

“TIMELINE” AD FACTS

VIDEO	AUDIO	RESEARCH
<p>Open on portrait of Bill Nelson circa 1972. This picture will slowly morph with visuals of Nelson at various ages throughout the script into present day Nelson.</p> <p>ID Nelson and graphic: 1972 Begins 45-Year Political Career.</p>	<p>ANNOUNCER: “Bill Nelson begins political career.</p>	<p><u>Nelson Has Been Running For Public Office Since 1972</u></p> <p>Nelson First Ran For Public Office In 1972. “Nelson's public service career began in 1972, with his election to the Florida Legislature. He then served six terms in the U.S. Congress representing Orlando and the Space Coast, becoming an early champion of the environment. In 1994, Nelson was elected to the Florida Cabinet as state Treasurer, Insurance Commissioner and Fire Marshal. During his six years in the post, he showed he was a common-sense problem solver and strong consumer advocate. Nelson was first elected to the U.S. Senate in November 2000.” <small>(“Biography,” U.S. Senator Bill Nelson, Accessed 4/27/17)</small></p>
<p>Graphic: 1978</p> <p>Cut Social Security</p> <p>Raised Taxes</p>	<p>Went to Washington:</p> <p>Cut Social Security.</p> <p>Raised taxes on Floridians.</p>	<p><i>In 1983, Nelson Voted For The Social Security Amendments Of 1983, Which Increased Taxes And Raised The Age Of Eligibility</i></p> <p>On March 24, 1983, Bill Nelson Voted For The Conference Report To H.R. 1900, The Social Security Amendments Of 1983. (Conference Report To H.R. 1900, Roll Call Vote #47; Passed 243-102, 3/24/83, Nelson Voted Yea;</p>

The Social Security Amendments Of 1983 Taxed Social Security Benefits For Certain Taxpayers

The Social Security Amendments Of 1983 Included A Tax On Social Security Benefits For Taxpayers Whose Adjusted Gross Income Combined With Benefits Exceeded \$25,000 For A Single Taxpayer And \$32,000 For Married Taxpayers Filing Jointly.

“Beginning in 1984, includes up to one-half of Social Security benefits as taxable income for taxpayers whose adjusted gross income, combined with half their benefits and any tax-exempt interest they may have exceeds \$25,000 for a single taxpayer and \$32,000 for married taxpayers filing jointly. Benefits received by married taxpayers filing separately are taxable without regard to other income. Appropriate amounts equal to estimated tax liability to the Social Security trust funds.” (“Summary Of P.L. 98-21, (H.R. 1900) Social Security Amendments Of 1983,” Office Of Legislation & Congressional Affairs, [Social Security Administration](#), 11/26/84)

The Social Security Amendments Of 1983 Advanced Scheduled Increases In Social Security Tax Rates.

“Advances scheduled increases in Social Security tax rates. Social Security

tax rates (which include the Hospital Insurance tax rates) for employers and employees will increase to 7.0 percent in 1984, {1} 7.05 percent in 1985, 7.15 percent in 1986-87, 7.51 percent in 1988-89 and 7.65 percent in 1990 and thereafter.” (“Summary Of P.L. 98-21, (H.R. 1900) Social Security Amendments Of 1983,” Office Of Legislation & Congressional Affairs, [Social Security Administration](#), 11/26/84)

The Social Security Amendments Of 1983 Increased Tax Rates On Self-Employment Income Equal To The Combined Employee-Employer Rates.

“Increases tax rates on self-employment income equal to the combined employee-employer rates and provides credits against tax liability to offset part of the increase.” (“Summary Of P.L. 98-21, (H.R. 1900) Social Security Amendments Of 1983,” Office Of Legislation & Congressional Affairs, [Social Security Administration](#), 11/26/84)

- **NOTE: The Legislation Provided Tax Credits To Offset Part Of The Increase In Self-Employment Taxes.**

“Increases tax rates on self-employment income equal to the combined employee-employer rates and provides credits against tax liability to offset part of the increase.”

