

HEALTH INSURANCE COMPANIES WILL SEE BILLIONS IN BENEFIT FROM THE MCCONNELL TAX BILL, BUT HOOSIERS WILL SEE SKYROCKETING PREMIUMS

HEALTH INSURERS WERE EXPECTED TO RECEIVE BILLIONS IN BENEFITS FROM THE MCCONNELL TAX BILL

INSURERS WERE PROJECTED TO RECEIVE \$10 BILLION IN TAX SAVINGS IN 2018 ALONE

Health Insurance Companies Were Projected To Receive \$10 Billion In Tax Savings In 2018 Alone Due To The McConnell Tax Plan. “Health care companies will add tens of billions of dollars to their bottom lines this year thanks to savings from the Republican tax cut package. But only a fraction of that money will benefit patients. [...] 21 companies collectively expect to gain \$10 billion in tax savings in 2018 alone. Most of the money is going toward share buybacks, dividends, acquisitions and paying down debt — with just a sliver for one-time employee bonuses, research and internal investments.” [Axios, [3/5/18](#)]

THE BENEFITS INSURANCE COMPANIES WERE PROJECTED TO RECEIVE WOULD MAKE THEM “AMONG THE BIGGEST WINNERS” OF THE MCCONNELL TAX BILL

Axios: Large Health Insurance Companies Would Be “Among The Biggest Winners” Of The McConnell Tax Bill’s Lowering Of The Corporate Tax Rate. “Large health insurance companies would be among the biggest winners under Republicans’ tax overhaul bill. Nearly all of their business is based in the U.S. and they consequently pay close to the full 35% corporate tax rate. [...] Cutting the corporate tax rate to 20% would instantly boost insurers’ profits.” [Axios, [12/11/18](#)]

IN INDIANA, PREMIUMS WERE EXPECTED TO INCREASE BY AS MUCH AS 50 PERCENT

INDIANA WAS AMONG STATES EXPECTED TO SEE HEALTH CARE PREMIUMS RISE BY AS MUCH AS 50 PERCENT BY 2021

INDIANA WAS AT A “HIGH MARKETPLACE RISK” OF PREMIUMS INCREASING

According To A Study By Covered California, Indiana Was A “High Marketplace Risk” Of 50 Percent Premium Increases By 2021. [Covered California, [3/8/18](#)]

EXPERTS ARGUED THAT INDIANA’S EXPECTED PREMIUM INCREASES WERE DUE TO THE TAX BILL AND TRUMP ADMINISTRATION EFFORTS TO SABOTAGE THE ACA

EXPERTS POINTED TO THE TAX BILL’S ELIMINATION OF THE ACA’S INDIVIDUAL MANDATE AS THE BIGGEST SINGLE ELEMENT DRIVING INCREASES

ELIMINATING THE INDIVIDUAL MANDATE WAS EXPECTED TO INCREASE PREMIUMS BY 7 TO 15 PERCENT IN 2018

Washington Post: Covered California Found That The “Largest Single Impact” To Increase Premiums Was The Tax Bill’s Elimination Of The ACA’s Individual Mandate; They Argued The Repeal Alone Would Increase Premiums By 7 To 15 Percent In 2018. “According to the [Covered California] analysis, the largest single impact will come from eliminating, starting in 2019, the ACA’s penalty for Americans who violate the law’s requirement that most people in the United States carry health coverage. That change alone, part of a massive tax bill Congress adopted in December, can be expected to increase premiums by 7 to 15 percent next year, depending on the state, and as much as 10 percent each of the following two years.” [Washington Post, [3/8/18](#)]

EXPERTS ALSO ARGUED THAT TRUMP EFFORTS TO SHORTEN THE ACA SIGN UP PERIOD AND TO ALLOW FOR HEALTH CARE PLANS WITH FEWER BENEFITS WOULD CONTRIBUTE TO INCREASED PREMIUMS

