

## MO TV Spot: "Served"

Claim	Backup
<p><u>VO:</u></p> <p>Two men, two different kinds of service...</p> <p>After 9/11, Jason Kander enlisted...</p> <p><u>GFX</u> Jason Kander enlists after 9/11</p>	<p><b>Jason Kander enlisted in the Army National Guard in September 2003</b></p> <p><a href="#">Enlistment/Reenlistment Document, Armed Forces of the United States</a>  <b>Name:</b> Jason David Kander  <b>Date of enlistment:</b> 2003-09-30  <b>I am enlisting in the:</b> Army National Guard of the United States</p> <p><a href="#">"Military records laud Missouri Senate, governor candidates." McClatchy, 8/30/16</a>            Kander enlisted in the Army in September 2003.</p>
<p>And deployed to Afghanistan as an intelligence officer.</p> <p><u>GFX</u> 2006: Kander deploys to Afghanistan</p>	<p><b>Kander served in Afghanistan as an intelligence officer from October 2006 to January 2007</b></p> <p><a href="#">Personnel Qualification Record, Jason Kander Oversea Service (pg. 8)</a>  <b>From:</b> 20061002  <b>Thru:</b> 20070131  <b>Area and Country:</b> Camp Eggers, Afghanistan</p> <p><a href="#">"Military records laud Missouri Senate, governor candidates." McClatchy, 8/30/16</a>            On election day a decade ago, Army Lt. Jason Kander was serving as an intelligence officer in Afghanistan</p>
<p>In Congress, Roy Blunt voted to protect his own pay raise. Twelve times</p> <p><u>GFX</u> Voted 12 times to protect his own pay raise</p> <p>Congress again voted itself a pay raise</p>	<p><b><u>Vote 1</u></b></p> <p><b>In December 2010, Blunt voted against HR 3083, which prevented a Congressional pay raise by preventing an adjustment in GS base pay, which pay adjustments for members of Congress cannot exceed</b></p> <p><a href="#">HR 3083, Vote #662, 12/21/10</a>            Blunt: Nay</p> <p><a href="#">HR 3082, 111<sup>th</sup> Congress</a>            Became Public Law: 111-322</p> <p><a href="#">"Salaries of Members of Congress: Recent Actions and Historical Tables." Congressional Research Service, 2/23/16</a>            P.L. 111-322 prevented any adjustment in GS base pay before December 31, 2012. Since the percentage adjustment in Member</p>

# END CITIZENS UNITED

DEMOCRATS FIGHTING FOR REFORM

pay may not exceed the percentage adjustment in the base pay of GS employees, Member pay was also frozen during this period. If not limited by GS pay, Member pay could have been adjusted by 1.3% in 2012.

## Vote 2

**In February 2009, Blunt voted against an adoption of the rules for a bill, where the rules contained language to incorporate a provision blocking a pay increase.**

[H RES 184, Vote #85, 2/25/09](#)

Blunt: Nay

Vote Total: 398 Aye, 24 Nay

[Fiscal 2009 Omnibus Appropriations – Rule, House Vote #85, CQ, 2/25/09](#)

Adoption of the rule (H Res 184) that would provide for House floor consideration of the bill that would provide fiscal 2009 appropriations for federal departments and agencies covered by nine unfinished fiscal 2009 spending bills. The rule contains self-executing language, that upon adoption, would incorporate a provision to block the automatic cost-of-living adjustment for members of Congress in 2010.

[“Lawmakers give up pay raise in 2010.” Associated Press, 2/25/09](#)

Wary of angering constituents during the recession, members of Congress will turn down the automatic pay raise they are due next year.

...

The freeze was inserted in the resolution establishing the rules of debate for the spending bill. Republicans, who generally opposed the spending bill, voted overwhelmingly for the resolution, which passed 398-24.

