
CIGNA CORPORATION POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE	MCSALLY FOR SENATE INC	9/30/19	\$5,000
UNITEDHEALTH GROUP INCORPORATED PAC (UNITEDHEALTH GROUP PAC)	MCSALLY FOR SENATE INC	6/30/19	\$2,500
AFLAC POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE (AFLAC PAC)	MCSALLY FOR SENATE INC	5/28/19	\$1,000
BLUEPAC - BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD ASSOCIATION PAC	MCSALLY FOR SENATE INC	5/7/19	\$1,000
AFLAC POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE (AFLAC PAC)	MCSALLY FOR SENATE INC	3/31/19	\$2,500
BLUEPAC - BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD ASSOCIATION PAC	MCSALLY FOR SENATE INC	8/24/18	\$4,000
AFLAC POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE (AFLAC PAC)	MCSALLY FOR SENATE INC	7/5/18	\$1,000
AFLAC POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE (AFLAC PAC)	MCSALLY FOR SENATE INC	7/5/18	\$1,500
AFLAC POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE (AFLAC PAC)	MCSALLY FOR CONGRESS	12/29/17	\$2,500
AFLAC POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE (AFLAC PAC)	MCSALLY FOR SENATE INC	12/29/17	\$2,500
BLUEPAC - BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD ASSOCIATION PAC	MCSALLY FOR SENATE INC	10/25/17	\$1,000
BLUEPAC - BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD ASSOCIATION PAC	MCSALLY FOR CONGRESS	10/25/17	\$1,000
AETNA INC. POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE	MCSALLY FOR CONGRESS	9/30/17	\$2,500
AFLAC POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE (AFLAC PAC)	MCSALLY FOR CONGRESS	9/8/17	\$1,000

ANTHEM, INC. POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE (ANTHEM PAC)	MCSALLY FOR CONGRESS	9/30/16	\$2,500
UNITEDHEALTH GROUP INCORPORATED PAC (UNITED FOR HEALTH)	MCSALLY FOR CONGRESS	9/22/16	\$2,000
BLUEPAC - BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD ASSOCIATION PAC	MCSALLY FOR CONGRESS	8/18/16	\$1,500
AFLAC POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE (AFLAC PAC)	MCSALLY FOR CONGRESS	6/30/16	\$1,000
HUMANA INC. POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE	MCSALLY FOR CONGRESS	6/30/16	\$1,000
HEALTH NET, INCORPORATED POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE	MCSALLY FOR CONGRESS	3/31/16	\$1,000
HUMANA INC. POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE	MCSALLY FOR CONGRESS	2/22/16	\$1,000
CHUBB GROUP HOLDINGS INC. LEGACY POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE	MCSALLY FOR CONGRESS	10/20/15	\$2,500
AFLAC POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE (AFLAC PAC)	MCSALLY FOR CONGRESS	6/30/15	\$1,000
HEALTH NET, INCORPORATED POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE	MCSALLY FOR CONGRESS	6/10/15	\$1,000
HEALTH NET, INCORPORATED POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE	MCSALLY FOR CONGRESS	2/9/15	\$1,000
TOTAL			\$61,000

[FEC, McSally for Senate, McSally for Congress, accessed [6/11/20](#)]

PHARMA COMPANY	RECIPIENT	DATE	AMOUNT
CVS HEALTH PAC	THUNDERBOLT PAC	4/3/20	\$5,000
PFIZER INC. PAC	MCSALLY FOR SENATE INC	3/30/20	\$2,500
PFIZER INC. PAC	MCSALLY FOR SENATE INC	3/30/20	\$2,500
AMGEN INC. POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE	MCSALLY FOR SENATE INC	12/31/19	\$1,000
AMGEN INC. POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE	MCSALLY FOR SENATE INC	12/31/19	\$2,000
JOHNSON & JOHNSON POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE	MCSALLY FOR SENATE INC	12/31/19	\$1,000
AMERISOURCEBERGEN CORPORATION POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE (ABC PAC)	MCSALLY FOR SENATE INC	12/23/19	\$1,000
PFIZER INC. PAC	MCSALLY FOR SENATE INC	12/10/19	\$2,500

