

AD	BACKUP
<p>KID: Hey Mister! How do I get ahead in Washington?</p> <p>ANNCR: Well Billy, take a page out of Mimi Walters' book.</p> <p><i>TEXT (book title): "How to Get Ahead in DC" by Rep. Mimi Walters</i></p>	
<p>ANNCR: Mimi took over \$20,000 from the gun lobby—and refuses to support banning people on the terrorist watch list from buying guns.</p> <p><i>TEXT: Mimi Walters \$20,000 from the Gun Lobby Refuse to support common sense gun reforms [Center for Responsive Politics, accessed 10/8/18]</i></p>	<p><b>WALTERS HAS TAKEN \$20,000 FROM THE GUN LOBBY</b></p> <p><b>Walters Has Received \$22,650 From Gun Rights Groups.</b> According to the Center for Responsive Politics, Walters has received \$22,650 from gun rights groups. Groups included under the “gun rights” category include the National Rifle Association, the National Shooting Sports Association, Safari Club International, and Gun Owners of America. [Center for Responsive Politics, accessed <a href="#">10/10/18</a>]</p> <p><b>WALTERS OPPOSED BANNING PEOPLE ON THE TERRORIST WATCH LIST FROM BUYING GUNS</b></p> <p><b>June 2016: Walters Voted To Block Consideration Of A Bill To Close The Loophole That Allowed Suspects On The FBI Terror Watch List To Buy Firearms.</b> In June 2016, Walters voted for a “motion to order the previous question (thus ending debate and possibility of amendment) on the rule (H Res 778) that would provide for House floor consideration of the bill (HR 5053) that would prohibit the Treasury Department from requiring 501(c) tax-exempt organizations to identify contributors in annual returns and the fiscal 2017 Defense appropriations bill (HR 5293).” According to the Democratic Leader’s office, “With the Previous Question, Democrats are demanding an immediate vote on H.R. 1076, the bipartisan ‘No Fly, No Buy’ legislation keep guns out of the hands of suspected terrorists, authored by Republican Congressman Peter King.” The previous question passed 236 to 171. A vote against the previous question would have allowed consideration of the 'No Fly, No Buy’ bill. [CQ; H. Res. 778, Vote #299, <a href="#">6/14/16</a>]</p> <p><b>January 2016: Walters Voted To Block Consideration Of Bill To Close Terrorist Gun Loophole And Prevent People On Terrorist Watchlist From Buying Firearms.</b> In January 2016, Walters voted for consideration of a vote to “call for an immediate vote on Republican Congressman Peter King’s Denying Firearms and Explosives to Dangerous Terrorists Act, H.R. 1076, to protect the American people by closing the terrorist gun loophole and preventing people on the terrorist watchlist from buying firearms.” The previous question carried, 236-176. A vote against the previous question would have allowed the bill to be considered. [H. Res 581, Vote #21, <a href="#">1/07/16</a>; Democratic Leader – Previous Questions, <a href="#">1/07/16</a>]</p>

