

May 9, 2012

MONTANANS FOR TESTER

FACT CHECK: REHBERG ATTACK AD “Honest”

**FABRICATED HEADLINES, FABRICATED FACTS:**

*The false claims Dennis Rehberg makes in his first ad of the campaign are as fictional as the fabricated headlines splashed across the screen.*

AD CLAIMS	FACTS
<p>Jon Tester: You’ve got to have honest leadership.</p>	<p><b>FACT: JON TESTER OFFERS MONTANANS “HONEST LEADERSHIP”</b></p> <p><b>HEADLINE – Montana Judge Lauds Tester In Ethics Report.</b> [<a href="#">AP, 4/27/12</a>]</p> <p><b>Montana Judge Gave Tester “High Marks” In Office Ethics Review.</b> In April 2012, the AP reported: “A former Montana supreme court justice is giving U.S. Sen. Jon Tester high marks in a new ethics review. Tester promised during his 2006 election to have Montana judges conduct periodic ethics reviews of his office. Former justice William Leaphart says in a report from earlier this month that he inspected Tester's personal records, potential conflicts of interest, gifts, foreign travel and other activities.” [<a href="#">AP, 4/27/12</a>]</p> <p><b>Montana Judge Found Tester’s Office “To Be Transparent With Its Record Keeping And In Compliance With Ethical Standards.”</b> In April 2012, the <a href="#">AP</a> reported: “The judge concludes that he found the office to be transparent with its record keeping and in compliance with ethical standards. [<a href="#">AP, 4/27/12</a>]</p> <p><b>HEADLINE – Tester Gets High Praise In Ethics Review.”</b> [<a href="#">Missoula Independent, 4/26/12</a>]</p> <p><b>Montana Judge: Tester Was “Unique” In His Level Of Transparency And Ethics.</b> In April 2012, <a href="#">Missoula Independent</a> reported: “The latest review, made available online today, called Tester ‘unique’ in his level of transparency and ethical practice based on in-depth analysis of earmarks, campaign finance reports and political activity.” [<a href="#">Missoula Independent, 4/26/12</a>]</p> <p><b>EDITORIAL – Montana’s Advocate for Accountability.</b> [The <a href="#">Missoulian</a>, Editorial, <a href="#">1/18/2009</a>]</p>

PAID FOR BY MONTANANS FOR TESTER

**Tester’s “Down-to-Earth, Matter-of-Fact Style Hasn’t Changed a Bit Since He Left Big Sandy for Washington.”** In September 2010, the Montana Standard editorial board wrote: “One thing The Standard’s editorial board has always appreciated about U.S. Sen. Jon Tester is his down-to-earth, matter-of-fact style, and that hasn’t changed a bit since he left Big Sandy for Washington. He never comes in with a preset agenda to lecture at length about. Rather, he stops by for a visit, opens himself up to whatever questions we’d care to ask, and keeps his answers short and sweet to make sure there’s time to cover all the topics. We like the access and the openness.” [Montana Standard, Editorial, [9/2/2010](#)]

**Helena Independent Record Praised Tester as “Honest, Forthright and Jovial Elected Official Who’s About as Open as the Expansive Montana Prairie.”** In September 2010, the Helena Independent Record editorial board wrote: “Sometimes, though, it’s what a person isn’t that makes him what he is. And in an hourlong editorial board visit with Senator Tester Tuesday, it’s refreshing to see an honest, forthright and jovial elected official who’s as open as the expansive Montana prairie. It’s not the first time a delegation member has visited our editorial board, of course, and not the first time Tester has weighed in here on topics from appropriations, to the northern border, to the economy, to war, to life back on the farm.” [Helena Independent Record, Editorial, [9/1/2010](#)]

**EDITORIAL: Tester’s Overall Performance “Has Been Downright Impressive.”** In January 2009, the Missoulian editorial board wrote: “If his past performance is any indication, Tester will be a fine addition to the Appropriations Committee. However, even as we congratulate Tester and wish him well in his new duties, we have to note that he hasn’t exactly spent the past two years sitting on his hands. In fact, while we might quibble with a few of his decisions, his overall performance on the Veteran’s Affairs, Indian Affairs and Banking committees has been downright impressive.” [The Missoulian, Editorial, [1/18/2009](#)]

Voice Over: But Jon Tester’s dishonest attacks hide his votes.

**FABRICATED HEADLINE: Dishonest Attacks**

Voice Over: For higher taxes, 55 times.