(“Summary Of P.L. 98-21, (H.R. 1900) Social Security Amendments Of 1983,” Office Of Legislation & Congressional Affairs, [Social Security Administration](#), 11/26/84)

The Social Security Amendments Of 1983 Raised The Age of Eligibility For Unreduced Retirement Benefits To 67 By 2027

The Social Security Amendments Of 1983 Raised The Age Of Eligibility For Unreduced Retirement Benefits To 67 By 2027.

“Raises the age of eligibility for unreduced retirement benefits in two stages to 67 by the year 2027. Workers born in 1938 will be the first group affected by the gradual increase. Benefits will still be available at age 62, but with greater reduction.” (“Summary Of P.L. 98-21, (H.R. 1900) Social Security Amendments Of 1983,” Office Of Legislation & Congressional Affairs, [Social Security Administration](#), 11/26/84)

- **NOTE: Benefits Were Still Available At Age 62, But With Greater Reductions.**
“Raises the age of eligibility for unreduced retirement benefits in two stages to 67 by the year 2027. Workers born in 1938 will be the first group affected by the gradual increase. Benefits will still be available at age 62, but with greater reduction.” (“Summary Of P.L. 98-21, (H.R. 1900) Social Security Amendments Of 1983,” Office Of Legislation & Congressional Affairs, [Social Security Administration](#), 11/26/84)

According To The AFL-CIO, “Clearly, Raising The Full Retirement Age Cuts [Social Security] Benefits And

Does So In Two Significant Ways.”

“Clearly, raising the full retirement age cuts benefits and does so in two significant ways. First, all workers, whether they delay retirement to the new full retirement age or continue to retire early, will get reduced lifetime benefits. Second, those who take early retirement will also receive lower monthly benefit amounts that provide a less adequate income throughout retirement. For example, under the current scheduled increase in the full retirement age, an individual who elects to begin receipt at age 62 will get a monthly benefit amount equal to 70 percent of the full retirement benefit, compared to 80 percent under the rules currently in effect. A further increase would cut this benefit even more. But this is not the whole story.”

(Prepared Statement From David A. Smith, Hearing On The Future Of Social Security For This Generation And Next: Implications Of Raising The Retirement Age, House Subcommittee On Social Security, [House Committee On Ways And Means](#), 2/26/98)

The Social Security Amendments Of 1983 Delayed A Cost-Of-Living Adjustment By Six Months

The Social Security Amendments Of 1983 Delayed A June 1983 Cost-Of-Living Adjustment Until December Of 1983.

“Delayed the June 1983 cost-of-living adjustment until December 1983

(January 3,1984 checks) and provides for future adjustments payable in January rather than July of each year.” (“Summary Of P.L. 98-21, (H.R. 1900) Social Security Amendments Of 1983,” Office Of Legislation & Congressional Affairs, [Social Security Administration](#), 11/26/84)

Some Of The Changes In The Social Security Amendments Of 1983 Have Been Characterized As Cuts To Social Security Benefits

According To The Brookings Institute, The Social Security Amendments Of 1983 “Marked The Last Time Congress Cut Social Security Benefits, Raised Taxes And Lived To Tell About It.” “It is almost 22 years to the month since Representative Barber Conable Jr. strode to the floor of the House to defend a carefully constructed plan to save Social Security. Mr. Conable, a moderate New York Republican with whom I then worked, spoke with characteristic understatement. ‘This is not a work of art,’ he told a packed chamber. ‘But it is artful work.’ He was right. The \$168 billion package eased the program through a turbulent period, and 1983 marks the last time Congress cut Social Security benefits, raised taxes and lived to tell about it. Before drawing too