	<p><b>December 2015: Walters Voted To Block Consideration Of A Bill To Close The Terrorist Gun Loophole.</b> In December 2015, Walters voted To Block consideration of the Denying Firearms and Explosives to Dangerous Terrorists Act, a bill “to protect the American people by closing the terrorist gun loophole and preventing people on the terrorist watchlist from buying firearms.” The previous question carried, 236-177. A vote against the previous question was to force the vote on closing the loophole. [H. Res. 560, Vote #690, <a href="#">12/11/15</a>; Democratic Leader – Previous Questions, <a href="#">12/11/15</a>]</p>
<p>ANNCR: Walters got over \$130,000 from the telecom industry, and voted to let them sell customers’ personal data without their permission.</p> <p><i>TEXT: Mimi Walters \$130,000 from the Telecom Industry Vote to let telecoms sell customers’ personal data [Center for Responsive Politics, accessed 10/8/18]</i></p>	<p><b>WALTERS HAS TAKEN OVER \$130,000 FROM THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS INDUSTRY</b></p> <p><b>Walters Has Taken \$135,275 From The Telecom Services Industry.</b> According to the Center for Responsive Politics, Walters has received \$135,275 from the telecom services industry. Groups included under the “telecom services” category include Comcast, Cox Enterprises, Charter Communications, and the Internet &amp; Television Association. [Center for Responsive Politics, accessed <a href="#">10/10/18</a>]</p> <p><b>WALTERS VOTED TO ALLOW INTERNET SERVICE PROVIDERS TO SELL CUSTOMERS’ PERSONAL DATA WITHOUT THEIR PERMISSION</b></p> <p><b>Poliquin Voted For S.J. Res. 34.</b> [S.J. Res. 34, Vote #202, <a href="#">3/28/17</a>]</p> <p><b>Resolution Would Nullify An FCC Rule That Required Internet Service Providers To Seek Consent From Their Customers In Order To “Share Their Sensitive Private Data.”</b> In March 2017, Tech Crunch reported: “Less than a week after the Senate voted to empower internet service providers to freely share private user data with advertisers, the House has weighed in, too. Today in a 215-205 vote on Senate Joint Resolution 34 (H. Res. 230), the House voted to repeal broadband privacy regulations that the Obama administration’s FCC introduced in 2016. In a narrower vote than some expected, 15 Republicans broke rank to join the 190 Democrats who voted against the repeal. The FCC rules, designed to protect consumers, required ISPs to seek consent from their customers in order to share their sensitive private data (it’s worth noting that ISPs can collect it, either way). For consumers, the rollback is a bad deal no matter how you slice it.” [Tech Crunch, <a href="#">3/28/17</a>]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Sensitive Data Included Precise Geolocation, Financial Information, Health Information, Children’s Information And Web Browsing History.</b> In March 2017, Reuters reported: “According to the rules approved by the Federal Communications Commission in October under then-President Barack Obama, internet providers would need to obtain consumer consent before using precise geolocation, financial information, health information, children’s information and web browsing history for advertising and internal marketing.” [Reuters, <a href="#">3/23/17</a>]</li> <li>• <b>Sensitive Data Also Included Social Security Numbers.</b> In April 2017, Business Insider reported: “Many of those rules took after the guidelines recommended by the FTC before the Title II reclassification. ISPs would’ve been free to use some ‘nonsensitive’ personal data, like email addresses, for advertising purposes without having to ask customers beforehand, but they’d have had to give those customers the ability to opt out of that practice. With other ‘sensitive’ personal data — like Social</li> </ul>

Security numbers, children's info, financial info, health info, and location data — the FCC would've forced ISPs to give customers the chance of opting in before an ISP could collect the data. Again, this is same recommendation — but not mandate — presented in the FTC's privacy guidelines.” [Business Insider, [4/4/17](#)]

- **With The Regulation In Place, The FCC Would Have Forced ISPs To Give Customers The Chance Of Opting In Before Collecting Social Security Numbers And Health And Financial Information.** In April 2017, Business Insider reported: “With other ‘sensitive’ personal data — like Social Security numbers, children's info, financial info, health info, and location data — the FCC would've forced ISPs to give customers the chance of opting in before an ISP could collect the data. Again, this is same recommendation — but not mandate — presented in the FTC's privacy guidelines.” [Business Insider, [4/4/17](#)]
- **Without The FCC Rule In Place, ISPs Could Sell Social Security Numbers, Health And Financial Data, And Other Sensitive Information.** In April 2017, the Daily Dot reported: “Trump’s signing of Senate Joint Resolution 34 (S.J. Res. 34), which wipes away Federal Communications Commission (FCC) privacy rules for broadband providers that were set to go into effect later this year, defies the wishes of a majority of American voters from both parties, including Trump supporters, while satisfying the broadband industry. Without the FCC rules in place, ISPs may collect and sell web browsing histories, health and financial data, the contents of emails and messages, app usage data, Social Security numbers, and other private information.” [Daily Dot, [4/4/17](#)]

**HEADLINE: “House Votes To Allow Internet Service Providers To Sell, Share Your Personal Information.”** [Consumerist, [5/4/17](#)]

**HEADLINE: “Trump Expected To Sign Bill Allowing Internet Providers To Sell User Web Data.”** [ABC News, [3/29/17](#)]

**S.J. Res. 34 Would “Empower Internet Service Providers To Freely Share Private User Data With Advertising.”** In March 2017, Tech Crunch reported: “Less than a week after the Senate voted to empower internet service providers to freely share private user data with advertisers, the House has weighed in, too. Today in a 215-205 vote on Senate Joint Resolution 34 (H. Res. 230), the House voted to repeal broadband privacy regulations that the Obama administration’s FCC introduced in 2016.” [Tech Crunch, [3/28/17](#)]