AMGEN INC. POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE	MCSALLY FOR SENATE INC	11/7/19	\$1,000
CVS HEALTH PAC	MCSALLY FOR SENATE INC	9/30/19	\$2,500
CVS HEALTH PAC	MCSALLY FOR SENATE INC	9/30/19	\$1,500
CARDINAL HEALTH INC. PAC AKA CARDINAL HEALTH COMPANIES PAC	MCSALLY FOR SENATE INC	9/30/19	\$2,500
CVS HEALTH PAC	MCSALLY FOR SENATE INC	6/28/19	\$2,500
BAYER U.S. LLC POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE	MCSALLY FOR SENATE INC	6/28/19	\$1,000
ROCHE DIAGNOSTICS CORPORATION PAC (ROCHE DXPAC)	MCSALLY FOR SENATE INC	6/28/19	\$1,000
MCKESSON CORPORATION EMPLOYEES POLITICAL FUND	MCSALLY FOR SENATE INC	6/27/19	\$1,500
CARDINAL HEALTH INC. PAC AKA CARDINAL HEALTH COMPANIES PAC	MCSALLY FOR SENATE INC	6/10/19	\$2,500
NOVO NORDISK INC. PAC (NOVO NORDISK PAC)	MCSALLY FOR SENATE INC	5/21/19	\$1,500
AMGEN INC. POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE	MCSALLY FOR SENATE INC	5/17/19	\$2,000
GENENTECH INC. POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE	MCSALLY FOR SENATE INC	5/7/19	\$5,000
CVS HEALTH PAC	MCSALLY FOR SENATE INC	3/31/19	\$1,000
CSL EMPLOYEES POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE	MCSALLY FOR SENATE INC	10/10/18	\$1,000

CARDINAL HEALTH INC. PAC AKA CARDINAL HEALTH COMPANIES PAC	MCSALLY FOR SENATE INC	9/30/18	\$2,500
EXPRESS SCRIPTS INC. POLITICAL FUND (A/K/A EXPRESS SCRIPTS PAC)	MCSALLY FOR SENATE INC	9/4/18	\$4,000
ASTELLAS US LLC PAC (ASTELLAS PAC)	MCSALLY FOR CONGRESS	12/29/17	\$1,000
ASTELLAS US LLC PAC (ASTELLAS PAC)	MCSALLY FOR SENATE INC	12/29/17	\$1,000
EXPRESS SCRIPTS INC. POLITICAL FUND (A/K/A EXPRESS SCRIPTS PAC)	MCSALLY FOR CONGRESS	11/30/17	\$1,500
EXPRESS SCRIPTS INC. POLITICAL FUND (A/K/A EXPRESS SCRIPTS PAC)	MCSALLY FOR SENATE INC	11/30/17	\$1,500
WALGREEN CO PAC	MCSALLY FOR CONGRESS	10/11/17	\$1,000