		<p>much inspiration from this history, however, we should recognize that this rescue was anything but assured when Mr. Conable and the other members of the bipartisan National Commission on Social Security Reform began work under the leadership of Alan Greenspan in February 1982.” (Paul C. Light, Op-Ed, “The Crisis Last Time: Social Security Reform,” Brookings Institute, 3/5/05)</p>
<p>Graphic: 1990 Orlando Sentinel quote with newspaper masthead.</p>	<p>Politician Bill Nelson continues to run for partisan office “leaving few footprints behind.”</p>	<p>In 1990, Almost 20 Years After First Being Elected To A Public Office, The <i>Orlando Sentinel</i> Said: “Mr. Nelson Has Been Running For Something Or Other During Much Of His Life, But Leaving Few Footprints Behind.” “Mr. Nelson must have turned to negative campaigning because his own political record provides so little to talk about. Even his closest allies are unable to identify much that he has done during 12 years in Congress. In truth, Mr. Nelson has been running for something or other during much of his life, but leaving few footprints behind. That concerns us. He also has a distressing habit of promising a lot without saying how he would pay for it. Indeed, he doesn't even seem to have a clear idea of the costs.” (Editorial, “Lawton Chiles A Statesman,” <i>Orlando Sentinel</i>, 8/26/90)</p>

<p>Graphic: 2000</p> <p>Voted with Hillary Clinton 89% of the time</p> <p>Raised Taxes</p>	<p>Votes with Hillary Clinton</p> <p>89% of the time and raised taxes again.</p>	<p><u>Between 2001 And 2008, Nelson Voted With Hillary Clinton 89 Percent Of The Time In The U.S. Senate</u></p> <p>Between 2001 And 2008, Nelson Voted With Hillary Clinton 89 Percent Of The Time In The U.S. Senate. (CQ Vote Study, Accessed 8/28/17)</p> <p><i>Nelson Has Repeatedly Voted In Favor Of Higher Taxes</i></p> <p>Nelson Voted To Block An Amendment That Would Permanently Lower Certain Taxes.</p> <p>“DeMint, R-S.C., motion to waive Budget Act with respect to the Baucus, D-Mont., point of order against the DeMint substitute amendment no. 168 to the Reid, D-Nev., substitute amendment no. 98. The DeMint amendment would make permanent a number of tax reductions scheduled to expire in 2011, including the 15 percent rate on dividends and capital gains, so-called marriage penalty relief, and the \$1,000-per-child tax credit. It would repeal the alternative minimum tax, reduce the top business tax rate from 35 percent to 25 percent, and repeal the estate tax for estates under \$5 million. The substitute would provide \$901.7 billion for tax cuts and additional spending to stimulate the economy, including a provision to exempt additional</p>
--	--	---

taxpayers from the alternative minimum tax in 2009. It also would provide \$27 billion to extend and expand federal unemployment insurance through Dec. 31, 2009, \$87 billion to reimburse state Medicaid programs, \$27.1 billion for highway programs, \$19.5 billion for school construction and \$14.4 billion for renewable energy research and development.” (S. Amdt. 168 To S. Amdt. 98 To H.R. 1, [Roll Call Vote #38](#): Motion Rejected 36-61, 2/4/09, Nelson Voted Nay; CQ Summary, Accessed 1/15/16)

In July 2010, Nelson Voted Against A Permanent Repeal Of The Death Tax. “DeMint, R-S.C., motion to suspend Rule 22 to permit the consideration of a DeMint motion to commit the bill to the Finance Committee with instructions that it be reported back with language that would provide for a permanent repeal of the estate tax.”

(H.R. 4213, [Roll Call Vote #213](#): Motion Rejected 39-59, 7/21/10, Nelson Voted Nay; CQ Summary, Accessed 1/15/16)

In January 2013, Nelson Voted For The Fiscal Cliff Package That Taxed Estates Valued Over \$5 Million And Joint Estates Valued Over \$10 Million At 40 Percent.