**FACT: TESTER HELPED PASS INTO LAW \$1.4 TRILLION IN TAX CUTS FOR MIDDLE CLASS MONTANANS AND SMALL BUISNESSES**

**February 2012 – Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012: \$93.2 Billion.** [P.L.112-96; Senate Roll Call [Vote #22](#), 2/17/2012; JCX-17-12, [2/16/12](#)]

**December 2011 – Temporary Payroll Tax Cut Continuation Act of 2011: \$20.8 Billion.** [P.L.112-78; Senate UC, 12/23/2011; [JCX-57-11](#), 12/23/11]

**November 2011 – Repeal of 3 Percent Withholding Tax on Contractors: \$11.19 Billion.** [P.L. 112-56; Senate Roll Call [Vote #204](#), 11/10/2011; CBO, 10/25/11, [Page 4](#)]

**FABRICATED**

**HEADLINE: Tester In Favor of Higher Taxes**

Source: Vote #83, 03/21/07, #102, 03/23/07, #43 03/13/08, #43, 02/04/09

- **Tester's Veterans Jobs Bill Provided \$95 Million in Tax Cuts to Small Businesses Hiring Veterans.** In November 2011, the Congressional Budget Office projected that Tester's VOW To Hire Heroes Act would result in businesses paying \$95 million less in taxes from 2012 to 2016. [Congressional Budget Office Analysis, [11/9/11](#)]

**October 2011 – Trade Adjustment Assistance Extension Act of 2011: \$1.78 Billion.** [P.L.112-40; Senate Roll Call [Vote #150](#), 9/22/2011; CBO, 10/6/11, [Page 4](#)]

**April 2011- Comprehensive 1099 Taxpayer Protection and Repayment of Exchange Subsidy Overpayments Act of 2011: \$21.9 Billion.** [P.L. 112-9; Senate Roll Call [Vote #49](#), 4/5/2011; [JCX-8-11](#) Page 1; Bloomberg, [4/14/11](#)]

**December 2010 – Tax Relief, Unemployment Insurance Reauthorization And Job Creation Act Of 2010: More than \$714 Billion.** [Senate Roll Call [Vote #276](#); P.L. 111-312; [JCX-20-11](#)]

**September 2010 – Small Business Jobs Act: \$11.968 Billion.** [Senate Roll Call [Vote #237](#), P.L. 111-240; [JCX-48-10](#); SBA, [Small Business Jobs Act](#)]

**July 2010 – Homebuyer Assistance And Improvement Act: \$140 Million.** [P.L. 111-198; [JCX-34-10](#); National Association Of Realtors, Press Release, [7/1/10](#)]

**March 2010 – Hiring Incentives To Restore Employment Act: \$17.634 Billion.** [P.L. 111-147; [JCX-6-10](#); Treasury Department, [12/8/10](#)]

**January 2010 – Charitable Donations For Haiti Earthquake Relief: \$2 Million.** [Senate Passed by Unanimous Consent, 1/21/2010; CBO, [1/28/10](#)]

**November 2009 – Worker, Homeownership, And Business Assistance Act: \$21.473 Billion.** [Senate Roll Call [Vote #334](#), P.L. 111-92; [JCX-45-09](#); CBO, [11/25/09](#)]

**February 2009 – American Recovery And Reinvestment Act: \$312.097 Billion.** [P.L. 111-5; [JCX-19-09](#); Recovery.gov, [2/4/11](#); Internal Revenue Service, ARRA [Information Center](#)]