Washington Post: Covered California Found That The Trump Administration's Decisions To Shorten The ACA's Sign Up Period And To "Severely Curtail Marketing" Contributed To Increasing Premiums. "Also contributing to the escalating rates are the Trump administration's decisions to shorten the sign-up time for consumers to buy ACA health plans and to severely curtail marketing and other activities to encourage people to sign up." [Washington Post, [3/8/18](#)]

Washington Post: Covered California Anticipated A Smaller Impact On Premiums From The Trump Administration's Proposals To Allow Consumers To Buy Health Plans With Fewer Benefits Than Those Allowed Under The ACA. "The report anticipates a smaller effect from the administration's proposals to make it easier for consumers to buy two kinds of health plans with lower prices and skimpier benefits than the ACA allows." [Washington Post, [3/8/18](#)]

THE MCCONNELL TAX BILL WOULD LEAD TO CUTS TO MEDICARE AND SOCIAL SECURITY

Final GOP Bill Would Trigger \$25 Billion Cut To Medicare. "Healthcare analysts warn that the tax cut bill overall will have big downstream effects on funding for Medicare, Medicaid, Affordable Care Act subsidies, and other federal and state healthcare programs. That's because the projected \$1 trillion-plus increase in the federal deficit resulting from the tax cuts will put pressure on Congress to slash healthcare spending. In addition, the Congressional Budget Office estimated that passing the tax bill would trigger an automatic \$25 billion cut in Medicare in 2018 to offset the reduced revenue, under the pay-as-you-go rule." [Modern Healthcare, [12/15/17](#)]

AARP: GOP Tax Bill Will Likely Lead To "Dramatic Cuts" To Medicare And Medicaid And Other Programs Serving Older Americans. "We remain deeply concerned by the negative effect the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act will have on the nation's ability to fund critical priorities. The tax legislation will increase the deficit by approximately \$1.5 trillion over the next ten years, and an unknown amount beyond 2027. The large increase in the deficit will inevitably lead to calls for greater spending cuts, which are likely to include dramatic cuts to Medicare, Medicaid, and other important programs serving older Americans." [AARP Press Release, [12/18/17](#)]

BUT SENATOR JOE DONNELLY OPPOSED THE TAX PLAN AND SUPPORTED MIDDLE CLASS TAX CUTS

DONNELLY REPEATEDLY VOTED TO EXTEND THE BUSH TAX CUTS AND VOTED TO MAKE THEM PERMANENT

2010: Donnelly Voted To Extend The Bush Tax Cuts For Two Years. In December 2010, Donnelly voted for a bill that "would extend the 2001- and 2003-enacted tax cuts for all taxpayers for two years and revive the lapsed estate tax, setting the tax rate at 35 percent on estates worth more than \$5 million for 2011 and 2012. It also would extend unemployment insurance benefits for 13 months and cut the employee portion of the Social Security tax by 2 percentage points." The vote was on a motion to concur in the Senate amendment and the motion was agreed to by a vote of 277 to 148. [House Vote 647, [12/17/10](#); Congressional Quarterly, [12/17/10](#)]

December 2010: Donnelly Voted To Extend The Bush Tax Cuts For The Middle Class. "The two congressmen representing portions of Elkhart County split on a House vote today on tax cut extensions for the middle class. U. S. Rep. Joe Donnelly, D-2nd, voted for the legislation, while U. S. Rep. Marlin Stutzman, R-3rd, voted against it. 'I've said from the beginning of this debate that we need to make the tax cuts for the middle-class permanent,' Donnelly said in a statement. 'That's why I voted for the bill on the House floor today. I've also said that we should extend the cuts for the higher-wage earners for a year or two while our economy continues to recover. In a perfect world, we would be able to make them all permanent, but voters were clear in November that they're concerned about the deficit and debt.'" [Elkhart Truth, 12/3/10]

August 2012: Donnelly Voted To Extend The Bush Tax Cuts. "Nineteen Democrats - including Rep. Joe Donnelly, D-2nd, who is running for a Senate seat - joined 237 Republicans in voting to extend the 2001 and '03 tax cuts Wednesday. One Republican and 170 Democrats opposed the legislation. 'I believe we can all agree that the economy is not as strong as we would like it to be. With that in mind, I voted to keep all tax rates at their current levels,' Donnelly said in a statement." [Fort Wayne Journal Gazette, 8/2/12]