EXPRESS SCRIPTS INC. POLITICAL FUND (A/K/A EXPRESS SCRIPTS PAC)	MCSALLY FOR CONGRESS	6/26/17	\$2,500
BRISTOL-MYERS SQUIBB CO. EMPLOYEE POLITICAL ADVOCACY FUND FOR INNOVATION	MCSALLY FOR CONGRESS	5/31/17	\$1,000
PFIZER INC. PAC	MCSALLY FOR CONGRESS	5/31/17	\$1,000
ELI LILLY AND COMPANY POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE	MCSALLY FOR CONGRESS	3/31/17	\$2,500
MERCK & CO., INC., EMPLOYEES POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE (MERCK PAC)	MCSALLY FOR CONGRESS	3/31/17	\$1,000
NOVO NORDISK INC. PAC (NOVO NORDISK PAC)	MCSALLY FOR CONGRESS	3/31/17	\$1,500
SANOFI US SERVICES INC. EMPLOYEES' POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE	MCSALLY FOR CONGRESS	3/31/17	\$1,000
EXPRESS SCRIPTS INC. POLITICAL FUND (A/K/A EXPRESS SCRIPTS PAC)	MCSALLY FOR CONGRESS	3/3/17	\$1,000
ELI LILLY AND COMPANY POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE	MCSALLY FOR CONGRESS	6/20/16	\$1,000
ELI LILLY AND COMPANY POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE	MCSALLY FOR CONGRESS	6/20/16	\$1,500
ELI LILLY AND COMPANY POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE	MCSALLY FOR CONGRESS	5/5/16	\$2,500
EXPRESS SCRIPTS INC. POLITICAL FUND (A/K/A EXPRESS SCRIPTS PAC)	MCSALLY FOR CONGRESS	3/31/16	\$1,500
CARDINAL HEALTH INC. PAC AKA CARDINAL HEALTH COMPANIES PAC	MCSALLY FOR CONGRESS	2/29/16	\$2,000
EXPRESS SCRIPTS INC. POLITICAL FUND (A/K/A EXPRESS SCRIPTS PAC)	MCSALLY FOR CONGRESS	12/7/15	\$2,500
ELI LILLY AND COMPANY POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE	MCSALLY FOR CONGRESS	9/30/15	\$1,000
SANOFI US SERVICES INC. EMPLOYEES' POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE	MCSALLY FOR CONGRESS	9/30/15	\$2,500
GLAXOSMITHKLINE LLC PAC (GSK PAC)	MCSALLY FOR CONGRESS	6/30/15	\$1,000
SANOFI US SERVICES INC. EMPLOYEES' POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE	MCSALLY FOR CONGRESS	5/11/15	\$2,500

EXPRESS SCRIPTS INC. POLITICAL FUND (A/K/A EXPRESS SCRIPTS PAC)	MCSALLY FOR CONGRESS	3/31/15	\$1,000
EXPRESS SCRIPTS INC. POLITICAL FUND (A/K/A EXPRESS SCRIPTS PAC)	MCSALLY FOR CONGRESS	3/30/15	\$1,000
EXPRESS SCRIPTS INC. POLITICAL FUND (A/K/A EXPRESS SCRIPTS PAC)	MCSALLY FOR CONGRESS	9/18/14	\$2,500
EXPRESS SCRIPTS INC. POLITICAL FUND (A/K/A EXPRESS SCRIPTS PAC)	MCSALLY FOR CONGRESS	8/6/14	\$2,500
TOTAL			\$93,000

[FEC, McSally for Congress, McSally for Senate, Thunderbolt PAC, accessed 6/14/20]

VOTERS WHO HAVE A VIVID MEMORY OF MCSALLY’S NEGATIVE 2018 CAMPAIGN KNOW SHE HAS RUN A NEGATIVE AND DISHONEST CAMPAIGN BEFORE, AND BELIEVE SHE PUTS PARTISAN POLITICS AHEAD OF ARIZONANS IN ORDER TO FURTHER HER CAREER

Arizona Republic: McSally’s Focus On Kelly’s Ties To China Was “A Return To A Strategy That Failed With Voters In 2018.” “McSally has implied Kelly, a former Navy combat pilot, is beholden to Chinese interests. In raising doubts about her opponent’s patriotic loyalties, it is a return to a strategy that failed with voters in 2018. In that election, McSally accused Democrat Kyrsten Sinema of condoning 'treason' based on her comment in a 2003 radio interview. McSally, a former Air Force combat pilot, has taken a tough stance over China since arriving at the House of Representatives in 2015. But her flurry of legislative actions amid the pandemic in recent weeks is noticeable.” [Arizona Republic, [6/5/20](#)]