**Under S.J. Res. 34, “There Are Few Limits On The Ways ISPs Will Be Allowed To Interact With Sensitive User Data.”** In March 2017, Tech Crunch reported: “Under the regulation rollback, there are few limits on the ways ISPs will be allowed to interact with sensitive user data. That includes not just allowing providers to create marketing profiles based on the browsing history of their users, but also letting them deploy undetectable tools that track web traffic, too.” [Tech Crunch, [3/28/17](#)]

**Tech Crunch: “There’s No Doubt That Major ISPs Will Sell Out Their Users To Advertisers When Given The Chance.”** In March 2017, Tech Crunch reported: “There’s no doubt that major ISPs will sell out their users to advertisers when given the chance, but some smaller providers aren’t yet complicit. Still, in

	<p>many markets, consumers don't have a choice of internet provider — a problem that stands to deepen in our present climate of deregulation. Now, only a signature from the president stands in the way of the repeal.” [Tech Crunch, <a href="#">3/28/17</a>]</p> <p><b>Under S.J. Res. 34, ISPs Could “Sell Their Users’ Information Directly To Marketers, Financial Firms And Other Companies That Mine Personal Data—All Of Whom Could Use The Data Without Consumers’ Consent.”</b> In March 2017, the Washington Post reported: “The providers could also sell their users’ information directly to marketers, financial firms and other companies that mine personal data — all of whom could use the data without consumers’ consent. In addition, the Federal Communications Commission, which initially drafted the protections, would be forbidden from issuing similar rules in the future.” [Washington Post, <a href="#">3/28/17</a>]</p> <p><b>Sen. Ed Markey: S.J. Res. 34 Would Make It Easier For Sensitive Information “To Be Used, Shared, And Sold To The Highest Bidder Without Their Permission.”</b> In March 2017, Reuters reported: “But Democratic Senator Ed Markey said, ‘Republicans have just made it easier for American’s sensitive information about their health, finances and families to be used, shared, and sold to the highest bidder without their permission.’” [Reuters, <a href="#">3/23/17</a>]</p> <p><b>Editorial: S.J. Res. 34 Would Allow Telecomms Companies “To Sell Revealing Personal Data They Gather About Their Customers.”</b> In March 2017, the Los Angeles Times editorial board stated: “The move by the House and Senate to repeal the rules at the behest of major phone and cable companies would allow those firms to sell revealing personal data they gather about their customers — their browsing habits, the apps they use, where they take their mobile devices — to advertisers and other buyers, whether their customers want the data to be sold or not.” [Los Angeles Times, editorial, <a href="#">3/30/17</a>]</p> <p><b>Editorial: Eliminating The FCC’s Rules Would Allow ISPs To Track Their Customers’ Behavior “And Sell That Information To Advertisers, Credit Card Companies, Lenders Or Anyone Else Eager For These Insight.”</b> In March 2017, the Los Angeles Times editorial board stated: “That competition may be coming as new, ultra-high-capacity fixed and mobile wireless services enter the market in the years ahead. In the meantime, though, eliminating the FCC's rules would appear to free Internet providers to track where their customers go and what they do online, create detailed profiles of their behavior and sell that information to advertisers, credit card companies, lenders or anyone else eager for these insights.” [Los Angeles Times, editorial, <a href="#">3/30/17</a>]</p>
<p>KID: Wait...but is that not so good for constituents?</p> <p>ANNCR: Be a good boy and shut your pie-hole Billy. Now make like Mimi, learn to work the system and you'll be made in the shade.</p> <p><i>TEXT: Mimi Walters Get elected. Work the system. Sold Out Orange County</i></p>	

*TEXT: Paid for by End Citizens United, endcitizensunited.org and not authorized by any candidate or candidate's committee. End Citizens United is responsible for the content of this advertising.*

