

**ARIZONANS NEED TO KNOW THAT MARTHA MCSALLY WILL DO OR SAY ANYTHING TO GET ELECTED, WE HAVE SEEN IT BEFORE IN 2018, AND IT'S HAPPENING AGAIN IN 2020**

**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](#)]

**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](#)]

**WE'VE SEEN IT BEFORE: 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](#)]

- **Washington Post: McSally Is “Misleading Voters.”** “Under fire from their Democratic rivals for their votes on health care, McSally and Taylor are misleading voters.” [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](#)]

**NONPARTISAN SOURCES SAY MARTHA MCSALLY IS “MISLEADING” VOTERS WITH DISHONEST TV ATTACK ADS....**

**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 Daily Star: Fact-Checkers Were "Poking Holes" In McSally's Claims About Kelly's Ties To World View Enterprises.** "U.S. Sen. Martha McSally accuses Democratic opponent Mark Kelly of 'lining his pockets with taxpayer money' in a trio of new attack ads, but fact-checkers are already poking holes in some of her claims. The ads launched July 31 feature

testimonials from three Southern Arizona residents and focus on Kelly's ties to World View Enterprises, the high-tech, high-altitude balloon company he helped found in 2013." [Arizona Daily Star, [8/8/20](#)]

#### THAT INCLUDE "INACCURACIES"....

**HEADLINE: "Fact-Checkers Find Inaccuracies In McSally Attack Ads Against Opponent Kelly"** [Arizona Daily Star, [8/8/20](#)]

#### AND "IGNORE CRITICAL FACTS"...

**PolitiFact: McSally's Attack On Mark Kelly "Ignores Critical Facts."** "In the competitive Arizona Senate race, Republican Sen. Martha McSally is taking aim at Democratic opponent Mark Kelly, claiming that he's a hypocrite who attacked a loan program to help businesses during the pandemic and then took money from the program for his own company. [...] McSally's statement contains an element of truth but ignores critical facts that would give a different impression. We rate it Mostly False." [PolitiFact, [8/06/20](#)]

#### ONE OPINION COLUMNIST CALLED MCSALLY'S ADS "BASICALLY A LIE"

**Arizona Daily Star's Tim Steller: McSally's Claim That Kelly Pocketed \$15 Million Through World View Was "Basically A Lie."** "Did @CaptMarkKelly really 'pocket \$15 million' in a Pima County economic-development deal, as @SenMcSallyAZ says in recent ads. No, it's basically a lie." [Twitter, @senyorreporter, [8/8/20](#)]

#### AND IN 2020, AS IN 2018, MCSALLY IS FALSELY CLAIMING TO PROTECT PEOPLE WITH PRE-EXISTING CONDITIONS

**2020: 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](#)]

**2018: 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](#)]

### **WHEN SHE HAS REPEATEDLY VOTED TO UNDERMINE OR ELIMINATE THOSE PROTECTIONS**

**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](#)]

- **Politifact Argued That McSally's Votes In 2015 And 2017 Would Undermined Or Eliminate Coverage Protections For Preexisting Conditions.** "Only one national law makes sure people with preexisting medical conditions don't face discrimination or higher prices from insurers. It's the Affordable Care Act. Both as a member of the House of Representatives and as a senator, McSally has supported efforts to undo the health law — voting in 2015 to repeal it and in 2017 to replace it with the Republican-backed American Health Care Act, which would have permitted insurers to charge higher premiums for people with complicated medical histories." [Politifact, [6/22/20](#)]

**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](#)]

**THAT’S WHY INDEPENDENT SOURCES HAVE DETERMINED THAT MCSALLY’S CLAIMS ABOUT PROTECTING PEOPLE WITH PRE-EXISTING CONDITIONS ARE “FALSE” AND “MISLEAD[ING].”**

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

**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](#)]

## **MCSALLY SAID SHE WOULD PROTECT SENIORS**

**McSally: “We Have To Keep The Promises We’ve Made To Our Seniors And Protect The Retirement Benefits They’ve Earned.”** “In 2012, during McSally’s initial run for Congress, she sketched out her support for raising the retirement age and allowing younger workers to invest in lieu of paying into Social Security in a candidate questionnaire for the Green Valley News. 'We have to keep the promises we’ve made to our seniors and protect the retirement benefits they’ve earned,' McSally wrote. 'At the same time, we have take measures to strengthen and sustain it for future generations because it is currently unsustainable. For younger workers, we need to consider approaches such as gradually increasing the retirement age and allowing them to invest a portion of their Social Security payments in ways that will allow them to maximize their returns.’” [Arizona Republic, [10/15/18](#)]

## **MCSALLY SUPPORTED A PLAN TO TURN MEDICARE INTO A VOUCHER PROGRAM AND SHIFT COSTS ONTO SENIORS**

### **MCSALLY VOTED TO TURN MEDICARE INTO A VOUCHER PROGRAM**

**Arizona Daily Star: In 2017, McSally Voted For A Plan To “Change Medicare To A Voucher Program.”** “The House on Oct. 5 adopted, 219-206, a Republican budget plan for fiscal 2018-2027 that would set the stage for later legislative action to reduce corporate and individual taxes by \$5.4 trillion and

non-military outlays by \$5.8 trillion. A yes vote backed a budget (H Con Res 71) that would gradually change Medicare to a voucher program and devolve many K-12 education programs to state and local governments. Yes: McSally, Gosar, Biggs, Schweikert, Franks No: O'Halleran, Grijalva, Gallego, Sinema." [Arizona Daily Star, [10/7/17](#)]

## **THE BUDGET PROPOSAL WOULD "SHIFT COSTS" FROM MEDICARE ONTO SENIORS**

**AARP CEO Jo Ann Jenkins: The Republican Budget Plan Would "Shift Costs From Medicare" Onto Seniors And Did "Little To Actually Lower The Cost Of Health Care."** "The House of Representatives passed a budget on Thursday that would cut Medicare by \$487 billion over the next decade, recommends raising the eligibility age and opens the door to transforming the health insurance plan into a voucher program. The measure passed by 219-206 vote with all Democrats and 18 Republicans voting no. In addition to the Medicare spending cut, the proposal recommends raising the Medicare eligibility age from 65 to 67 and suggests instituting defined contributions for the program for new beneficiaries. Under such a plan, each beneficiary would get a set amount of money to pay for health costs. 'These proposals do little to actually lower the cost of health care, but simply shift costs from Medicare onto individuals — many of whom cannot afford to pay more for their care,' AARP Chief Executive Officer Jo Ann Jenkins said Tuesday in a letter to members of Congress." [AARP, [10/6/17](#)]

## **MCSALLY SUPPORTED RAISING THE RETIREMENT AGE**

**Arizona Republic: In 2012, McSally "Sketched Out Her Support For Raising The Retirement Age."** "In 2012, during McSally's initial run for Congress, she sketched out her support for raising the retirement age and allowing younger workers to invest in lieu of paying into Social Security in a candidate questionnaire for the Green Valley News. 'We have to keep the promises we've made to our seniors and protect the retirement benefits they've earned,' McSally wrote. 'At the same time, we have take measures to strengthen and sustain it for future generations because it is currently unsustainable. For younger workers, we need to consider approaches such as gradually increasing the retirement age and allowing them to invest a portion of their Social Security payments in ways that will allow them to maximize their returns.'" [Arizona Republic, [10/15/18](#)]