**May 2008 – Heroes Earnings Assistance And Relief Tax Act: \$1.326 Billion.** [PL 110-245; CBO, [5/29/08](#)]

	<p><b>February 2008 – Economic Stimulus Act: <u>\$82.5 Billion.</u></b> [P.L. 110-185; CBO, <a href="#">2/11/08</a>]</p> <p><b>December 2007 – Mortgage Forgiveness Debt Relief Act: <u>\$1.292 Billion.</u></b> [Passed Senate by Unanimous Consent, 12/14/2007; P.L. 110-142; CBO, <a href="#">1/25/08</a>]</p> <p><b>May 2007 – Small Business And Work Opportunity Tax Act: <u>\$4.84 Billion.</u></b> [Senate Roll Call <a href="#">Vote #126</a>, P.L. 110-28; Senate Finance Committee, 5/24/07]</p>
<p>Voice Over: To raise his own pay.</p> <p><b><u>FABRICATED</u></b> <b><u>HEADLINE: Tester Votes To Raise Own Pay</u></b></p> <p><i>Source: Vote #38 03/31/12, Montana State Senate 01/15/01 &amp; 04/10/01</i></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>FACT: TESTER REPEATEDLY BLOCKED PAY RAISES FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS</b></p> <p><b>Tester Voted to Block Annual Pay Raise for Members of Congress.</b> In January 2007, Tester voted to pass the Honest Leadership and Open Government Act of 2007. According to the Congressional Research Service, “The bill contained a provision (Section 116) that would deny an annual pay adjustment to Members of Congress who vote for an amendment to prohibit an annual adjustment for Members, or who voted against the tabling of an amendment to prohibit the increase. This language was not included in the House amendment or in the final version of the bill, which became P.L. 110-81.” [S.1, Senate Roll Call Vote #19, 1/18/07; Congressional Research Service, <i>Salaries for Members of Congress: Congressional Votes</i>]</p> <p><b>Tester Voted to Block Annual Pay Raise for Members of Congress.</b> In March 2009, Tester voted to block a scheduled pay raise for Members of Congress. A provision denying the automatic pay raise was included in the Omnibus Appropriations Act of 2009. According to the Congressional Research Service, “Under the formula established in the Ethics Reform Act, Members were scheduled to receive a pay adjustment in January 2010 of 2.1%.<sup>8</sup> This adjustment was denied by Congress through a provision included in the FY2009 Omnibus Appropriations Act (H.R. 1105).<sup>9</sup> Section 103 of Division J of the act states, “Notwithstanding any provision of section 601(a)(2) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 31(2)), the percentage adjustment scheduled to take effect under any such provision in calendar year 2010 shall not take effect.” On March 10, 2009, the bill passed the Senate without amendment by voice vote. [H.R.1105, Senate Voice Vote 3/10/09; Congressional Research Service, <i>Salaries for Members of Congress: Congressional Votes</i>]</p> <p><b>Tester Supported Efforts to Block Annual Pay Raise for Members of Congress.</b> In April 2010, Tester supported efforts to block the scheduled annual pay raise for Members of Congress. The bill containing a provision to prohibit the pay raise was agreed to in the Senate by unanimous consent. According to the Congressional Research Service, “The 2011 pay adjustment was prohibited by the enactment of H.R. 5146 (P.L. 111-165) on May 14, 2010. H.R.</p>

5146 was introduced in the House on April 27 and was agreed to the same day. (Roll no. 226). It was agreed to in the Senate the following day by unanimous consent. Pay for Members of Congress in 2011 will remain at the 2009 and 2010 level of \$174,000. Additional legislation was also introduced to prevent the scheduled 2011 pay adjustment.” [HR 5146; Congressional Research Service, *Salaries of Members of Congress: Recent Actions and Historical Tables*]

**FACT: TESTER PUSHED FOR REPEAL OF AUTOMATIC PAY RAISES FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS**

**Tester Wrote *No Pay Raise for Congress Act of 2012* to Block Congressional Pay Raise for FY 2013.** Tester introduced the No Pay Raise for Congress Act of 2012 to eliminate the automatic cost of living (COLA) adjustments for Members of Congress during FY2013. [THOMAS, S.2210]

**March 2009 – Tester Cosponsored Bill to Repeal Automatic Pay Raise for Members of Congress, Bill Passed Senate But Stalled in House.** In March 2009, Tester cosponsored a bill to repeal the provision of law that provides automatic pay adjustments for Members of Congress. The bill passed the Senate without amendment by unanimous consent on March 17, 2009 but died in the House. [[S.542](#), Cosponsored 3/10/09; Congressional Research Service, *Salaries for Members of Congress: Congressional Votes*]

**Tester Co-Sponsored Bill To Stop Automatic Pay Increases for Members Of Congress.** In January 2011, Tester co-sponsored a McCaskill, D-Mo., bill that would repeal the provision that provides for automatic pay raises for members of Congress. [S. 133, JT Co-sponsored on [1/25/11](#)]

**FACT: TESTER SPONSORED BILL TO DENY PAYCHECKS TO MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND PRESIDENT IN CASE OF GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN**

**Tester Co-Sponsored Bill To Prohibit Members Of Congress From Receiving Pay During Government Shutdowns.** In February 2011, Tester co-sponsored a Boxer, D-Calif., bill that would prohibit Members of Congress and the President from receiving pay during government shutdowns. [S. 388, JT Co-sponsored [2/17/11](#)]

**Tester Voted To Prohibit Members Of Congress From Receiving Pay During Government Shutdowns.** In February 2011, Tester voted for a Boxer, D-Calif., bill via unanimous consent that would prohibit Members of Congress and the President from receiving pay during government shutdowns. [S. 388, voted on via unanimous consent on [3/1/11](#)]

- **Senate Unanimously Passed Tester Bill to Deny Pay to President and Members of Congress During Government Shutdown.** As reported by Reuters, “The Democratic-led Senate unanimously passed a bill on late Tuesday to deny pay to the president and U.S. lawmakers during government shutdowns. The measure now goes to the Republican-led House for final congressional approval, which would clear the way for Obama to sign it into law.” [Reuters, [3/2/2011](#)]

Voice Over: Spend your tax dollars on bonuses for Wall Street executives.