“Passage of the 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

		<p>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 measure would delay the automatic, across-the-board cuts known as the "sequester" for two months. Half of the sequester delay would be offset by discretionary cuts, split between defense and non-defense, and the other half offset by revenue raised through the voluntary transfer of traditional IRAs to Roth IRAs, which would tax retirement savings when transferred. It also would tax individual estates valued over \$5 million and joint estates valued over \$10 million at 40 percent. It would extend the Milk Income Loss Contract (MILC) program at current rates, and it would permanently "patch" the alternative minimum tax to account for inflation. Unemployment insurance would be extended through 2013. The bill would block scheduled cuts to Medicare physician payment rates and extend for five years tax credits included in the 2009 stimulus law including the child tax credit and the earned income tax credit. It would permanently institute the Personal Exemption</p>
--	--	---

		<p>Phase-out tax, which would reduce the value of exemptions for individual income over \$250,000. It would allow the 2 percent payroll tax holiday to expire.” (H.R. 8, Roll Call Vote #251: Passed 89-8, 1/1/13, Nelson Voted Yea)</p>
<p>Graphic: 2000 Cuts to Medicare Providers Weakens Social Security Protections</p>	<p>Cuts to Medicare providers. Weakens Social Security protections.</p>	<p><i>Nelson Voted For The Bipartisan Budget Act Of 2013, Which Cut Payments To Medicare Providers</i></p> <p>Nelson Voted For The Bipartisan Budget Act Of 2013. “Reid, D-Nev., motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the joint resolution that would increase the discretionary spending caps for fiscal 2014 and 2015, establish a budget for fiscal 2014 and outline the fiscal 2015 budget process. The increased spending would be offset by increased passenger air travel fees, increased federal employee pension contributions, extending sequester cuts to Medicare for two years and other changes. It also would block a scheduled cut to Medicare reimbursements for physicians.” (H.J.Res. 59, Roll Call Vote #281: Motion Agreed To 64-36, 12/18/13, Nelson Voted Yea; CQ Summary, Accessed 4/14/17)</p> <p><u>The Bipartisan Budget Act Of 2013 Cut Medicare Payments To Providers</u></p> <p>The “Bulk” Of Deficit Savings From The Bipartisan Budget Act Of 2013 Come From</p>

Cuts To Medicare

Providers. “It’s hard to discern in the budget deal announced Tuesday night, but the bulk of its deficit savings come from fresh cuts to Medicare providers. Under the proposal announced by Rep. Paul Ryan (R-Wis.) and Sen. Patty Murray (D-Wash.), chairs of their chambers’ respective budget committees, lawmakers will replace about two-thirds of the hated automatic cuts under budget sequestration (totaling \$63 billion) for this year and next, and cut the deficit by about \$23 billion. That \$23 billion -- and then some -- is explained in a short line in the summary of the deal: ‘The budget proposal saves \$28 billion over ten years by requiring the President to sequester the same percentage of mandatory budgetary resources in 2022 and 2023 as will be sequestered in 2021 under current law,’ it says. ‘Mandatory budget resources’ refers mostly to Medicare providers.” (Michael McAuliff, “Budget Deal Whacks Medicare Providers,” [The Huffington Post](#), 12/10/13)

The Deal Extended The Cuts To Medicare Providers For An Additional Two Years.

“Under the Budget Control Act of 2011, which set up the sequester, so-called discretionary programs were subject to 5.1 percent across-the-board cuts when the Congress’ ‘supercommittee’ failed to find targeted savings. Most

‘mandatory’ programs, such as Social Security and Medicaid, were exempt. But Medicare was not, and was subject to a 2 percent cut aimed at providers, worth more than \$120 billion over the 10 years of the sequester. By extending the sequester for mandatory programs, Medicare providers -- including hospitals -- will have to take the hit for two more years.” (Michael McAuliff, “Budget Deal Whacks Medicare Providers,” [The Huffington Post](#), 12/10/13)

- **According To An Analysis By The U.S. Senate Budget Committee, The Bipartisan Budget Act Of 2013 Included Approximately \$22 Billion In Cuts To Medicare Providers By Extending The 2% Medicare Sequester.** “Sec. 101 also continues the sequestration of certain mandatory accounts required under the BCA for an additional two years (2022 and 2023) to reduce deficits by \$28 billion. Approximately \$22 billion of that amount comes from extending the 2% Medicare sequester. This is a cut to health care providers—in other words, not a true reform—and it sunsets in 2023. A large part of the Medicare savings accrues to the Hospital Insurance (HI) Trust Fund for Part A, so the

proposal uses trust fund savings to increase discretionary spending.” (“Section-By-Section Analysis of The Ryan-Murray Spending Agreement,” [United States Senate Budget Committee](#), Accessed 6/11/18)