2013: Donnelly Voted To Permanently Extend The Bush Tax Cuts For Individuals Earning Below \$400,000 And Joint Filers Earning Below \$450,000. In January 2013, Donnelly voted for a bill that "would permanently extend the 2001 and 2003 tax rates for individual income below \$400,000 and joint-filer income below \$450,000. Rates for income above those thresholds would rise to 39.6 percent from 35 percent. It also would permanently extend the tax rates on

dividends and capital gains for individual income below \$400,000 and joint-filer income below \$450,000. Rates for the dividends and capital gains taxes would rise to 20 percent for income above those thresholds.” The vote was on a motion to concur in the Senate amendments. The motion was agreed to by a vote of 257 to 167. [House Vote 659, [1/1/13](#); Congressional Quarterly, [1/1/13](#)]

DONNELLY REPEATEDLY VOTED AGAINST OBAMA-ERA CARBON TAX PROPOSALS

2009: Donnelly Voted Against The American Clean Energy And Security Act, Which Created A Cap-And-Trade System For Limiting Greenhouse Gas Emissions. In June 2009, Donnelly voted against a bill that “would create a cap-and-trade system for limiting greenhouse gas emissions and set new requirements for electric utilities. The EPA would be allowed to auction emission allowances to permit the buyer to emit a certain amount of greenhouse gases. Under the bill, three-quarters of emission allowances would be provided to polluters free of charge, based on formulas, when the cap-and-trade program would begin in 2012. Remaining allowances would be sold at auction. By 2030, 75 percent of the allowances would be sold to polluters by EPA. The bill would limit emissions at 17 percent below current levels in 2020, 42 percent in 2030 and 83 percent in 2050. Companies such as electric utilities, refineries and factories could buy and sell pollution allowances and get credit for funding special projects to reduce emissions on farms and in forests. It would require utilities to produce 15 percent of the nation’s electricity from renewable sources by 2020, with another 5 percent energy savings from efficiency. States could petition to bring the renewable mandate down to 12 percent, with 8 percent from efficiency. It would set new emissions standards for coal-fired power plants, and new energy efficiency and water use standards for buildings and products. It would establish programs to assist energy consumers with higher utility bills as a result of the system. It also would create programs for electrical transmission lines, smart grid technologies, modernizing electricity infrastructure to respond to changing conditions, reduction of emissions, increased energy efficiency, and carbon capture and sequestration.” The vote was on passage and passed by a vote of 219 to 212. [House Vote, [6/26/09](#); Congressional Quarterly, [6/26/09](#)]

- **Congressional Quarterly: A Vote In Favor Of Cap-And-Trade Was In Support Of The President’s Position.** “A ‘yea’ was a vote in support of the president’s position.” [Congressional Quarterly, [6/26/09](#)]

June 2009: Donnelly Voted Against A Cap-And-Trade Bill. “Democratic Reps. Andre Carson and Baron Hill were the only members of Indiana’s delegation to vote in favor of a bill to force reductions in greenhouse gases blamed for global warming. The House passed the bill 219-212 on Friday. Carson and Hill were among 211 Democrats and eight Republicans who voted for the measure. There were 44 Democrats and 168 Republicans opposed, including Indiana Democrats Joe Donnelly, Brad Ellsworth and Pete Visclosky, and Republicans Dan Burton, Steve Buyer, Mike Pence and Mark Souder. [...] Donnelly, however, said it could jeopardize jobs. ‘The legislation has too many uncertainties in terms of the effect it would have on manufacturers and other businesses and the Hoosiers they employ,’ Donnelly said. ‘In particular, I am very concerned that the bill would put us at a competitive disadvantage relative to other emerging economic powers like China and India.’” [Associated Press, 6/27/09]