**FABRICATED**  
**HEADLINE:** *Bonuses For Wall Street*

*Source: Vote #64 02/13/09, Fox Business 03/17/09*

**FACT: TESTER EXPLICITLY OPPOSED BONUSES FOR AIG EXECUTIVES**

**Tester: Bonuses For AIG Execs Is “Ridiculous.”** In March 2009, the AP reported: “Senate Democratic Leader Harry Reid said Tuesday Congress will force executives of American International Group to pay back at least some of the \$165 million in bonuses they received after the insurance giant got billions in federal bailout money.” According to the report, Tester described bonuses for AIG executives as “ridiculous” and said they “need to understand that the only reason they even have a job is because of the taxpayers.” [AP, 3/17/09]

**Tester Bonuses For AIG Execs Are “Unfortunate, And That’s An Understatement.”** In March 2009, on MSNBC, Tester said: he thought it was “unfortunate and that’s an understatement” that AIG executives got bonuses. He added: “I think that, you know, the problems we’re facing in this country are enormous, and I can go down the list, but you know what they are, David. And the fact is that we had a Wall Street bailout bill that was presented last October and passed to help these companies get solvent again and get the economy back in the right direction. And what happens? The money goes out for bonuses, making some 73 people millionaires with taxpayer dollars.” [MSNBC, 3/17/09]

**Tester: “The People Out Here Are Outraged” About AIG Bonuses.** In March 2009, MSNBC reported: “I know there’s contracts out there, and I understand that contracts mean a lot in this country. But this is just a sense of fair play and common sense. And the fact that these contracts were negotiated over a year ago, money went out the door to AIG for the first time, if my memory serves me correct, back in September. And there’s been other tranches of money going to them since then. And now they’re using the money for trips to California, for employees’ workshops, or whatever you want to call them. And then -- and now we’ve got bonus -- none of it makes sense. And I will tell you that I think that the people out here are outraged. The waiter and the truck driver and the waitress in Montana are outraged with all this stuff too. And I think that we need to impose upon these people whatever way we can to get this money back, because it’s -- even though it is only one-tenth of one percent of the total money AIG got, it’s still a lot of money. And it’s a lot of money to me, and it’s a lot of money to Montanans.” [MSNBC, 3/17/09]

**Tester: “Everybody Can Be Replaced” At AIG.** In March 2009, on MSNBC, Tester said: “You know, I think there’s good people all over this country. And I think AIG obviously needs to clean up their act. And I think everybody can be replaced. So I don’t think any single person has a monopoly on their ability to clean up any company. The people there may be able to do it. But I will tell you that there’s got to be different actions coming out of the company than what I’ve seen, especially over the last few days.” [MSNBC, 3/17/09]

**Tester Turned Down \$1,000 Contribution From AIG.** In March 2009, the Montana Republican Party issued a press release: “U.S. Sens. Max Baucus and Jon Tester and Rep. Denny Rehberg on Tuesday decried insurance giant AIG's \$165 million in bonuses to employees after it received billions in a federal bailout.” According to the release, “AIG made one donation of \$1,000 to Tester, which he turned down last year because it was going out of business at the time.” His spokesman, Patrick Devlin, said “Jon never received the check so no reporting of the check was necessary.” [Montana Republican Party, 3/18/09]

**Tester on AIG Executive Bonuses: “The Morally Right Thing To Do Here Is Give The Money Back To The Taxpayers.”** In March 2009, on MSNBC, Tester said: “And I’m not -- you know, people make mistakes and they say things they don’t mean all the time. The fact is, is this was flat wrong. These people who received the money need to let their moral compass lead them in the right direction. And the morally right thing to do here is give the money back to the taxpayers. This company would not even be in business if it wasn’t for the taxpayers of this country. And if they weren’t in business, they certainly wouldn’t have gotten any bonuses, because they would have been broke, gone, out of business. There would have been no money to get. So I think that they need to understand that the only reason they’re not part of the 600,000 that were unemployed last month is because of the taxpayers of the country. And they need to give the bonuses back.” [MSNBC, 3/17/09]

**FACT: ORIGINAL BILL APPROVED BY SENATE “CONTAINED A TOUGH PROHIBITION AGAINST ANY BONUSES FOR EXECUTIVES AT FINANCIAL FIRMS BAILED OUT BY TARP PROGRAM”**

**Billings Gazette: Bill Approved By Senate Contained Tough Prohibition Against Any Bonuses for Executives.** As reported by the Billings Gazette, “The Rehberg campaign said Tester is a hypocrite for criticizing FNMA and FHLMC executive salaries, because Tester voted in 2009 for the economic stimulus bill that allowed insurance giant AIG and other companies bailed out by taxpayer money to pay big executive bonuses that year. Actually, the original version of the bill, as approved by the Senate, contained a tough prohibition against any bonuses for executives at financial firms bailed out by the TARP program.” [Billings Gazette, [11/16/2011](#)]

