

“Monthly Bills” – TV/OTT :30 – for Husted OHIO (09/08/25)

AUDIO	VISUAL	RESEARCH
<p>“They promised to bring <u>down</u> prices,</p> <p>But instead, our Senator, Jon Husted, just voted to make our monthly bills <u>go up</u>.”</p>	<p>SENATOR HUSTED</p> <p>PROMISED TO BRING <u>DOWN</u> PRICES</p> <p>SENATOR HUSTED</p> <p>VOTED TO MAKE OUR BILLS GO UP</p>	<p>Republicans promised to bring down prices.</p> <p>“Americans crave pre-Covid prices. Former President Donald Trump is promising to make them a reality. ‘Prices will come down,’ Trump told voters during a speech last week laying out his vision for a return to the White House. ‘You just watch: They’ll come down, and they’ll come down fast, not only with insurance, with everything.’” (CNN.com, 08/20/24)</p> <p>“CHAPTER ONE: DEFEAT INFLATION AND QUICKLY BRING DOWN ALL PRICES - Our Commitment: The Republican Party will reverse the worst Inflation crisis in four decades that has crushed the middle class, devastated family budgets, and pushed the dream of homeownership out of reach for millions. We will defeat Inflation, tackle the cost-of-living crisis, improve fiscal sanity, restore price stability, and quickly bring down prices.” (Republican Party Platform 2024 “Make America Great Again!” The American Presidency Project, 07/08/24)</p> <p>“President-elect Donald Trump has promised to bring down prices on groceries, rent and other basic necessities of life.” (Louisiana Illuminator, 11/27/24)</p> <p>Husted voted for H.R. 1.</p> <p>(119th Congress, H.R. 1, Senate Vote #372, 07/01/25; Husted “Yea”)</p> <p>Husted voted to slash food assistance programs which “provides extra cash for groceries to 42 million low-income Americans and is a lifeline for many to purchase nutritious foods, which tend to be more expensive.” Husted’s vote cut “\$267 billion from food assistance.”</p> <p>“Although the ‘beautiful bill’ left the most controversial cuts on the table, it would still make major changes to federal health and food assistance programs called Medicaid and the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (Snap), known colloquially as ‘food stamps.’ Medicaid is a public health insurance program for the low-income, disabled and elderly that insures roughly 71 million Americans. In just one example of its impact, the program pays for nearly half of all births in the US. Snap or “food stamps” provides extra cash for groceries to 42 million low-income Americans, and is a lifeline for many to purchase nutritious foods, which tend to be more expensive. On Tuesday, the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office (CBO) released its latest ‘score’ of the bill, finding that it would cut \$698bn from Medicaid and \$267bn from food assistance.” (<i>The Guardian</i>, 05/23/25)</p> <p>Husted’s vote “cut food benefits by an average of \$100 per month for about 600,000 low-income households” and “cut food assistance benefits for all 40 million participants.”</p>

“The Senate proposal, like the House bill, would cut food benefits by an average of \$100 per month for about 600,000 low-income households by eliminating an administrative simplification for calculating utility expenses for many households. We estimate that more than 500,000 children live in these households. [...] Over time, the bill would also, like the House bill, cut food assistance benefits for all 40 million participants, including 1 in 5 children in the U.S., and make SNAP benefits increasingly inadequate to afford a healthy diet by restricting future updates to the Thrifty Food Plan, the basis for SNAP benefits.” (Center for Budget and Policy Priorities, [06/30/25](#))

Husted’s vote to adjust the age range for food assistance eligibility will force some to face higher costs in the form of “food and groceries.”

“Imagine a 55-year-old couple. On top of helping care for their grandchildren and their aging parents, Michael and Lisa have been working part-time seasonal jobs to earn a combined annual income of \$25,000 (118 percent of the federal poverty level, or FPL) over the course of the year. Because their state expanded Medicaid under the Affordable Care Act, the couple has health insurance through Medicaid, which covers the costs of Lisa’s ongoing breast cancer treatment and Michael’s prescriptions. The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) helps them put food on the table. The legislation would increase the couple’s costs by \$19,224. The couple would not see a change in taxes under the bill but would face higher costs in the form of [...] \$2,844 more for food and groceries. The House Agriculture Committee text calls for a \$290 billion reduction for SNAP, a program that helps 42 million families afford food. The proposal would raise the top of the age range for recipients subject to work reporting requirements from age 54 to 64. This policy would impose a three-month time limit on benefits in a three-year period for not complying with these requirements, which could take away \$2,844 the couple receives in annual SNAP benefits if they are unable to consistently prove they work enough hours.” (Center for American Progress, [05/14/25](#))

Husted’s vote for the Republican reconciliation bill will take away incentives for energy-saving improvements and “would raise monthly bills for families and businesses” according to the American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy.