AD	BACKUP
<p>KID: Hey Mister! How do I get ahead in Washington?</p> <p>ANNCR: Well Billy, take a page out of Mimi Walters' book.</p> <p><i>TEXT (book title): "How to Get Ahead in DC" by Rep. Mimi Walters</i></p>	
<p>ANNCR: Mimi raked in more than \$200,000 from the oil and gas industry and voted to give oil companies \$25 billion in tax breaks</p> <p><i>TEXT: Mimi Walters \$200,000 from Oil &amp; Gas Vote for \$25 Billion in Tax Breaks [Center for Responsive Politics, accessed 10/8/18]</i></p>	<p><b>WALTERS HAS TAKEN OVER \$200,000 FROM THE OIL &amp; GAS INDUSTRY</b></p> <p><b>Walters Has Taken \$220,750 From The Oil &amp; Gas Industry.</b> According to the Center for Responsive Politics, Walters has received \$220,750 from the oil &amp; gas industry. Groups included under the "oil &amp; gas" category include Chevron, Exxon Mobil, ConocoPhillips, and Marathon Petroleum. [Center for Responsive Politics, accessed <a href="#">10/10/18</a>]</p> <p><b>WALTERS VOTED TO GIVE OIL COMPANIES A \$25 BILLION TAX BREAK</b></p> <p><b>Walters Voted To Adopt The Conference Report On The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act.</b> In December 2017, Walters voted for: "Adoption of the conference report on the bill that would revise the federal income tax system by lowering the corporate tax rate from 35 percent to 21 percent; lowering individual tax rates through 2025; limiting state and local deductions to \$10,000 through 2025; decreasing the limit on deductible mortgage debt through 2025; and creating a new system of taxing U.S. corporations with foreign subsidiaries. Specifically, it would repeal personal exemptions and would roughly double the standard deduction through 2025. It would raise the child tax credit to \$2,000 through 2025, would repeal the alternative minimum tax for corporations and provide for broader exemptions to the tax for individuals through 2025. It would double individual exemptions to the estate tax and gift tax through 2025, and would establish a new top tax rate for 'pass-through' business income through 2025." The report was adopted by a vote of 227-203. [CQ, 12/19/17; H.R.1, Vote 692, <a href="#">12/19/17</a>]</p> <p><b>HEADLINE: "Inside The Tax Bill's \$25 Billion Oil Company Bonanza."</b> [Pacific Standard, <a href="#">3/27/18</a>]</p> <p><b>Seventeen American Oil &amp; Gas Companies Reported A Combined Total Of \$25 Billion In Direct One-Time Benefits From The Tax Bill.</b> In March 2018, the Pacific Standard reported: "Just 17 American oil and gas companies reported a combined total of \$25 billion in direct one-time benefits from the 2017 Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. Many of the companies will also receive millions of dollars in income tax refunds this year." [Pacific Standard, <a href="#">3/27/18</a>]</p>

ANNCR: Walters got \$70,000 from health insurance companies and voted to strip protections for people with preexisting conditions.

*TEXT: Mimi Walters  
\$70,000 from the health insurance industry  
Voted to strip protections for pre-existing conditions [FEC, accessed 10/10/18]*

## **WALTERS HAS TAKEN OVER \$70,000 FROM THE HEALTH INSURANCE COMPANIES**

**Walters Has Taken Over \$70,000 From Health Insurance Companies.** From 2013 through 2018, Walters received a total of \$81,500 from health insurance company PACs, such as Aetna, Blue Cross Blue Shield, Cigna, Caremark, Molina Healthcare, Humana, and UnitedHealth Group, as well as supplemental health insurer AFLAC. She also received an additional \$6,500 from industry association America’s Health Insurance Plans. [FEC, accessed 10/19/18]

## **WALTERS VOTED FOR THE AMERICAN HEALTH CARE ACT**

**Walters Voted For The American Health Care Act.** In May 2017, Walters 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 by a vote of 217-213. [CQ; H.R. 1628, Vote #256, [5/4/17](#)]

## **AHCA WOULD STRIP PROTECTIONS FOR PREEXISTING CONDITIONS**

**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](#)]

**AHCA “Would Drop Obamacare’s Rules Capping How Much Extra” People With Preexisting Conditions Could Be Charged.** In May 2017, PolitiFact reported: “The AHCA does keep the requirement that people with pre-existing conditions must be offered health insurance. But it would drop Obamacare’s rules capping how much extra those people can be charged.” [PolitiFact, [5/4/17](#)]

	<p><b>AHCA Could Allow People With Preexisting Conditions To Be Charged Possibly Tens Of Thousands OF Dollars More Per Year.</b> In May 2017, PolitiFact reported: “That means if the AHCA passes, it would allow for people with pre-existing conditions to be charged more per year for their insurance coverage – possibly to the tune of thousands or even tens of thousands of dollars more per year, some studies have found.” [PolitiFact, <a href="#">5/4/17</a>]</p>
<p>KID: Wait...but is that not so good for constituents?</p> <p>ANNCR: Be a good boy and shut your pie-hole Billy. Now make like Mimi, learn to work the system and you'll be made in the shade.</p> <p><i>TEXT: Mimi Walters Get elected. Work the system. Sold Out Orange County</i></p> <p><i>TEXT: Paid for by End Citizens United, endcitizensunited.org and not authorized by any candidate or candidate's committee. End Citizens United is responsible for the content of this advertising.</i></p>	