**FactCheck.org: “As It Was Passed by Senate, Stimulus Bill Contained a Strict Prohibition on Recipients of**

**TARP Funds Paying ‘Any Bonus.’**” As reported by Factcheck.org, “As it was passed by the Senate, the stimulus bill contained a strict prohibition on recipients of TARP funds paying "any bonus" to at least the 25 highest-paid employees – or more, at the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury. The language is contained on page 736, and it said the Treasury Department’s regulations governing recipients of funds under the Troubled Assets Relief Program (TARP) "shall" contain: H.R. 1, Senate version: ... a prohibition on such TARP recipient paying or accruing any bonus, retention award, or incentive compensation during the period that the obligation is outstanding to at least the 25 most highly compensated employees, or such higher number as the Secretary may determine is in the public interest. [Factcheck.org, Accessed 05/08/12]

**FACT: REHBERG DISMISSED VOTE TO CLAWBACK AIG BONUSES AS A “DUMB DECISION” THAT WAS “UN-AMERICAN” AND “UNCONSTITUTIONAL”**

**Rehberg: My Vote to Clawback AIG Bonuses a “Dumb Decision” That Was “Un-American” and “Unconstitutional.”** During an August 2009 town hall meeting, Rehberg dismissed his vote to clawback bonuses to AIG executives through a 90 percent tax as a “dumb decision.” Rehberg: Because I'm not always right. You know I make dumb decisions sometimes. You usually tell me, my mom's the first one who to tells me. But it's one of those you know, what was I thinking? It had to do with the AIG bailout and the executives got this, the bonuses, right? And I’m upset about it, and so what did I do, I voted to tax them at 90% of the bonus. Just to try to get the money back to you, and my people said what are you thinking, taxing 90% on an individual? That's un-American, that’s unconstitutional. And I thought well, you're probably right. [YouTube, Town Hall Meeting, 8/24/2009]

**FACT: REHBERG VOTED TO LET WALL STREET CEOs KEEP MILLIONS IN BONUSES FROM THE TAXPAYER FUNDED BAILOUTS**

**Billings Gazette: Rehberg Voted “No” on Bill That Would Have Prohibited TARP Funding From Paying Executive Compensation.** As reported by the Billings Gazette, “However, Rehberg also voted ‘no’ on April 1, 2009, on a bill that would have prohibited recipients of TARP funding from paying ‘unreasonable or excessive’ compensation, as defined by federal banking regulators. The bill passed the House but was never voted on by the Senate.” [Billings Gazette, [11/16/2011](#)]

**Rehberg Voted Against Bill to Cap Executive Compensation for Bailout Companies.** In 2009, Rehberg voted against a bill to bar any recipient of federal money from the \$700 billion financial industry bailout from paying any compensation that is “unreasonable or excessive,” as defined by standards to be set by federal banking regulators. The restrictions would be lifted once a company had repaid the government. This was one of the bills that came from the outrage over AIG bonuses. The bill passed 247-171. [HR 1664, [Vote 182](#), 4/01/09]

<p>Voice Over: Give Obama his way with your money, 95% of the time</p> <p><b><u>FABRICATED</u></b> <b><u>HEADLINE: Tester Votes With Obama 95%</u></b></p> <p>Source: Congressional Quarterly, Billings Gazette 03/04/12</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>FACT:</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>TESTER CONSISTENTLY RANKED ONE OF THE MOST CENTRIST MEMBERS OF THE SENATE</u></b></p> <p><b><u>National Journal</u></b> Ranked Tester As 60<sup>th</sup> Most Conservative Member Of The Senate In 2011. [<u>National Journal</u>, <a href="#">2/23/12</a>]</p> <p><b><u>National Journal</u></b> Ranked Tester As 43<sup>rd</sup> Most Conservative Member Of The Senate In 2010. [<u>National Journal</u>, <a href="#">2/27/11</a>]</p> <p><b><u>National Journal</u></b> Ranked Tester As 58<sup>th</sup> Most Conservative Member Of The Senate In 2009. [<u>National Journal</u>, <a href="#">2009</a>]</p> <p><b><u>National Journal</u></b> Ranked Tester As 57<sup>th</sup> Most Conservative Member Of The Senate In 2008. [<u>National Journal</u>, <a href="#">1/30/08</a>]</p> <p><b><u>National Journal</u></b> Ranked Tester As 59<sup>th</sup> Most Conservative Member Of The Senate In 2007. [<u>National Journal</u>, <a href="#">2007</a>]</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>CITED SCORE BASED ON ARBITRARY VOTE SELECTION, USES ONLY 38 PERCENT OF TESTER'S VOTES IN THE SENATE</b></p> <p><b>CQ Score Based On Only 38 Percent of Total Votes Taken By Jon Tester, Organization Cherry Picks Votes to Determine Score.</b> In March 2012, the Lee State Bureau reported: “CQ has been using the same methodology for rating congressional members' support of the president since 1953. It chooses votes on matters on which the president has taken a ‘clear position,’ and rates how members agreed or didn't. In 2011, for example, it chose 95 votes in the House (10 percent of 945 votes taken) and 89 votes in the Senate (38 percent of 235 votes taken). In the Senate, 46 of those votes were ‘confirmation votes’ on Obama nominees to various positions and judgeships.” [<u>Billings Gazette</u>, <a href="#">3/4/12</a>]</p>
<p>Voice Over: Denny Rehberg cut taxes, opposed bailouts, voted against pay raises.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>FACT: REHBERG VOTED FOR LARGEST TAX INCREASE ON MONTANA FAMILIES IN HISTORY</b></p> <p><b>Rehberg Voted Against Extending Tax Cuts to All Taxpayers.</b> In 2010, Rehberg voted against extending the</p>