## Vote 3

**In June 2007, Roy Blunt voted in favor of ordering the previous question, which prevented a measure from being considered that would have blocked a pay increase. The Washington Post declared that the House “gave itself a pay raise.”**

[On Ordering the Previous Question, H Res 517, Vote #580, 6/27/07](#)

Blunt: Yea

[Salaries of Members of Congress: Congressional Votes, 1990-2016, Congressional Research Service, 6/21/16](#)

On June 27, 2007, the House took action potentially relating to the

# END CITIZENS UNITED

DEMOCRATS FIGHTING FOR REFORM

January 2008 Member pay increase. The House agreed (244-181, vote #580) to order the previous question on the rule (H.Res. 517) for consideration of H.R. 2829, the FY2008 Financial Services and General Government Appropriations bill. By ordering the previous question, the House voted to prevent an amendment to the rule from being offered and brought the rule to an immediate vote. The House bill did not contain Member pay language, and the House did not vote on an amendment to accept or reject a Member pay increase.

Under the terms of H.Res. 517, as adopted, an amendment seeking to halt the pay raise was not in order. An amendment to the rule could have waived points of order so as to permit an amendment to the bill prohibiting a pay increase. During floor debate, at least one Member spoke against the previous question and indicated an intention to offer an amendment to the rule to prohibit the increase if it was defeated.

[“House Grudgingly Accepts a Pay Raise, as Usual.”](#)  
[Washington Post, 6/28/07](#)

Last night, the House made its peace with it, rejecting a bid to block the automatic cost-of-living raise of about \$4,400 on a 244 to 181 vote

...

Members must actively vote to block the raise to stop it. As he has in the past, Democrat Jim Matheson of Utah moved to hold a direct vote to block the increase -- and his motion was defeated by a majority of both parties, as it has been in the past. The vote ends up being the only public record for members on the issue.

So by voting against Matheson's proposal last night, the House gave itself a pay raise.

## Vote 4

**In June 2006, Roy Blunt voted in favor of ordering the previous question, which prevented a measure from being considered that would have blocked his own pay raise. The Associated Press declared “House lawmakers give themselves \$3,300 raise”**

[On Ordering the Previous Question, H Res 865, Vote #261, 6/13/06](#)

Blunt: Yea

[Salaries of Members of Congress: Congressional Votes, 1990-2016, Congressional Research Service, 6/21/16](#)

**06/13/06**—The House agreed (249-167, vote #261) to order the previous question on the rule (H.Res. 865)

# END CITIZENS UNITED

DEMOCRATS FIGHTING FOR REFORM

for consideration of H.R. 5576, the FY2007 Transportation and Treasury Appropriation bill. By ordering the previous question, the House voted to prevent an amendment to the rule from being offered, and to bring the rule to an immediate vote. An amendment to the rule could have waived points of order so as to permit an amendment to the bill prohibiting a pay increase. Although H.Res. 865 was an open rule that allowed any germane amendment, an amendment to prohibit the pay adjustment would not have been germane. By agreeing to order the previous question, some Members considered the vote to be against consideration of an amendment prohibiting a pay raise. Had the House not agreed to a motion to order the previous question, they argued, a Member could have offered an amendment to the rule related to the pay adjustment. Under the terms of H.Res. 865, as adopted, an amendment seeking to halt the pay raise was not in order. During floor debate, Representative Jim Matheson made known his intention to offer an amendment to the rule to prohibit the increase, and spoke against the previous question so that his amendment could receive a waiver to be considered.

## [“House lawmakers give themselves \\$3,300 raise.” Associated Press, 6/13/06](#)

Despite record low approval ratings, House lawmakers Tuesday embraced a \$3,300 pay raise that will increase their salaries to \$168,500.

...

Lawmakers easily squelched a bid by Rep. Jim Matheson, D-Utah, to get a direct vote to block the COLA, which is automatically awarded unless lawmakers vote to block it.

...

Like last year, Matheson led a quixotic drive to block the raise. He was the only member to speak on the topic.

“I do not think that it is appropriate to let this bill go through without an up or down vote on whether or not Congress should have an increase in its own pay,” Matheson said.

But by a 249-167 vote, the House rejected Matheson’s procedural attempt to get a direct vote on the pay raise.