2010: A Donnelly Ad Referred To Cap-And-Trade As “Nancy Pelosi’s Energy Tax.” “Indiana Rep. Joe Donnelly is taking an unusual jab at his party’s leadership in a campaign ad that refers to climate change legislation as ‘Nancy Pelosi’s energy tax.’ The two-term Democrat is pulling a page from Republican strategists in trying to distance himself from policies that have some voters wary. In one ad, Donnelly says he voted against Pelosi’s ‘energy tax on Hoosier families.’ Another ad touts his votes to crack down on illegal immigration. Donnelly says he doesn’t work for the ‘Washington crowd’ as a photograph of President Barack Obama, Pelosi and House Minority Leader John Boehner flashes by. Donnelly faces former state Rep. Jackie Walorski in November. Former Republican vice presidential nominee Sarah Palin endorsed Walorski this week.” [Evansville Courier & Press, 8/21/10]

Donnelly Was One Of Four Democrats Who Voted For A Republican Proposal To Ensure No Tax Was Levied On Carbon Emissions. “Republicans also made Democrats take an uncomfortable vote on an amendment to ensure no tax is levied on carbon emissions, a policy proposal Obama and the Democrats have floated before as part of a cap-and-trade system. It was adopted, 58-42, with four Democrats – Donnelly [sic], McCaskill, Manchin and Heidi Heitkamp of North Dakota -- crossing party lines to vote with Republicans.” [Politico, 4/4/15]

March 2013: Donnelly Voted Against An Amendment To Redirect Carbon Tax Revenue As Reduced Tax Rates Or Deficit Reduction Efforts. “The Senate -- including 13 Democrats -- soundly rejected an amendment by Sen. Sheldon Whitehouse (D-R.I.) that would have steered revenue from a carbon tax back to the American people in the form of deficit reduction or reduced tax rates. A handful of red-state Democrats up for reelection in 2014 voted against the Whitehouse amendment, including Sens. Max Baucus of Montana, Kay Hagan of North Carolina, Mary Landrieu of Louisiana, Tim Johnson of South Dakota and Mark Pryor of Arkansas. Freshman Democrats put themselves on the record on climate change for the first time, with Heitkamp and Sens. Joe Donnelly of Indiana and Tim Kaine of Virginia all voting no.” [Politico, 3/25/13]

2013: Donnelly Voted Against An Amendment To Establish A Carbon Tax. In March 2013, Donnelly voted against an amendment “that would establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to allow for legislation that would provide for a fee on carbon pollution and use revenues collected to reduce the deficit.” The measure was rejected by a vote of 41 to 58. [Senate Vote 58, [3/22/13](#); Congressional Quarterly, [3/22/13](#)]

2013: Donnelly Voted Effectively Voted For An Amendment To Require 60 Votes For Any Legislation That Created A Tax Or Fee On Carbon Emissions. In March 2013, Donnelly voted for a “motion to waive the Budget Act with respect to the Murray, D-Wash., point of order against the Blunt amendment no. 261 for not being germane. The Blunt amendment would create a 60-vote point of order against any legislation that includes a tax or fee on carbon emissions.” The motion was to waive the Budget Act against the Blunt amendment; the motion was rejected by a vote of 53 to 46. [Senate Vote 59, [3/22/13](#); Congressional Quarterly, [3/22/13](#)]

DONNELLY VOTED FOR AND INTRODUCED A BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

2011: Donnelly Voted In Favor Of A Joint Resolution To Propose A Constitutional Balanced Budget Amendment. In November 2011, Donnelly voted in favor of a “motion to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution that would propose a constitutional amendment that would require a balanced budget starting in fiscal 2018 or the second fiscal year after ratification by three-fourths of the states, whichever is later. Under the proposal three-fifths of the entire House and Senate would be required to approve deficit spending or an increase in the public debt limit. A simple majority could waive the requirement in times of congressionally declared war or in the face of a serious military threat.” The motion was rejected by a vote of 261 to 165. [House Vote 858, [11/18/11](#); Congressional Quarterly, [11/18/11](#)]

2017: Donnelly Introduced A Balanced Budget Amendment To The Constitution. [S.J.Res. 39, [3/30/17](#)]

2015: Donnelly Introduced A Balanced Budget Amendment To The Constitution. [S.J.Res.18, [7/9/15](#)]