



**“REVEALED”**

Visual	Audio	Facts
<p><b>Congressman Taylor’s Campaign Staff Under Investigation “out-and-out fraud”</b>  <b>Richmond Times-Dispatch</b>  <b>“forgery”</b>  <b>The Virginian-Pilot</b></p>	<p><b>Voiceover Announcer:</b>  Congressman Taylor’s campaign -- under investigation for out-and-out-fraud.</p>	<p><b>Richmond Circuit Court Judge Found “Out And Out Fraud” By Scott Taylor’s Campaign.</b> In September of 2018, the Richmond Times-Dispatch reported: “In a ruling with potentially serious ramifications for the re-election campaign of Rep. Scott Taylor, R-2nd, a judge on Wednesday found ‘out-and-out fraud’ in signatures Taylor’s campaign staff gathered to help get an independent spoiler candidate on the ballot.” [<a href="#">Richmond Times-Dispatch, 9/5/2018</a>]</p> <p><b>Judge Found That Each Petition Circulated By Scott Taylor Campaign Staffers “Was Done So With The Intent To Defraud The Commonwealth And Its Election Officials.”</b> In September of 2018, WTKR News 3 reported: “Taylor’s staffers collected 600 signatures to help get Brown on the ballot, according to the written opinion. Rupe wrote that each petition circulated by the staffers ‘was done so with the intent to defraud the Commonwealth and its election officials.’ Separately from the lawsuit, a special prosecutor is investigating whether Taylor’s staff did anything illegal.” [<a href="#">WTKR News 3, 9/6/2018</a>]</p> <p><b>Special Prosecutor Investigating Scott Taylor’s Campaign Staff.</b> In September of 2018, WTKR News 3 reported: “Taylor’s staffers collected 600 signatures to help get Brown on the ballot, according to the written opinion. Rupe wrote that each petition circulated by the staffers ‘was done so with the intent to defraud the Commonwealth and its election officials.’ Separately from the lawsuit, a special prosecutor is investigating whether Taylor’s staff did anything illegal.” [<a href="#">WTKR News 3, 9/6/2018</a>]</p> <p><b>Scott Taylor Subpoenaed In Civil Lawsuit Over Petition Fraud.</b> On September 4, 2018, the Virginian-Pilot reported: “U.S. Rep. Scott Taylor has</p>



		<p>been subpoenaed to testify Wednesday in Richmond in a lawsuit that accuses members of his campaign staff of falsifying petition signatures to help an independent candidate get on the 2nd Congressional District ballot.”  <a href="#">[Virginian-Pilot, 9/4/2018]</a></p>
	Now, this shocking revelation.	
<p><b>Congressman Taylor Took Over \$750,000 in contributions from Special Interests</b>          Center for Responsive Politics</p>	Taylor took over seven hundred fifty thousand from special interests.	<p><b>Scott Taylor Has Received \$756,699 In Campaign Contributions From Business PACs.</b> According to campaign finance records compiled by the Center For Responsive Politics, Scott Taylor has received \$564,199 from business PACs in the 2018 election cycle and \$192,500 from business PACs in the 2016 election cycle. <a href="#">[OpenSecrets.org accessed 10/15/2018]</a></p>
<p><b>Congressman Taylor Allow Big Corporations to Spew More Toxic Pollution</b>  <a href="#">House Roll Call Vote 99, 3/7/18</a>; <a href="#">House Roll Call Vote 101, 3/8/18</a></p>	And sided with big corporations -- allowing them to spew more toxic pollution into our air.	<p><b>Scott Taylor Voted To Block Safeguards Against Air Pollution Including Mercury, Arsenic, And Chromium From Woodstoves And Boilers.</b> Representative Bill Johnson (R-OH) sponsored H.R. 1917, the Blocking Regulatory Interference from Closing Kilns (BRICK) Act of 2017, which would delay public health protections, in this case limits on deadly toxic pollution – including mercury, arsenic, and chromium – from brick manufacturing facilities. The BRICK Act was also modified in the Rules Committee to incorporate H.R. 453, the Relief from New Source Performance Standards Act of 2017. This bill (now section 3 of H.R. 1917) would delay stronger emission limits for new woodstoves and boilers, which reduce hazardous and toxic air pollutants – including particulate matter (soot), nitrogen oxides, volatile organic compounds (VOCs), and carcinogens like benzene and formaldehyde. On March 7, the House approved H.R. 1917 by a vote of 234-180. The pro-environment position was No. Scott Taylor voted Yes. <a href="#">[LCV Scorecard; House Vote #99, 3/7/2018]</a></p> <p><b>Scott Taylor Voted To Exempt Waste Coal Burning Power Plants From Air Pollution Safeguards.</b> Representative Keith Rothfus (R-PA) sponsored H.R.</p>