- **The Bipartisan Budget Act Of 2013 Also Increases The 2 Percent Cap On Cuts To Medicare Providers To 2.9 Percent For The First Half Of FY 2023.** “While the Act provides limited relief from sequestration cuts for certain defense and non-defense spending for FYs 2014 and 2015, the Act does not extend relief to sequestration reductions impacting mandatory programs such as Medicare; the 2% reduction to Medicare provider and plan payments therefore will continue in 2014 unless additional Congressional action is taken. In fact, the Act achieves new savings by extending sequestration for mandatory programs – including Medicare – for another two years, through 2023. The Act also ‘realigns’ the Medicare sequestration amounts for FY 2023 to capture more of the sequestration savings during the first half of FY 2023, which falls in the legislation’s 10-year budget window. Specifically, the 2% cap on Medicare provider

payment cuts will be raised to 2.9% for the first 6 months of FY 2023, and then drop to 1.11% for the second half of FY 2023. This change ‘scores’ as \$2.1 billion in savings, although the provision is billed as not increasing the overall effect of the sequester on Medicare providers. Obviously, there is a hope that Congress will adopt an alternative deficit reduction framework well before the sequestration extension would be triggered.” (Debra A McCurdy And Paul W. Pitts, “President Signs 2-Year Funding Bill With Medicare SGR Patch, Sequestration Extension For Medicare Providers,” [ReedSmith](#), 12/30/13)

Nelson Voted For The Budget Control Act Of 2011, Which Set Up The Medicare Sequestration Cuts That Were Extended In The Bipartisan Budget Act Of 2013

In August 2011, Nelson Voted For The Budget Control Act, Which Featured Sequestration. “Reid, D-Nev., motion to concur in the House amendment to the bill that would provide a process to reduce the deficit by up to \$2.4 trillion. The measure would allow the president to raise the debt limit immediately by \$400 billion, with an additional \$500 billion subject to a resolution of disapproval. It would set discretionary spending caps that would

reduce the deficit by \$917 billion in fiscal 2012 through 2021 and establish a firewall between security and non-security spending for fiscal 2012 and 2013. It would establish a bipartisan, bicameral committee tasked with making recommendations to reduce the deficit by \$1.5 trillion. It would require across-the-board cuts to non-exempt discretionary and mandatory accounts by up to \$1.2 trillion over fiscal 2013 through 2021 if committee reductions totaling \$1.2 trillion were not enacted. The measure would require Congress to vote on a balanced-budget constitutional amendment by the end of 2011. It also would provide for an additional debt limit increase of \$1.2 trillion to \$1.5 trillion, subject to a resolution of disapproval.”
(S. 365, [Roll Call Vote #123](#); Motion Agreed To 74-26, 8/2/11, Nelson Voted Yea; CQ Summary, Accessed 1/15/16)

***Nelson Repeatedly
Voted Against
Legislation To
Protect The Social
Security Trust
Fund***

**Nelson Repeatedly
Voted Against
Legislation That Would
Create Protective
Measures For The
Social Security Trust
Fund**

**In 2006, Nelson Voted
Against An
Amendment To
Establish A Reserve
Fund To Bar Congress**

From Borrowing From The Social Security Trust Fund.

“Amendment no. 3087 that would create a reserve fund to adjust the budget and pay for the impact of any legislation that would bar Congress from borrowing from the Social Security trust fund to finance other government programs.” (s.

Amdt. 3087 To S. Con. Res. 83, [Roll Call Vote #68](#): Amendment Rejected 46-53, 3/16/06, Nelson Voted Nay, CQ Summary Accessed 9/27/16)

In 2007, Nelson Voted Against An Amendment To Establish A Reserve Fund To Allow For Legislation To Bar Congress From Borrowing From The Social Security Trust Fund.