“Another industry that is fuming is energy efficiency. The bill would eliminate several tax credits, including one that helps homeowners make upgrades such as adding insulation or more efficient heating and cooling systems. It also would cut back on credits for builders to construct efficient homes and apartments. ‘Taking away incentives for energy-saving improvements would raise monthly bills for families and businesses. It will only exacerbate the growing strain on the electric grid,’ said Steven Nadel, executive director for the American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy.” (*E&E News*, [07/02/25](#))

		<p>Husted’s vote for the Republican reconciliation bill “will lead to increased energy bills” and have other devastating impacts.</p> <p>“The American Clean Power Association (ACP) issued the following statement from CEO Jason Grumet after the Senate passed, in a 51-50 vote, the reconciliation bill: ‘The Senate reconciliation package is a step backward for American energy policy. The intentional effort to undermine the fastest-growing sources of electric power will lead to increased energy bills, decreased grid reliability, and the loss of hundreds of thousands of jobs. Most discouraging is forfeiting the progress we’ve made in manufacturing batteries, wind turbines and solar panels, and the economic growth occurring in communities across the country.’” (American Clean Power Association, 07/01/25)</p>
<p>Husted’s plan takes Medicaid away from millions of Americans, which means they’ll pay thousands out-of-pocket for care.</p>	<p>HUSTED’S PLAN: PAY MORE FOR HEALTH CARE</p>	<p>Husted voted to cut \$1 trillion from health programs and an estimated 11.8 million Americans losing their health insurance.</p> <p>“The final bill, passed by the House on Thursday, delivered a \$1 trillion-plus cut to health care programs and could lead to an estimated 11.8 million people losing their insurance.” (<i>Politico</i>, 07/06/25)</p> <p>Husted’s vote will make “11.8 million more Americans would become uninsured by 2034” including \$1 trillion in cuts “coming from Medicaid alone” according to the bipartisan Congressional Budget Office.</p> <p>“Republicans’ marquee domestic policy bill that is making its way through the Senate would result in deeper cuts and more Americans losing health insurance coverage than the original measure that passed the House last month, according to new estimates from the Congressional Budget Office. According to a report published late Saturday night, the legislation would mean 11.8 million more Americans would become uninsured by 2034. Federal spending on Medicaid, Medicare and Obamacare would be reduced by more than \$1.1 trillion over that period — with more than \$1 trillion of those cuts coming from Medicaid alone. The fresh estimates make official what many analysts had already predicted and some Republican lawmakers had feared.” (<i>The New York Times</i>, 06/29/25)</p> <p>Husted voted to make adults who lose Medicaid coverage “spend an average of about \$2,220 more in annual out-of-pocket costs” and a couple making 104% of federal poverty level who lost Medicaid “could face \$4,440 more in out-of-pocket costs, constituting about 20 percent of their income.”</p> <p>“Losing coverage does not make an illness disappear. Extrapolating from a 2017 Commonwealth Fund study by Sherry Glied, Ougni Chakraborty, and Therese Russo on changes in out-of-pocket costs for people gaining coverage as a result of Medicaid expansion, CAP estimates that adults who lose Medicaid coverage would spend an average of about</p>