1119, the Satisfying Energy Needs and Saving the Environment (SENSE) Act, which would permanently exempt waste coal burning power plants from meeting certain clean air standards, including limits on hydrogen chloride and sulfur dioxide, both of which can cause significant respiratory problems. The courts have already ruled on this matter and found that waste coal-burning power plants are already meeting these air quality standards, and there is no evidence that allowing for higher levels of pollutants would do anything but expose our communities to dirtier air. On March 8, the House approved H.R. 1119 by a vote of 215-189. The pro-environment position was No. Scott Taylor voted Yes. [[LCV Scorecard](#); [House Vote #101, 3/8/2018](#)]

**Scott Taylor Voted To Block The EPA From Setting Limits On Methane Pollution.** Representative Markwayne Mullin (R-OK) offered an amendment to H.R. 3354, the Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2018, which would prevent the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) from implementing its standards to reduce methane pollution from new and modified sources in the oil and gas industry. The EPA’s methane standard requires low-cost, proven safeguards that are critical to reducing methane’s contributions to climate change, with estimated climate benefits of \$170 million by 2025, and also curbs toxic air pollutants that contribute to smog and jeopardize the health of nearby communities. On September 13, the House approved the Mullin amendment by a vote of 218-195. The pro-environment position was No. Scott Taylor voted Yes. [[House Vote #488, 09/13/2017](#)]

**Scott Taylor Voted For An Attack on Smog Protections & the Clean Air Act.** Representative Pete Olson (R-TX) sponsored H.R. 806, the Ozone Standards Implementation Act of 2017, which would delay the Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA) recently-updated standards for ozone pollution and eviscerate a central pillar of the Clean Air Act. This legislation would allow the EPA to consider factors unrelated to health, like technical feasibility, in the initial standard setting process. This bill would also delay the EPA’s ozone standards by at least ten years and double the current five-year review periods for updating all national air quality standards, allowing unhealthy air to persist



even longer. On July 18, the House approved H.R. 806 by a vote of 229-199. The pro-environment position was NO. Scott Taylor votes YES. [[LCV Scorecard](#), [House Vote #391, 7/18/2017](#)]

**Scott Taylor Voted To Eliminate Clean Water Act Safeguards Against Toxic Pesticides.** Rep. Gibbs (R-OH) introduced H.R. 953, the ‘Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act of 2017,’ which would eliminate Clean Water Act safeguards protecting communities from toxic pesticides and result in pesticides being discharged directly into water bodies without any meaningful oversight or public transparency. H.R. 953 is unnecessary to address the Zika virus or other mosquito-borne health threats and is simply a handout to pesticide manufacturers and other corporate interests. On May 24, the House passed H.R. 953. The pro-environment position was No. Scott Taylor voted Yes. [[LCV Scorecard](#); [House Vote #282, 05/24/2017](#)]

**Scott Taylor Voted To Repeal Clean Water Safeguards For Protecting The Drinking Water Sources Of 117 Million People.** Representative Jim Banks (R-IN) offered an amendment to the Agriculture and Nutrition Act of 2018, also known as the Farm Bill, which would repeal the clean water safeguards established by 2015 Clean Water Rule. This Rule protects the waters that feed the drinking water of over 117 million people as well as the streams, headwaters, wetlands and other water bodies that serve as habitat for wildlife, reduce flooding risk, and naturally filter pollution. The Banks amendment would subvert the entire rulemaking process by disregarding public input, ignore the Rule’s strong scientific foundation, and return Clean Water Act jurisdiction to an inconsistent and uncertain regulatory scheme. Eliminating the Clean Water Rule would disproportionately impact low-income communities and communities of color and would jeopardize the clean water families, communities, and economies depend on. On May 18, 2018, the House approved the Banks amendment by a vote of 238-173. The pro-environment position was NO. Scott Taylor voted YES. [[LCV Scorecard](#), [House Vote #203, 5/18/2018](#)]