*Screen Text: Denny Rehberg  
Cut Taxes, Opposed  
Bailouts Voted Against Pay  
Raises*

*Source: Roll Calls 149  
05/26/01, 225 05/23/03, 138  
04/28/04, 102 04/13/05, 519  
07/23/08, 674 09/29/08, 681  
10/03/08, 690 12/10/08, 19  
02/01/12, 226 04/27/10*

Voice Over: Because its  
your money not theirs.

*Screen Text: It's Your  
Money Not Theirs.*

*Approved By Denny  
Rehberg, Paid For By  
Montanans For Rehberg*

Voice Over: I'm Denny  
Rehberg, I approve this  
message

2001 and 2003 tax cuts for all taxpayers for two years and set the estate tax at 35 percent on estates worth more than \$5 million for two years. The measure also extended unemployment insurance benefits for 13 months and cut the employee portion of the Social Security tax by 2 percentage points. The measure was seen as a compromise from both sides of the aisle as liberals did not want to extend tax cuts for upper income earners nor extend the estate tax, and conservatives were upset about an extension of benefits which were not offset. The final package was estimated to cost \$857 billion. According to CNN, extending the Bush tax cuts in the measure would cost \$544.3 billion. The bulk, \$463 billion, was for the extension of families making less than \$250,000. Approximately \$81.5 billion was attributable to the extension of cuts that applied to the highest income families. The bill passed, 277-148. [CQ Weekly, [1/03/11](#); CNN, [12/07/10](#); HR 4853, [Vote 647](#), 12/17/10]

**Rehberg Voted Against The Plan Which Extended The Bush-Era Tax Cuts For Two Years And Also Extended Unemployment Benefits.** In December 2010, the Bozeman Daily Chronicle reported, "Baucus and Tester both voted for the tax cut plan, which extended the Bush-era tax cuts for two years and also extended unemployment benefits. Rehberg voted against the bill." [Bozeman Daily Chronicle, 12/21/10]

**FACT: REHBERG VOTED TO INCREASE TAXES ON MONTANA FAMILIES BY \$750 THIS YEAR**

**Rehberg Voted To Kill Payroll Tax Cut Extension for Middle-Class Montanans.** In December 2011, Rehberg voted for a Camp, R-Mich., motion to disagree with the Senate amendments and request a conference on a bill (HR 3630) that would extend through February 2012 the 4.2 percent employee payroll tax rate, Medicare payments rates to doctors and workers' eligibility for certain expanded unemployment benefits. The bill also would require the president to approve the Keystone XL oil pipeline within 60 days of the bill's enactment unless he certifies that doing so is not in the national interest. Congressional Quarterly noted: "A 'nay' was a vote in support of the president's position." [HR 3630, Vote 946, [12/20/11](#); CQ, [12/20/11](#); CNN, [12/21/11](#)]

- **Payroll Tax Cut Plan Would Save Average Americans \$1,000 and Avoid Medicare Cuts.** In February 2012, KFBB reported: "Big news out of Washington, Senator Jon Tester released a statement after extending the Payroll Tax Cut through the end of 2012, saving the average American worker about \$1,000 dollars. 'Extending the payroll tax cut and protecting Medicare bring much-needed certainty to Montana families and seniors. This bipartisan plan is what our economy needs as it begins to improve and create more jobs,' says Senator Tester. The agreement avoids a 27% cut to Medicare reimbursement rates, ensuring that seniors have access to their doctors through Medicare." [KFBB, [2/18/12](#)]