		<p>\$2,220 more in annual out-of-pocket costs. This cost burden could force low-income families to delay care or take on crippling debt. For example, a couple with an annual income of \$22,000—or 104 percent of the FPL—who lost Medicaid could face \$4,440 more in out-of-pocket costs, constituting about 20 percent of their income.” (Center for American Progress, 06/12/25)</p> <p>Husted’s vote to cut spending on Medicaid and the Affordable Care Act impacts millions of people, “will result in coverage losses,” and will “raise costs for millions of others to keep their health coverage.”</p> <p>“The legislation passed by the House of Representatives last week includes at least \$800 billion in cuts to Medicaid and the Affordable Care Act (ACA) marketplaces over ten years, and likely more once official estimates of changes that were made before final House passage are complete. The bill also fails to extend enhanced premium tax credits that are helping more than 22 million people buy insurance on the marketplace and are set to expire at the end of 2025 (just like the tax cuts the House Republicans have chosen to extend). In their quest to cut hundreds of billions of dollars from health care, the House Republicans’ bill will take away federally supported coverage programs from millions of people. Along with the cuts that will result in coverage losses, the bill would raise costs for millions of others who manage to keep their health coverage.” (Center for Budget and Policy Priorities, 05/29/25)</p> <p>Husted’s vote will “slash Medicaid, Medicare and SNAP” and will “strip health coverage from millions, increase out-of-pocket costs, deepen poverty and food insecurity, and destabilize the entire health care system.”</p> <p>“Senate Republicans passed a devastating budget bill that would slash Medicaid, Medicare, and SNAP (food assistance) and strip coverage from 17 million Americans to pay for tax cuts that disproportionately benefit high income earners. [...] The bill would strip health coverage from millions, increase out-of-pocket costs, deepen poverty and food insecurity, and destabilize the entire health care system. Its rollbacks represent the biggest cuts to health care and food assistance in history, wiping out recent gains in coverage and outcomes. Older adults, people with disabilities, children, and families with low incomes would be among those most at risk and hardest hit.” (Medicare Rights Center, 07/03/25)</p>
<p>And it removes clean energy from the electric grid,</p> <p>creating a massive rate hike on electricity.</p>	<p>HUSTED’S PLAN:</p> <p>ELECTRICITY RATE HIKE</p>	<p>Husted’s vote for the Republican reconciliation bill “jeopardizes hundreds of projects slated to boost the nation’s electric grid,” “will make it harder to get renewable energy to the electric grid,” and “threaten reliability of the electric grid.”</p> <p>“The measure jeopardizes hundreds of renewable energy projects slated to boost the nation’s electric grid, they said. ‘Despite limited improvements, this legislation undermines the very foundation of America’s manufacturing comeback and global energy leadership,’ said Abigail Ross Hopper, president and CEO of the Solar Energy Industries Association. [...] While</p>

		<p>Democrats complained that the bill would make it harder to get renewable energy to the electric grid, Republicans said the measure represents historic savings for taxpayers and supports production of traditional energy sources such as oil, natural gas and coal, as well as nuclear power, increasing reliability. [...] ‘By eliminating a number of clean energy incentives and slashing others, this bill represents a significant step backward for America’s energy future,’ said Nathaniel Keohane, president of the Center for Climate and Energy Solutions, a nonprofit that seeks to accelerate the global transition to net-zero greenhouse gas emissions. ‘Curtailling incentives for electricity generated from wind and solar power is particularly shortsighted’ and will raise energy prices for households and businesses and threaten reliability of the electric grid, Keohane said.” (Associated Press, 07/01/25)</p> <p>Husted’s vote for the Republican reconciliation bill will remove clean energy incentives and “will only exacerbate the growing strain on the electric grid.”</p> <p>“Another industry that is fuming is energy efficiency. The bill would eliminate several tax credits, including one that helps homeowners make upgrades such as adding insulation or more efficient heating and cooling systems. It also would cut back on credits for builders to construct efficient homes and apartments. ‘Taking away incentives for energy-saving improvements would raise monthly bills for families and businesses. It will only exacerbate the growing strain on the electric grid,’ said Steven Nadel, executive director for the American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy.” (E&E News, 07/02/25)</p> <p>Husted’s vote for the Republican reconciliation bill “will lead to increased energy bills, decreased grid reliability, and the loss of hundreds of thousands of jobs.”</p> <p>“The American Clean Power Association (ACP) issued the following statement from CEO Jason Grumet after the Senate passed, in a 51-50 vote, the reconciliation bill: ‘The Senate reconciliation package is a step backward for American energy policy. The intentional effort to undermine the fastest-growing sources of electric power will lead to increased energy bills, decreased grid reliability, and the loss of hundreds of thousands of jobs. Most discouraging is forfeiting the progress we’ve made in manufacturing batteries, wind turbines and solar panels, and the economic growth occurring in communities across the country.’” (American Clean Power Association, 07/01/25)</p>
<p><i>And it’s all just to cut taxes - yet again - for the super-rich.</i></p> <p>Everything costs too much already ... and Senator Husted just voted to make it even worse.</p>	<p>TAX CUT FOR THE SUPER RICH</p> <p>CALL SENATOR HUSTED</p> <p>202-224-3353</p> <p>EVERYTHING COSTS TOO MUCH</p>	<p>Husted’s vote was “a major boom for wealthy Americans” and “to offset the expense of tax cuts, Republicans are pairing the tax deductions with cuts to key government assistance programs, which Republicans say will save the federal government \$1tn.”</p> <p>The bill was a major boon for wealthy Americans, who saw big savings after the tax cuts. The bill established a 20% deduction for income through certain business entities, known as pass-through entities, including LLCs and partnerships. It also doubled the estate and gift tax exemption from \$5.5m to \$11.2m per person, largely an aid to wealthy families. Because the</p>