POLITICO: “Republicans Privately Worry [McSally’s] Repeating Mistakes From The Last Race.” “McSally ran a burn-it-all-down general election against Sinema, throwing out attacks at a roaring pace in the ten weeks between her primary and Election Day. But she makes no bones now about already turning negative against Kelly, even as some Republicans privately worry, she’s repeating mistakes from the last race. Facing a cash deficit that's likely to grow, McSally said she had to fight early to define the race when she saw the opening.” [POLITICO, [3/1/20](#)]

Washington Examiner: Some Republican Strategists Questioned “McSally’s Team And Strategy,” Said She Had “Yet To Prove She Learned From Previous Mistakes.” McSally is not the only Republican incumbent getting pummeled without backup from GOP groups, and some Republican strategists are rebuffing complaints from her allies as misplaced. Others are questioning McSally's team and strategy, saying she has yet to prove she learned from previous mistakes. ‘It’s absurd to think a party committee should be spending money on TV more than a year out from Election Day,’ one GOP strategist said. ‘Anyone who does clearly lacks professional knowledge on the subject and shouldn’t be anywhere near political campaigns in 2020.’” [Washington Examiner, [10/11/19](#)]

IN 2020, AS IN 2018, INDEPENDENT SOURCES HAVE DETERMINED THAT MCSALLY'S CLAIMS ABOUT PROTECTING PEOPLE WITH PRE-EXISTING CONDITIONS ARE "FALSE" AND "MISLEAD[ING]."

PolitiFact Rated McSally's Ad Claiming She Protects People With Pre-Existing Conditions "False." "In her new TV ad, McSally claims she will 'always protect those with preexisting conditions.' But nothing in her voting record, which tracks closely with the Republican repeal-and-replace philosophy, supports this claim. And she has continually declined opportunities to oppose a pending legal threat to the ACA, including its provisions related to preexisting conditions, by a group of GOP governors and supported by the Trump administration. Meanwhile, the legislation her campaign cited to justify her stance falls short in terms of meaningfully protecting Americans with preexisting medical conditions. McSally has not in the past or present taken actions that back up her statement. We rate it False." [PolitiFact, [6/25/20](#)]

The Washington Post Gave McSally's Claim That She Protects People With Pre-Existing Conditions "Four Pinocchios." "Voters deserve straight answers when their health care is on the line, especially in the middle of a deadly pandemic. Daines, Gardner and McSally have voted to end the Affordable Care Act. People with preexisting conditions would have been left exposed because of those votes; insurers could have denied coverage or jacked up prices for sick patients. The three senators' comments about the GOP lawsuit are woefully vague, but they can all be interpreted as tacit support. Asked about the case, a Daines spokesperson said 'whatever mechanism' to get rid of the ACA would do. McSally's campaign 'didn't specifically answer, but pointed to her general disapproval of the ACA.' Gardner avoided the question six times in one interview, but in another, he said: "That's the court's decision. If the Democrats want to stand for an unconstitutional law, I guess that's their choice." Four Pinocchios all around." [The Washington Post, [7/15/20](#)]

- **The Washington Post: McSally's Comments About The GOP Lawsuit "Woefully Vague."** "The three senators' comments about the GOP lawsuit are woefully vague, but they can all be interpreted as tacit support. Asked about the case, a Daines spokesperson said 'whatever mechanism' to get rid of the ACA would do. McSally's campaign 'didn't specifically answer, but pointed to her general disapproval of the ACA.' Gardner avoided the question six times in one interview, but in another, he said: "That's the court's decision. If the Democrats want to stand for an unconstitutional law, I guess that's their choice." Four Pinocchios all around." [The Washington Post, [7/15/20](#)]
- **The Washington Post: McSally's Support For Pre-Existing Conditions Is A "Classic Case Of Buyer Beware."** "'Steve Daines will protect Montanans with preexisting conditions.' — Campaign ad from Sen. Steve Daines (R-Mont.) 'Of course I will always protect those with preexisting conditions. Always.' — Campaign ad from Sen. Martha McSally (R-Ariz.) 'What I look forward to working on is a plan that protects people with preexisting conditions.' — Sen. Cory Gardner (R-Colo.), in an interview with Colorado Public Radio, July 1, 2020. Sound familiar? Just like President Trump, these Republican senators say they support coverage guarantees for patients with preexisting health conditions. And just like Trump, their records show the opposite. The president's doublespeak — voicing support for these protections while asking the Supreme Court to

