Week ending 03/13/2017 - PA-08 MoCTrack Report

MoC Twitter action

Senator Bob Casey was on fire this week. His hot topics are:

- 1) His opposition to the GOP sponsored American Health Care Act (AHCA). On Wednesday, he went on a twitterstorm, and sent out 67 tweets, one for each county in PA, to show how the health care expenses for 50-64 year olds (he is on the Senate Committee on Aging) would increase. He has been vocal almost every day since the release of the draft bill. (108 tweets)
- 2) Town Halls he had one scheduled for today (3/12) in Philadelphia, and he was promoting it regularly, and soliciting questions online from people who could not be at the meeting (9 tweets)
- 3) His opposition to the new executive order/travel ban (7 tweets)

Representative Brian Fitzpatrick tweeted slightly more than normal. His hot topics are:

- 1) He has been urging the Defense Department to fund study and remediation of water contaminated with PFOA and PFOS in the Warminster and Horsham area, where there was a naval base. (5 tweets)
- 2) His first bill, relating to Department of Homeland Security budgeting, moved out of committee this week (2 tweets)
- 3) various Environmental issues, including a refutation of Scott Pruitt's assertion about CO2 not being an environmental hazard (2 tweets)

Senator Pat Toomey continued his habit of a light twitter presence. Of his handful of non-local interest items, the only topic he tweeted about more than once was his opposition to the anti-Semitic attacks in our area.

Legislation of interest

I know that all anyone has the bandwidth for this week is the American Health Care Act (ACHA).

I contacted the Fitzpatrick DC office to see if the Congressman has any position on the bill, and his staffer said that Representative Fitzpatrick had reviewed the bill, but he would not come to any conclusions until after the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) had the opportunity to rate the bill.

I read the bill itself to see if I could find any inflammatory stuff the Action Alerts folks could use in communications, but... whoa nelly is that thing boring. Even the most incendiary topics come out dull once they are filtered into bill-speak (I've included a sample on the defunding of Planned Parenthood below the rest of this email).

So having reviewed the bill and commentary on it, I think the best means for addressing it, locally, is to point out how much the proposed AHCA would hinder the treatment of opioid abuse. We know that Representative Fitzpatrick has made addressing opioid abuse the cornerstone of his local advocacy. In his phone Town Hall his staff handpicked almost half of the questions that he addressed on the topic of opioid abuse. He has participated in a number of round tables, and still tweets regularly about it. In light of his consuming interest on this topic, to continually point out how much the new AHCA draft would harm local treatment of opioid addiction could potentially drive Rep. Fltzpatrick away from this bill. This is actually a win-win for area progressives, potentially - if Fitzpatrick votes for the AHCA, then his hypocrisy on the opioid issue makes him a target; or he votes against the AHCA, it serves progressive goals outright. I'm including two links below that could provide materials from which to craft a message of "how can someone who supports addressing the opioid epidemic be in support of a bill that will remove the tools to do so."

Mother Jones, Trumpcare Would Make America's Opioid Epidemic Even Worse http://www.motherjones.com/politics/2017/03/trumpcare-ryancare-disaster-mental-health-addiction-treatment

Slate, Broken Pledge, Trump's promises to "take care" of inner city, rural, and Rust Belt voters have officially proved to be a con

http://www.slate.com/articles/news_and_politics/politics/2017/03/trumpcare_proves_that_trump_s_promise_to_take_care_of_rural_voters_was_always.html

And for those of you who made it down here and want to see how defunding Planned Parenthood can actually sound boring, I present you some excerpts from the American Health Care Act...

From Title I, Section 103 – "for the 1-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, no Federal funds provided from a program referred to in this subsection that is considered direct spending for any year may be made available to a State for payments to a prohibited entity..." followed by subsection B 1 a iii , that states "PROHIBITED ENTITY.—The term "prohibited entity" means an entity, including its affiliates, subsidiaries, successors, and clinics, that, as of the date of enactment of this Act...provides for abortions..."