Jaime Herrera Beutler's taken $1.6 million from corporate special interests and voted for Trump's tax giveaway. It gives 83 percent of the breaks to the top one percent and gives pharmaceutical companies nearly $80 billion in tax breaks, while adding nearly $2 trillion to the national debt, and could put Social Security and Medicare on the chopping block to pay for it. Herrera Beutler also voted with Trump's attempt to dismantle our health care and let insurance companies deny coverage for pre-existing conditions during the pandemic. When asked if she would be voting for Trump this year, Herrera Beutler said, “I am.”

Jaime For Congress And The Liberty Fund Received $1,616,785 From Political Committees Registered As Corporate PACs Or Corporate PACs Without Capital Stock. [FEC, accessed 9/14/20]

The Liberty Fund Was Jaime Herrera Beutler’s Leadership PAC. [FEC, 7/17/12]
Herrera Beutler Voted For Final Passage Of The Tax Cuts And Jobs Act. [HR 1, Vote #699, 12/20/17; CQ Floor Votes, 12/20/17]

Americans For Tax Fairness: Under Republican Tax Reform, The “Big 10” Pharmaceutical Companies “Will Save $76 Billion In Taxes On Their Offshore Profits Alone.” “America’s 10 biggest prescription-drug corporations—the Pharma Big 10—are among the biggest winners from the Trump-GOP tax cuts but they are sharing few of the benefits with their employees and are offering no pricing relief to their customers. […] The Pharma Big 10 will save $76 billion in taxes on their offshore profits alone. The 10 firms had $506 billion in untaxed profits offshore in 2017, on which they owed nearly $134 billion under previous law. Under the Trump-GOP tax regime they will owe only about $57 billion—a tax savings of $76 billion—and they can stretch their tax payments over eight years.” [Americans for Tax Fairness, April 2018]

In 2027, Taxpayers In The Top One Percent Of The Income Distribution Would Receive Tax Cuts That Would Account For 83 Percent Of The Total Benefit For That Year. “In 2027, the overall average tax cut would be $160, or 0.2 percent of after-tax income (table 3), largely because almost all individual income tax provisions would sunset after 2025. On average, taxes would be little changed for taxpayers in the bottom 95 percent of the income distribution. Taxpayers in the bottom two quintiles of the income distribution would face an average tax increase of 0.1 percent of after-tax income; taxpayers in the middle income quintile would see no material change on average; and taxpayers in the 95th to 99th income percentiles would receive an average tax cut of 0.2 percent of after-tax income. Taxpayers in the top 1 percent of the income distribution would receive an average tax cut of 0.9 percent of after-tax income, accounting for 83 percent of the total benefit for that year.” [Tax Policy Center report, Distributional analysis of the Conference Agreement for the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, page 5]

The CBO Estimated The Tax Cuts And Jobs Act Would Increase The Debt By $1.9 Trillion Over 10 Years. “The GOP’s signature tax law is projected to increase the national debt by $1.9 trillion between 2018 and 2028, according to a new report by the Congressional Budget Office (CBO). According to the report, the tax law would cost the government $2.3 trillion in revenues, but economic growth would offset that figure by about $461 billion.” [The Hill, 4/9/18]

In Response To The Tax Bill Driving Up The Debt, Social Security And Medicare Were Likely Cuts. “But some Democrats have warned that the GOP is already telegraphing its next legislative priority: spending cuts to programs like Social Security and Medicare that would partially blunt their tax bill’s impact on American debt. […] It’s unlikely many within the Republicans’ ranks would advocate for across-the-board cuts that would, for example, limit military spending, considering the party’s 2016 platform committed to ‘rebuilding the U.S. military into the strongest on earth, with vast superiority over any other nation or group of nations in the world.’ Instead, the most likely targets for cuts and restructuring in the coming months are likely to be Medicare and Social Security benefits. Rubio last week indicated ‘the driver of our debt is the structure of Social Security and Medicare for future beneficiaries.’” [US News, 12/7/17]
July 2020: Herrera Beulter Voted Against An Amendment To Defund Lawsuits Challenging The Affordable Care Act. Herrera Beulter voted against the “Underwood, D-Ill., amendment no. 148 that would prohibit the use of funds provided by the bill for the Justice Department to argue in any litigation that the provisions of the 2010 health care law and certain related provisions are unconstitutional or invalid on any grounds.” The amendment was approved 234-181: Democrats 228-0, Republicans 6-180, Independents 0-1. [H.Amdt. 865 to H.R. 7617, Vote #175, 7/30/20; CQ, 7/30/20]

June 2020: The Trump Administration Was Seeking To Overturn The Affordable Care Act In The Supreme Court. “The Trump administration asked the Supreme Court late Thursday to overturn the Affordable Care Act — a move that, if successful, would bring a permanent end to the health insurance program popularly known as Obamacare and wipe out coverage for as many as 23 million Americans. In an 82-page brief submitted an hour before a midnight deadline, the administration joined Republican officials in Texas and 17 other states in arguing that in 2017, Congress, then controlled by Republicans, had rendered the law unconstitutional when it zeroed out the tax penalty for not buying insurance — the so-called individual mandate.” [New York Times, 6/26/20]

The Affordable Care Act Prevented Insurers From Denying Coverage Or Charging More If An Individual Had A Preexisting Condition. “In the old days, insurance companies had ways to avoid selling policies to people who were likely to cost more than insurers wanted to spend. They might deny them coverage outright, or exclude coverage for a known condition, or charge so much that insurance became unaffordable. The Affordable Care Act boxes out the old insurance practices with a package of legal moves. First, it says point-blank that carriers ‘may not impose any preexisting condition exclusion.’ It backs that up with another section that says they ‘may not establish rules for eligibility’ based on health status, medical condition, claims experience or medical history.” [PolitiFact, 10/17/18]