“DeMint, R-S.C., amendment no. 489 that would establish a reserve fund to allow the Finance Committee to report legislation that would bar Congress from borrowing from the Social Security trust fund to finance other government programs.” (s.

Amdt. 489 To S. Con. Res. 21, [Roll Call Vote #89](#): Amendment Rejected 45-52, 3/22/07, Nelson Voted Nay, CQ Summary Accessed 9/27/16)

Senate Democrats, Including Chuck Schumer, Claimed Efforts To Protect The Social Security Trust Fund Were Efforts To Privatize Social Security—A Claim Rejected By The Legislation’s Sponsor

In 2006, Senate Democrats Pledged To Make Social Security A Campaign Issue After

They Opposed DeMint's Proposal To Protect The Social Security Trust Fund.

“Last week, during the Senate budget debate, Republicans raised the issue of Social Security reform, and Democrats — surprised that the issue won't go away — pledged to make it a major campaign issue this year. ‘The issue that won't die,’ said Sen. Charles E. Schumer after the Senate narrowly defeated a Social Security amendment to the budget bill. ‘It's going to be one of the big issues in 2006,’ pledged the New York Democrat, who is chairman of the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee. ‘They just gave us more fuel.’ Sen. Jim DeMint, South Carolina Republican, offered the proposal, which would have let Congress create a reserve fund protected under budget rules to save the Social Security surplus to pay for future benefits instead of other federal programs, as happens

NOW.” (“Social Security Reform Rejected,” [The Washington Times](#), 3/20/06)

- **Democrats Attempted To Frame The Measure For Political Purposes As A Step Towards Privatizing Social Security.** “The Senate defeated the proposal 53-46, with eight Republicans voting no, but Democrats still called it a step towards creating the Social

Security private accounts that President Bush wants. Mr. Schumer pledged to tell voters that electing a Democratic Senate is the only way to ‘make sure Social Security isn’t privatized.’ ‘Any time there’s an opportunity to privatize Social Security, they’ll take it,’ said Sen. Max Baucus, Montana Democrat. He said the DeMint proposal was ‘evidence today that they’re going to stick with it.’” (“Social Security Reform Rejected,” [The Washington Times](#), 3/20/06)

Supporters Of Protecting The Social Security Trust Fund Said The Measure Stated “Absolutely Nothing About Personal Accounts.”

“But supporters of the proposal said Democrats just want the status quo, under which Social Security will crumble. Mr. DeMint said his proposal stated ‘absolutely nothing about personal accounts,’ but was ‘about whether you believe Social Security should be saved or allowed to wither on the vine.’ ‘I’m saddened this amendment was characterized inaccurately as a privatization move,’ said Sen. Michael D. Crapo, Idaho Republican. ‘The American public and future generations of taxpayers will suffer if we cannot address the issues regarding Social Security and fiscal discipline.’” (“Social

		Security Reform Rejected," The Washington Times , 3/20/06)
Graphic: TERM LIMIT Career Politician Bill Nelson	After 45 years, it's time to term limit Bill Nelson.	<p><u>Nelson Has Been Running For Public Office For 46 Years</u></p> <p>Nelson First Ran For Public Office In 1972. "Nelson's public service career began in 1972, with his election to the Florida Legislature. He then served six terms in the U.S. Congress representing Orlando and the Space Coast, becoming an early champion of the environment. In 1994, Nelson was elected to the Florida Cabinet as state Treasurer, Insurance Commissioner and Fire Marshal. During his six years in the post, he showed he was a common-sense problem solver and strong consumer advocate. Nelson was first elected to the U.S. Senate in November 2000." ("Biography," U.S. Senator Bill Nelson, Accessed 4/27/17)</p>
DISCLAIMER: PAID FOR BY NEW REPUBLICAN PAC. NOT AUTHORIZED BY ANY CANDIDATE OR CANDIDATE'S COMMITTEE. WWW.NEWREPUBLICANPAC.ORG	ANNOUNCER: New Republican PAC is responsible for the content of this advertising.	