**Scott Taylor Voted To Slash Funding For Environmental Protection And**



		<p><b>Undo Protections For Clean Air And Clean Water.</b> Representative Ken Calvert (R-CA) sponsored H.R. 3354, the Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2018, which would harm people’s health and the outdoors by slashing funding for many critical programs and by using radical policy riders to outright block environmental protections. This spending bill contained damaging cuts to programs that protect public health and fuel our outdoor economy, such as the more than \$500 million cut to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the 32 percent cut to the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Additionally, this legislation contained a slew of anti-environmental and other ideological policy riders, including a measure that would allow the EPA to bypass the law and hide its repeal of drinking water protections for 117 million people. On September 14, the House approved H.R. 3354 by a vote of 211-198. The pro-environment position was NO. Scott Taylor voted Yes. [<a href="#">LCV Scorecard</a>, <a href="#">House Vote #528, 9/14/2017</a>]</p>
<p><b>Congressman Taylor</b>  <b>“People with pre-existing conditions could be denied coverage”</b>  <a href="#">American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network, House Vote #256, 5/4/17</a>  <b>Asthma</b>  <b>Cancer</b></p>	<p>And Taylor sided with insurance companies, too -- voting to gut protections for people with pre-existing conditions, like asthma and cancer.</p>	<p><b>Scott Taylor Voted For The American Health Care Act That Which Would Result In 23 Million Fewer Americans With Health Insurance By 2026.</b> In May 2017, Scott Taylor voted for the American Health Care Act which would have significantly repealed portions of the Affordable Care Act by cutting Medicaid, cutting taxes on the rich, removing safeguard for pre-existing conditions and defunding Planned Parenthood. The overall legislation would have in part, also according to Congressional Quarterly, “ma[d]e 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 [have], in 2020, convert[ed] Medicaid into a capped entitlement that would provide[d] fixed federal payments to states and end[ed] 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. [...] It would [have] allow[ed] states to receive waivers to exempt insurers from having to provide certain minimum benefits.” The vote was on passage. The House passed the bill by a vote of 217 to 213. [House Vote 256, <a href="#">5/4/17</a>; Congressional Quarterly, <a href="#">5/4/17</a>; Kaiser Family Foundation, <a href="#">5/17</a>;</p>



Congressional Actions, [H.R. 1628](#)]

**Current Law Under The Affordable Care Act (Obamacare) Prevents Insurance Companies From Refusing To Cover Patients With Pre-Existing Conditions Such As Asthma, Diabetes, Or Cancer.** A website for the Department of Health and Human Services explains: "Under current law, health insurance companies can't refuse to cover you or charge you more just because you have a "pre-existing condition" — that is, a health problem you had before the date that new health coverage starts. These rules went into effect for plan years beginning on or after January 1, 2014." According to the HHS website, "Health insurers can no longer charge more or deny coverage to you or your child because of a pre-existing health condition like asthma, diabetes, or cancer. They cannot limit benefits for that condition either. Once you have insurance, they can't refuse to cover treatment for your pre-existing condition." [[HHS, About the ACA, Pre-Existing Conditions accessed 9/14/2018](#)]

**Leading Patient Organizations: "People With Pre-Existing Conditions Could Be Denied Coverage."** A May 1, 2017 joint press release by the American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network and 9 other patient advocacy organizations said, "Weakening protections in favor of high-risk pools would also undermine the ban on discrimination based on health status. The individuals and families we represent cannot go back to a time when people with pre-existing conditions could be denied coverage or forced to choose between purchasing basic necessities and affording their health care coverage. Given these factors, we oppose the latest draft of the AHCA. We urge Members of Congress to reject this legislation." [[American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network joint press release, 5/1/2017](#)]

**CBO: States That Opt Out Of Community Rating Protections Would Lead To Americans With Pre-Existing Conditions Being Priced Out Of The Insurance Market.** According to the CBO, "Community-rated premiums would rise over time, and people who are less healthy (including those with preexisting or newly acquired medical conditions) would ultimately be unable to purchase



		<p>comprehensive nongroup health insurance at premiums comparable to those under current law, if they could purchase it at all—despite the additional funding that would be available under H.R. 1628 to help reduce premiums. As a result, the nongroup markets in those states would become unstable for people with higher-than-average expected health care costs. That instability would cause some people who would have been insured in the nongroup market under current law to be uninsured.” [CBO via Vox, <a href="#">5/24/17</a>]</p>
<p><b>Congressman Taylor’s Not for Us</b></p>	<p>Congressman Taylor's not for us.</p>	
<p>LCV Victory Fund is responsible for the content of this advertising. Paid for by LCV Victory Fund, <a href="http://www.lcvvictoryfund.org">www.lcvvictoryfund.org</a>, and not authorized by any candidate or candidate’s committee.</p>	<p>LCV Victory Fund is responsible for the content of this advertising.</p>	