strike them down — is spreading into some battleground Senate races this year. It's a classic case of buyer beware: Look under the hood of what Daines, Gardner and McSally are selling, and you'll find a car without an engine." [The Washington Post, [7/15/20](#)]

- **HEADLINE: "GOP Senators In Close Races Mislead On Preexisting Conditions."** [The Washington Post, [7/15/20](#)]

Arizona Republic's EJ Montini: McSally's Claim That She Has "'Always'" Protected People With Pre-Existing Conditions "Sounds Like Empty Election-Year Rhetoric." "The senator, trailing in the polls to political newcomer and former astronaut Mark Kelly, could simply have said that she supports protecting those with preexisting conditions now. She could have said her position on the issue has evolved over time and she is much more committed to protections than she may have appeared to be in the past. But saying that she has 'always' supported such protections sounds like empty election-year rhetoric meant to reach across the raging river that separates political parties." [The Arizona Republic, EJ Montini, [6/26/20](#)]

IN 2018, INDEPENDENT SOURCES DESCRIBED MCSALLY'S CLAIMS OF PROTECTING PEOPLE WITH PRE-EXISTING CONDITIONS AS "MOSTLY FALSE."

PolitiFact: "Mostly False" That McSally Is "Leading The Fight To Force Insurance Companies To Cover Pre-Existing Conditions." "McSally claimed she's 'leading the fight' to 'force insurance companies to cover pre-existing conditions.' It was the Obama-era Affordable Care Act that forced insurance companies to cover pre-existing conditions. McSally in 2015 voted in favor of a full repeal of the law. The bill directed House committees to offer new proposals, including one that provided people with pre-existing conditions access to affordable health coverage. In 2017, McSally voted for the American Health Care Act, a Republican proposal that kept the Affordable Care Act's pre-existing conditions coverage. Despite language in the bill to protect people with pre-existing conditions, it included provisions that undermined that coverage and increased premiums for certain people, making insurance unaffordable in some cases, experts said. McSally did support an amendment to help reduce over 5 years increased premiums and out-of-pocket expenses that people with pre-existing conditions might face due to a state waiver allowed in the bill. McSally's statement contains an element of truth but ignores critical facts that would give a different impression. We rate it Mostly False." [PolitiFact, [10/30/18](#)]

Washington Post Gave McSally "Three Pinocchios" For Claiming That She Was "Leading The Fight" To Protect Pre-Existing Conditions. "Regarding the McSally ad, it says she was leading the fight – for something people already had under the ACA. [...] McSally also voted for the GOP's AHCA. Moreover, earlier in her tenure as a member of Congress, she voted to repeal Obama's ACA without a replacement in effect. Under fire from their Democratic rivals for their votes on health care, McSally and Taylor are misleading voters. The protections for people with preexisting conditions are already pretty strong in the ACA. Both lawmakers cast votes that the CBO said weakened protections against price increases, especially in states that took advantage of waivers in the law. The money contained in the bill to mitigate those problems was inadequate, the CBO concluded. The irony is rich: After years of trashing Obamacare, these

Republicans are now saying they will do what he promised he would if elected president. Three Pinocchios.” [Washington Post, [11/01/18](#)]

Arizona Republic’s EJ Montini: “Martha McSally Earns Her 4th ‘Mostly False’ Rating From PolitiFact.” [Arizona Republic, EJ Montini, [11/01/18](#)]