## **Vote 5**

**In June 2005, Roy Blunt voted in favor of ordering the previous question, which prevented a measure from being considered that would have blocked his own pay raise. The Deseret News declared “Congress again voted itself a pay raise.”**

[On Ordering the Previous Question, H Res 342, Vote #327, 6/28/05](#)

# END CITIZENS UNITED

DEMOCRATS FIGHTING FOR REFORM

Blunt: Yea

[Salaries of Members of Congress: Congressional Votes, 1990-2016, Congressional Research Service, 6/21/16](#)

**06/28/05**—The House agreed (263-152, vote #327) to order the previous question on the rule (H.Res. 342) for consideration of H.R. 3058, the FY2006 Transportation and Treasury Appropriation bill. By ordering the previous question, the House voted to prevent an amendment to the rule from being offered, and to bring the rule to an immediate vote. An amendment to the rule could have waived points of order so as to permit an amendment to the bill prohibiting a pay increase. Although H.Res. 342 was an open rule that allowed any germane amendment, an amendment to prohibit the pay adjustment would not have been germane. By agreeing to order the previous question, some Members considered the vote to be against consideration of an amendment to permit a pay raise prohibition to be offered. Had the House not agreed to a motion to order the previous question, they argued, a Member could have offered an amendment to the rule related to the pay adjustment. Under the terms of H.Res. 342, as adopted, an amendment seeking to halt the pay raise was not in order. During floor debate, Representative Jim Matheson made known his intention to offer an amendment to the rule to prohibit the increase, and spoke against the previous question so that his amendment could receive a waiver to be considered.

[“Congress OKs raise despite Matheson.” Deseret News, 6/30/05](#)

Congress again voted itself a pay raise Tuesday, this time to the tune of 1.9 percent, or \$3,100.

...

Rep. Jim Matheson, D-Utah, tried again — and failed again to persuade his colleagues to reject the automatic congressional pay raise that is wrapped inside an appropriations bill.

...

Reps. Chris Cannon and Rob Bishop, both Utah Republicans, joined Matheson in supporting the procedural move. But in the end, 263 representatives voted to end debate while 152 voted with Matheson.

This is the fifth time in five years Matheson has attempted the procedural move on the House floor and the fifth time he has failed. This time around, he got 18 fewer votes than the 170 he got in a similar vote taken last September. If that motion were defeated, then Matheson could offer an amendment blocking the automatic pay increases.

**Vote 6**

# END CITIZENS UNITED

DEMOCRATS FIGHTING FOR REFORM

In September 2004, Roy Blunt voted in favor of ordering the previous question, which prevented a measure from being considered that would have blocked his own pay raise. The Las Vegas Review-Journal declared that “House members approved a \$4,000 pay raise for themselves.”

[On Ordering the Previous Question, H Res 771, Vote #451, 9/14/04](#)

Blunt: Yea

[Salaries of Members of Congress: Congressional Votes, 1990-2016, Congressional Research Service, 6/21/16](#)

**09/14/04**—The House agreed (235-170, vote #451) to order the previous question on a rule (H.Res. 770) providing for consideration of H.R. 5025, the FY2005 Transportation and Treasury Appropriations bill. By ordering the previous question, the House voted to prevent an amendment to the rule from being offered, and to bring the rule to an immediate vote. An amendment to the rule could have waived points of order so as to permit an amendment to the bill prohibiting a pay increase. Although H.Res. 770 was an open rule that allowed any germane amendment, an amendment to prohibit the pay adjustment would not have been germane. By agreeing to order the previous question, some Members considered the vote to be against consideration of an amendment to permit a pay raise prohibition to be offered. Had the House not agreed to a motion to order the previous question, they argued, a Member could have offered an amendment to the rule related to the pay adjustment. Under the terms of H.Res. 770, as adopted, an amendment seeking to halt the pay raise was not in order

[“U.S. House members vote to give themselves salary increase.” Las Vegas Review-Journal, 9/16/04](#)

House members approved a \$4,000 pay raise for themselves this week

...

Since 1989, a cost-of-living adjustment has been automatic to spare lawmakers the embarrassment of voting themselves a pay raise. Congress has voted five times to reject the automatic raise, but has not done so since 1998.

On Tuesday, the House voted 235-170 for a technical procedure that included the pay raise. Ninety-one Republicans and 78 Democrats, two-fifths of each party, and one independent voted against the salary increase.