	<p>HUSTED IS MAKING IT WORSE</p> <p>PAID FOR BY THE OEC ACTION FUND</p>	<p>bill cut taxes for even the wealthiest Americans in the highest part of the top income bracket, this has meant that Americans in the top 0.1% percentile of earners are saving much more than lower- or even middle-class Americans. [...] To offset the expense of tax cuts, Republicans are pairing the tax reductions with cuts to key government assistance programs, which Republicans say will save the federal government \$1tn. Stricter work requirements for Medicaid and the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (Snap) program will see fewer people accessing government healthcare coverage and food assistance.” (<i>The Guardian</i>, Analysis – Lauren Aratani, 05/24/25)</p> <p>Husted’s vote for H.R.1 was one that “helps the rich and cuts aid to the poor.” “To give rich Americans a \$4.5 trillion tax cut, Trump will cut health care for the poor.”</p> <p>“To give rich Americans a \$4.5 trillion tax cut, Trump will cut health care for the poor [...] The looming con, as always with Trump, is in the numbers. He and his Republican enablers in Congress can only sop his billionaire pals by one of two means: ballooning the deficit and/or punishing the poor and vulnerable with draconian cuts to Medicaid. The New York Times, in an uncharacteristic burst of candor, summarized the budget plan the GOP-led House passed last week as one that ‘helps the rich and cuts aid to the poor,’ noting that Republicans, who had been voted into office promising to help working-class voters, were now ‘teeing up cuts to programs that provide health care and food to the poor’” The plan ‘instructs the Energy and Commerce Committee, which oversees Medicaid and Medicare, to come up with at least \$880 billion in cuts.’” (WBUR, Commentary – Steve Almond, 03/03/25)</p> <p>Husted’s vote for H.R.1 will give “big tax breaks to the wealthiest Americans” while “slashing benefits — especially Medicaid.”</p> <p>“The TCJA, like the current legislation, gave big tax breaks to the wealthiest Americans. But it also threw a few crumbs to people further down the scale. By contrast, the House Reconciliation Bill, by slashing benefits — especially Medicaid — will cause immense, almost inconceivable hardship to the bottom 40 percent of Americans, especially the poorest fifth.” (Paul Krugman Substack, 05/19/25)</p> <p>Husted’s vote for H.R. 1 included cuts “to pay for tax breaks that overwhelmingly benefit the ultra-rich.”</p> <p>“H.R. 1, the so-called ‘One Big Beautiful Bill Act’ — in fact, an ugly bill — kicks 16 million people off their health insurance, makes the largest cuts to nutrition assistance in history, and makes higher education less affordable. Why? To pay for tax breaks that overwhelmingly benefit the ultra-rich. Non-partisan analysis from the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) and Joint Committee on Taxation (JCT) shows that the bill worsens inequality, gives the ultra-rich a historic tax break, and makes working people worse off. Adding insult to injury, when including the cost of debt service, CBO finds that this bill adds \$3 trillion to the national debt.”</p>
--	---	---

(U.S. House of Representatives Committee on the Budget, "Trump's Big Bill for Billionaires Steals from the Poor to Give to the Ultra-Rich," [06/12/25](#))

Husted's vote for H.R.1 will "lead to increased assets for the richest Americans, while reducing them for the lowest-income households" according to "a new preliminary analysis from the Congressional Budget Office."

"Tax cuts in House Republicans' megabill would lead to increased assets for the richest Americans, while reducing them for the lowest-income households through cuts to federal spending on Medicaid and food aid, according to a new preliminary analysis from the Congressional Budget Office. The analysis, requested by top Democrats, gives fuel to Democrats' attacks on the bill that it would lead to gains for wealthy Americans while taking away benefits for lower-income people." (Politico, [05/21/25](#))

Husted's vote for H.R.1 "doubles down on" a plan "skewed in favor of the richest people in the country."

"The tax provisions of the House Republican reconciliation bill double down on the failures of the 2017 tax law, which was skewed in favor of the richest people in the country, further eroded the nation's revenue base, and didn't produce the promised economic gains for working people. Instead of changing course and prioritizing people with low and moderate incomes as House Republicans' rhetoric about supporting hard-pressed working families would suggest, the House Republican tax bill only offers more of the same. The bill is heavily skewed to the wealthy: Under the bill, the top 1 percent of people would receive tax cuts three times the size of those for people with incomes in the bottom 60 percent, measured as a share of after-tax income. The top 0.6 percent of people — the 1.2 million people with annual incomes above \$1 million — would receive more *total* tax cuts than the 127 million people with incomes below \$100,000." (Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, [05/22/25](#))