**FACT: REHBERG PROMISED HE WOULD NEVER VOTE FOR A PAY RAISE OR TAKE A PAY RAISE...**

**1996 – Rehberg: I Will Not Vote for Nor Accept a Pay Raise and That is a Promise.** During a 1996 radio call-in show, Rehberg said, “I can honestly tell you I have never voted for a pay raise, nor have I accepted one as a legislator, as Lieutenant Governor, and I will not vote for, nor accept a pay raise as a United States Senator and that is a promise. I will not take a cost of living increase, because that’s a hidden pay raise. If I have to take it, I will donate it to a Montana charity. I do not believe in the multi-million dollar pensions that these guys give themselves. They go back poor and come back rich. That’s not right. That’s a promise.” [KEMC public radio, Jackie Yamanaka and Jim Gransberry, hosts, 5/17/96]

**Rehberg Insisted He Would Not Accept Any Pay Raises.** As reported by [Roll Call](#), “With Rehberg, he insists, people will get a different kind of Senator. One who won't accept any pay raises or take a Congressional pension. ‘I won't kid you, I can use the money,’ he admits.” [[Roll Call](#), 7/10/96]

**1996 – Rehberg: “I Will Not Accept a Pay Raise, Cost of Living or Otherwise.”** In 1996, Rehberg said that if elected to the U.S. Senate, “I will not take a pension. I have not and I will not. Nor will I accept a pay raise, cost-of-living or otherwise, as a U.S. Senator.” He said it wasn’t because he was rich, saying, “I kind of resent people implying that I don’t need the money. My wife and I are both working, like everybody else, and we’re socking some away. We worry about college expenses. But these multi-million dollar pensions for members of Congress I think are wrong.” [[Miles City Star](#), 5/22/96]

### **...BEFORE HE VOTED TO INCREASE HIS OWN PAY FIVE TIMES**

**Rehberg Supported Congressional Pay Raise, Voted to Raise His Own Pay by \$3,300 in 2006.** In 2006, Rehberg voted to raise his own pay by \$3,300 to \$168,500. Rehberg voted to kill an amendment that would block an automatic pay hike for members of Congress. By killing the attempt to block the pay raise, Rehberg voted to receive a 2 percent increase and an annual salary of \$165,200. The effort to block the anti-pay raise amendment passed 249-167. [H RES 865, [Vote #261](#), 6/13/06; Congressional Research Service, *Salaries for Members of Congress: Congressional Votes*]

- **HEADLINE – House Lawmakers Accept \$3,300 Pay Hike.** As reported by the AP, “House lawmakers Tuesday embraced a \$3,300 pay raise that will increase their salaries to \$168,500. The 2 percent cost-of-living raise would be the seventh straight for members of the House and Senate.” [AP, [6/13/06](#)]
- **Lawmakers Easily Squelched Bid to Get Direct Vote to Block Pay Increase, “Automatically Awarded Unless Lawmakers Vote to Block It.** As reported by the AP, “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...But by a 249-167 vote, the House rejected Matheson's procedural attempt to get a direct vote on the pay raise.” [AP, [6/13/06](#)]

- **Vote “Prevented Amendments to the Rule, Including Those Related to Member Pay, From Being Considered.”** According to the Congressional Research Service, “On June 13, 2006, the House ordered the previous question on the rule for consideration of the FY2007 Treasury appropriations bill. This action prevented amendments to the rule, including those related to member pay, from being considered.” [Congressional Research Service, Salaries of Members of Congress, 1990-2009, p.24, emphasis added]
- **Vote Considered Vote Against Considering Amendment to Prohibit Pay Raise, Member Made Clear His Intention to Offer Amendment to Kill Pay Raise.** According to the Congressional Research Service, “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 argue, a Member could have offered an amendment to the rule permitting a pay raise vote in some form. 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.” [Congressional Research Service, Salaries of Members of Congress, 1990-2009, p.24, emphasis added]

**Rehberg Supported Congressional Pay Raise, Voted to Raise His Own Pay \$3,100 in 2005.** In 2005, Rehberg voted to raise his own pay by \$3,100 to \$165,200. Rehberg voted in favor of a measure intended to prevent the introduction of an amendment blocking an increase in the annual salary for House members by \$3,100 to \$165,000. The House blocked a bid by Congressman Jim Matheson (D-UT) to force an up-or-down vote on the pay raise. The effort to block the anti-payraise amendment passed 263-152. (HR 342, [Vote #327](#), 6/28/05)