**Vote 7**

# END CITIZENS UNITED

DEMOCRATS FIGHTING FOR REFORM

**In September 2003, Roy Blunt voted in favor of ordering the previous question, which prevented a measure from being considered that would have blocked his own pay raise. The Associated Press declared that “House... approved a 2.2 percent pay raise for Congress.”**

[On Ordering the Previous Question, H Res 351, Vote #463, 9/4/03](#)

Blunt: Yea

[Salaries of Members of Congress: Congressional Votes, 1990-2016, Congressional Research Service, 6/21/16](#)

**09/04/03**—The House agreed (240-173, vote #463) to order the previous question on a rule (H.Res. 351) providing for consideration of H.R. 2989, the FY2004 Transportation and Treasury Appropriations bill. By ordering the previous question, the House voted to prevent an amendment to the rule from being offered, and to bring the rule to an immediate vote. An amendment to the rule could have waived points of order so as to permit an amendment to the bill prohibiting a pay increase. Although H.Res. 351 was an open rule that allowed any germane amendment, an amendment to prohibit the pay adjustment would not have been germane. By agreeing to order the previous question, some Members considered the vote to be against consideration of an amendment to permit a pay raise prohibition to be offered. Had the House not agreed to a motion to order the previous question, they argued, a Member could have offered an amendment to the rule related to the pay adjustment. Under the terms of H.Res. 351, as adopted, an amendment seeking to halt the pay raise was not in order

[“Another Pay Raise For Congress?” Associated Press, 9/4/03](#)

The House on Thursday approved a 2.2 percent pay raise for Congress — slightly less than average wage increases in private business but enough to boost lawmakers' annual salaries to about \$158,000 next year.

...

By a 240-173 vote, the House rejected Matheson's procedural attempt to get a direct vote on the pay raise for lawmakers.

## **Vote 8**

**In July 2002, Roy Blunt voted in favor of ordering the previous question, which prevented a measure from being considered that would have blocked his own pay raise. The Associated Press declared that “lawmakers cleared the way... for the salary hike.”**

[On Ordering the Previous Question, H Res 488, Vote #322, 7/18/02](#)

Blunt: Yea

# END CITIZENS UNITED

DEMOCRATS FIGHTING FOR REFORM

[Salaries of Members of Congress: Congressional Votes, 1990-2016, Congressional Research Service, 6/21/16](#)

**07/18/02**—The House agreed (258-156, vote #322) to order the previous question on a rule (H.Res. 488) providing for consideration of H.R. 5120, the FY2003 Treasury Appropriations bill. By ordering the previous question, the House voted to prevent an amendment to the rule from being offered, and to bring the rule to an immediate vote. An amendment to the rule could have waived points of order so as to permit an amendment to the bill prohibiting a pay increase. Although H.Res. 488 was an open rule that allowed any germane amendment, an amendment to prohibit the pay adjustment would not have been germane. By agreeing to order the previous question, Members voted not to consider an amendment to permit a pay raise prohibition amendment to be offered. Had the House not agreed to a motion to order the previous question, a Member could have offered an amendment to the rule related to the pay adjustment. Under the terms of H.Res. 488, as adopted, an amendment seeking to halt the pay raise was not in order. The vote to order the previous question (and not allow any amendment to the rule) was seen by some as a vote to accept a pay adjustment.

**“House opens the way for fourth straight raise in pay.” Associated Press, 7/19/02**

If the raise, about \$5,000 a year, goes into effect, rank-and-file members of Congress would receive \$155,000, an increase of more than \$20,000 over the past decade.

Under a 1989 law, congressional pay raises, determined by a complicated formula that includes a measure of private industry employment costs, go into effect automatically unless lawmakers vote to block it.

House lawmakers cleared the way Thursday for the salary hike.

...

Showdowns over pay raises traditionally take place during debate on the annual spending bill for the Treasury Department and related agencies, but a 258-156 procedural vote at the opening of that debate effectively prevented lawmakers from offering an amendment to kill the raise.

## **Vote 9**

**In July 2002, Roy Blunt voted in favor of ordering the previous question, which prevented a measure from being considered that would have blocked his own pay raise.**

[On Ordering the Previous Question, H Res 206, Vote #267, 7/25/01](#)



# END CITIZENS UNITED

DEMOCRATS FIGHTING FOR REFORM

Blunt: Yea

[Salaries of Members of Congress: Congressional Votes, 1990-2016, Congressional Research Service, 6/21/16](#)

**07/25/01**—The House agreed (293-129, vote #267) to order the previous question on a rule (H.Res. 206) providing for consideration of H.R. 2590, the FY2002 Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Appropriations bill. H.Res. 206 was an open rule that allowed any germane amendment; an amendment to prohibit the pay adjustment, however, would not have been germane. By agreeing to order the previous question, Members voted not to consider an amendment to permit a pay raise prohibition amendment to be offered. Had the House not agreed to a motion to order the previous question, a Member could have offered an amendment to the rule related to the pay adjustment. Under the terms of H.Res. 206, an amendment seeking to halt the pay raise was not in order. The vote to order the previous question (and not allow any amendment to the rule) was seen by some as a vote to accept a pay increase.

## Vote 10

**In July 2000, Roy Blunt voted in favor of ordering the previous question, which prevented a measure from being considered that would have blocked his own pay raise.**

[On Ordering the Previous Question, H Res 560, Vote #419, 7/20/00](#)

Blunt: Yea

[Salaries of Members of Congress: Congressional Votes, 1990-2016, Congressional Research Service, 6/21/16](#)

**07/20/00**—The House agreed (250-173, vote #419) to order the previous question on a rule (H.Res. 560) providing for consideration of H.R. 4871, the FY2001 Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Appropriations bill. H.Res. 560 was an open rule that allowed any germane amendment; an amendment to prohibit the pay adjustment, however, would not have been germane. By agreeing to order the previous question, Members voted not to consider an amendment to permit a pay raise prohibition amendment to be offered. Had the House not agreed to a motion to order the previous question, a Member could have offered an amendment to the rule related to the pay adjustment. Under the terms of H.Res. 560, as adopted, an amendment seeking to halt the pay raise was not in order. The vote to order the previous question (and not allow any amendment to the rule) was seen by some as a vote to accept a pay adjustment.

# END CITIZENS UNITED

DEMOCRATS FIGHTING FOR REFORM

## Vote 11

**In July 1999, Roy Blunt voted in favor of ordering the previous question, which prevented a measure from being considered that would have blocked his own pay raise.**

[On Ordering the Previous Question, H Res 246, Vote #300, 7/15/99](#)

Blunt: Yea

[Salaries of Members of Congress: Congressional Votes, 1990-2016, Congressional Research Service, 6/21/16](#)

**07/15/99**—The House agreed (276-147, vote #300) to order the previous question on the rule (H.Res. 246) for consideration of H.R. 2490, the FY2000 Treasury and General Government Appropriations bill. H.Res. 246 was an open rule that allowed any germane amendment; an amendment to prohibit the pay adjustment, however, would not have been germane. By agreeing to order the previous question, Members voted not to consider an amendment to permit a pay raise prohibition amendment to be offered. Had the House not agreed to order the previous question, Members could have offered an amendment to the rule related to the pay adjustment. Under the terms of H.Res. 246, as adopted, an amendment seeking to halt the pay raise was not in order. The vote to order the previous question (and not allow any amendment to the rule) was seen by some as a vote to accept a pay adjustment.

## Vote 12

**In September 1997, Roy Blunt voted in favor of ordering the previous question, which prevented the inclusion of instructions to omit a pay increase to conferees on a conference report.**

[On Ordering the Previous Question, Vote #435, 9/24/97](#)

Blunt: Yea

[Salaries of Members of Congress: Congressional Votes, 1990-2016, Congressional Research Service, 6/21/16](#)

**09/24/97**—The House voted (229-199, vote 435) to order the previous question on a pending motion to instruct conferees on an issue unrelated to the pay issue. Because the House permits only one motion to instruct conferees, and because ordering the previous question precludes amendment to the pending question, this vote in effect foreclosed the possibility of instructing conferees to omit the pay adjustment from the conference report. As a result of this House vote, H.R. 2378 was sent to conference by the House without instructions to prohibit the pay adjustment. Conferees dropped the