- **HEADLINE – Congress OKs Raise Despite Matheson.** As reported by the [Deseret Morning News](#), “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. ‘We are at war, and that requires shared sacrifices,’ Matheson said. ‘Let us send a signal to the American people that Congress gets it. A little belt-tightening wouldn't hurt anyone around here.’” [[Deseret Morning News](#), [6/30/05](#)]
- **Rehberg Voted In Favor Of A \$3,100 Pay Raise.** In June 2005, the AP reported: "The 263-152 roll call Tuesday by which the House refused to consider a measure rejecting a \$3,100 cost-of-living pay raise next

year. In this vote, a 'yes' vote was a vote in favor of the pay raise, and 'no' vote was against it." The report noted that Rehberg voted "yea." [AP, 6/28/05]

- **Vote Prevented “Consideration of Amendment to Permit Pay Raise Prohibition To Be Offered,” After Member “Made Known His Intention to Offer Amendment to Prohibit the Increase.”** According to the Congressional Research Service, “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 argue, a Member could have offered an amendment to the rule permitting a pay raise vote in some form. 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.” [Congressional Research Service, Salaries of Members of Congress: Congressional Votes, 1990-2009, emphasis added]

**Rehberg Supported Congressional Pay Raise, Voted to Raise His Own Pay by \$4,000 in 2004.** In 2004, Rehberg voted to raise his own pay by \$4,000 to \$162,100. Rehberg voted in favor of a motion to order the previous question (thus ending debate and possibility of amendment) on adoption of the rule to provide for House floor consideration of the bill that would appropriate \$89.8 billion in fiscal 2005 for the departments of Treasury and Transportation and related agencies. If the motion had been defeated, an amendment to block the Congressional pay raise would have been allowed. The motion passed 235-170. (H Res 770, [Vote #451](#), 9/14/04)

- **HEADLINE – U.S. House Members Vote to Give Themselves Salary Increase.** [[Las Vegas Review-Journal](#), [9/16/04](#)]

**Rehberg Supported Congressional Pay Raise, Voted to Raise His Own Pay by \$3,400 in 2003.** In 2003, Rehberg voted to raise his own pay by \$3,400 to \$158,100. Rehberg voted in favor of a motion to order the previous question (thus ending debate and possibility of amendment) on adoption of the rule to provide for House floor consideration of the bill that would appropriate \$89.6 billion in fiscal 2004 spending, including \$27.5 billion in discretionary spending, for the departments of Treasury and Transportation and related agencies. If the motion had been defeated, an amendment to block the Congressional pay raise would have been allowed. The motion passed 240-173. (H. Res. 351, [Vote #463](#), 9/4/03)

- **HEADLINE – Another Pay Raise for Congress? House Approves Measure to Give Lawmakers a 2.2 Percent Boost.** As reported by the AP, “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. The House members decided to allow themselves a fifth straight cost-of-living raise after rejecting them for several years during the 1990s. Their annual pay has risen from \$136,700 in 1999 to about \$158,000 in 2004, if the legislation clears Congress and is signed by the president. Their salary this year is \$154,700. [AP, [9/4/03](#)]

- **AP: Rehberg Voted To Move Forward To An Automatic Pay Raise For Lawmakers.** In September 2003, the AP reported: "The 240-173 roll call Thursday by which the House rejected an attempt to have a direct vote on whether members of Congress should receive a cost-of-living pay raise next year. A 'yes' vote is a vote to approve procedures on a Transportation-Treasury spending bill, including an automatic COLA for lawmakers, that did not allow for a direct vote on the pay raise." The report noted that Rehberg voted "yea." [AP, 9/4/03]

**Rehberg Supported Congressional Pay Raise, Voted to Raise His Own Pay by \$4,700 in 2002.** In 2002, Rehberg voted to raise his own pay by \$4,700 to \$154,700. Rehberg voted in favor of a motion to order the previous question (thus ending debate and possibility of amendment) on adoption of the rule to provide for House floor consideration of the bill that would appropriate \$35.1 billion in fiscal 2003 Treasury-Postal appropriations. If the motion had been defeated, an amendment to block the Congressional pay raise would have been allowed. The motion passed 258-156. [H. Res. 488, [Vote #322](#), 7/18/02]

- **HEADLINE – House Clears Way for \$5K Pay Raise.** [AP, 7/18/02]
- **HEADLINE – Lawmakers Give Themselves Pay Increase to \$155,000.** [[Roll Call](#), 7/22/02]
- **“In Effect, Vote to Order Previous Question Was a Vote to Accept a Pay Raise.”** According to the Congressional Research Service, “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 permitting a pay raise vote in some form. Under the terms of H.Res. 488, as adopted, an amendment seeking to halt the pay raise was not in order. In effect a vote to order the previous question (and not allow any amendment to the rule) was a vote to accept a pay increase.” [Congressional Research Service, Salaries of Members of Congress: Congressional Votes, p.20-21]