# END CITIZENS UNITED

DEMOCRATS FIGHTING FOR REFORM

	<p>Senate pay amendment and both houses agreed to the conference report on September 24, 1997. H.R. 2378 was signed into P.L. 105-61 on October 10, 1997.</p>
<p>He lives in a DC mansion.</p> <p><u>GFX</u> \$1.6 Million DC Mansion</p>	<p><b>In July 2011, Roy Blunt and his wife Abigail purchased a DC mansion in her name for over \$1.6 million. They still own it today.</b></p> <p><a href="#">4936 Loughboro Rd NW – Washington DC Property Assessment Database</a></p> <p><b>Owner Name:</b> Abigail P. Blunt <b>Sale Price:</b> \$1,625,000 <b>[Sale] Recordation Date:</b> 7/11/11 <b>Current Total Value:</b> \$1,761,810</p> <p><a href="#">“Senator's wife, Abigail Blunt, again named one of Washington's top corporate lobbyists.” St. Louis Post-Dispatch, 10/30/15</a></p> <p>Abigail Blunt has again been named one of Washington's top corporate lobbyists by "The Hill," a Capitol Hill newspaper.</p> <p>The wife of Sen. Roy Blunt, R-Mo., was one of 45 named out of an estimated 10,000 lobbyists in its latest rankings this week. Abigail Blunt lobbies for Kraft Food Groups, Inc.</p>
<p>His wife and three of his children are all lobbyists.</p> <p><u>GFX</u> Family ties spark concern in lobby debate</p>	<p><b>Blunt’s wife Abigail Blunt, and his children Matt Blunt, Andy Blunt, and Amy Blunt are all registered lobbyists</b></p> <p><a href="#">“Truth check: Kander ads target Blunt's ties to lobbyists.” KMBC, 8/16/16</a></p> <p>Roy Blunt’s second wife, Abigail Blunt, is a major Washington lobbyist, heading government affairs efforts for Kraft Heinz. Before that, she was a top lobbyist for Altria Client Services, which owns Philip Morris and some other tobacco companies.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Roy Blunt’s son, Andy Blunt, is a well-known Missouri lobbyist and his father’s campaign manager. Andy Blunt’s clients include Truman Medical Center Charities, the University of Missouri, General Motors and Altria.</p> <p>Matt Blunt, a former Missouri governor, is president of the American Automotive Policy Council and is registered as a federal lobbyist. Amy Blunt is also a registered lobbyist in Missouri, but does not have a big client list now.</p> <p><a href="#">Federal Lobbying Report – The Kraft Heinz Company, 2016 Q2</a> <i>Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area</i> Abigail Blunt</p> <p><a href="#">Federal Lobbying Report – American Automotive Policy Council, Inc., 2016 Q2</a></p>

# END CITIZENS UNITED

DEMOCRATS FIGHTING FOR REFORM

	<p><i>Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area</i> Matthew Blunt</p> <p><a href="#">Lobbyist Summary, Missouri Ethics Commission</a> <b>Lobbyist name:</b> Andrew B. Blunt <b>Registered through:</b> 12/31/2016</p> <p><a href="#">Lobbyist Summary, Missouri Ethics Commission</a> <b>Lobbyist name:</b> Amy Blunt <b>Registered through:</b> 12/31/2016</p> <p><a href="#">"Family ties spark concern in lobby debate." Boston Globe, 1/28/06</a> One of the leading candidates to replace DeLay as majority leader is the acting majority leader, US Representative Roy Blunt of Missouri. He is married to Abigail Blunt, who has lobbied for tobacco interests and is registered to represent Altria, the conglomerate that includes Philip Morris. Critics have cited the Blunt case as an example of the need for change.</p> <p>When Blunt was dating his future wife in 2002, she was a registered lobbyist for Philip Morris and he unsuccessfully sought to insert a measure into a homeland security bill favorable to tobacco interests.</p>
<p>Kander served his country.</p> <p>Blunt served himself.</p> <p><u>GFX</u> Jason Kander served his country</p> <p>Roy Blunt served himself</p>	
<p>End Citizens United is responsible for the content of this advertising.</p> <p><u>GFX</u> Paid for by End Citizens United, endcitizensunited.org, and not authorized by any candidate or candidate's</p>	

# END CITIZENS UNITED

DEMOCRATS FIGHTING FOR REFORM

committee. End  
Citizens United is  
responsible for the  
content of this  
advertising.

