

MARCO RUBIO ON SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE

Highlights:

- Marco Rubio argued for changing Social Security and Medicare.
 - Rubio expressed the belief that future generations would not be able to reap the same rewards of Social Security.
- Marco Rubio supported raising the retirement age.
- Marco Rubio spoke negatively about Social Security.
 - Rubio said Social Security “weakened us as a people.”
 - Rubio said Social Security was “bankrupting our country.”
- Marco Rubio advocated for the privatization of Social Security.
- Marco Rubio supported cuts to Social Security.
 - Rubio effectively voted to require fewer votes to reduce guaranteed Social Security benefits.
- Marco Rubio voted against expanding Social Security benefits.
- Marco Rubio introduced the “Let Seniors Work Act” to abolish the retirement earnings test and exempt seniors from Social Security payroll taxes.
- Marco Rubio voted to confirm President Trump’s nominee to be the Commissioner of Social Security.
- Marco Rubio introduced the “New Parents Act, “Which would have forced parents to take money out of their future Social Security earnings to pay for parental leave.

Rubio Argued It Was Necessary To Change Social Security And Medicare

RUBIO SAID SOCIAL SECURITY “AS WE KNOW” IT WOULD CEASE TO EXIST WITHOUT REFORMS

2015: Rubio Stated That Social Security Would “Cease To Exist As We Know” It Without Reforms. According to American Dreams: Restoring Economic Opportunity for Everyone, “Financial analysts like to use the analogy of a three legged stool when they talk about saving for retirement. Today, each of the three legs of our traditional retirement stool—personal savings, pensions and Social Security—is wobbling. And if we do nothing, each of the three will likely cease to exist as we know them well before my generation enters retirement.” [American Dreams: Restoring Economic Opportunity for Everyone, 1/13/15]

Rubio: “Social Security Will Go Bankrupt And It Will Bankrupt The Country With It. So What It Will Require Is People Younger, Like Myself, People That Are 30 Years Away From Retirement, To Accept That Our Social Security Is Going To Work Differently Than It Did For My Parents.” According to CNN, “Social Security will go bankrupt and it will bankrupt the country with it. So what it will require is people younger, like myself, people that are 30 years away from retirement, to accept that our Social Security is going to work differently than it did for my parents.” [CNN, 3/11/16]

2011: Rubio Said Entitlement Programs Needed To Be Reformed. According to the Sarasota Herald Tribune, “The most difficult of the positions is likely to be his call for making major changes to entitlement programs like Social Security. ‘What I want to make sure, is that the programs we know as Social Security and Medicare exist and are around when I retire and when my children retire,’ said Rubio. [...] ‘And that is not going to happen if we don’t begin to make some reforms to those programs now.’” [Sarasota Herald Tribune, 2/13/11]

Rubio Said Politicians Who Claimed Social Security Could Last Untouched Were Lying

Rubio Claimed That Politicians Were “Lying” When They Said Social Security Would Remain In Its Current Form Untouched. According to the Washington Post, “BASH: Senator Rubio, you argue Americans your age must have an honest conversation about making Social Security sustainable. For people under 55, you want to raise the retirement age and also reduce benefits for wealthier Americans. So, what should the new retirement age be? And how much will those benefits be cut? RUBIO: Well, first of all, let me say that you’re right, there are about 3 million seniors in Florida with Social Security and Medicare. One of them is my mother, who happens to be here today. I’m against any changes to Social Security that are bad for my mother. And we don’t have to make any changes for them. But anyone who tells you that Social Security can stay the way it is is lying. Any politician that goes around saying, ‘We don’t have to anything; all we have to do is raise a few taxes or just leave it the way it is,’ they’re not being honest with you. Social Security will go bankrupt and it will bankrupt the country with it. So what it will require is people younger, like myself, people that are 30 years away from retirement, to accept that our Social Security is going to work differently than it did for my parents.” [Washington Post, [3/10/16](#)]

Rubio Said The Numbers For Making Social Security Solvent Did Not Add Up

Rubio Said, “The Numbers Don’t Add Up” For Making Social Security Solvent Solely By Eliminating Waste And Reducing Foreign Aid. According to the Washington Post, “BASH: Senator Rubio, will that be enough to save Social Security? RUBIO: No. And I -- and I think you’ve outlined why. The numbers don’t add up. You know, when I ran for the Senate in 2010, I came out and said we’re going to have to make changes to Social Security, and everyone said that’s the end of your campaign. In Florida, you can’t talk about that, but people know that it’s the truth here in Florida. Fraud is not enough. Certainly, let’s wipe out the fraud, but as you said, it won’t add up. You already gave those numbers. The second point is on foreign aid. I hear that all the time as well. I’m against any sort of wasting of money on foreign aid, but it’s less than 1 percent of our federal budget. The numbers don’t add up.” [Washington Post, [3/10/16](#)]

RUBIO ARGUED FOR REFORMING SOCIAL SECURITY IN ORDER TO SAVE MONEY

2013: Rubio Suggested That The Federal Government Save Money By Freezing Discretionary Spending As Well As By Reforming Entitlement Programs Such As Social Security. According to Florida Today, “Republican Sen. Marco Rubio wants the federal government to save money by freezing discretionary spending and reforming entitlement programs such as Social Security.” [Florida Today, 1/13/13]

RUBIO SAID PEOPLE WHO WOULD NOT REFORM MEDICARE WOULD “LET THE PROGRAMS GO BROKE”

2011: Rubio Said People Who Would Not Reform Medicare Would “Let The Programs Go Broke.” According to Fox Business via YouTube, “RUBIO: [there should be] no changes for current beneficiaries or people nearing retirement. You worked hard, you paid into the system based on a certain set of promises and we need to keep that. But younger people, people like myself that are decades away from retirement, there isn’t going to be a Medicare system if we don’t make changes and reforms to it now that save the program. I want to save the program. The people that are saying ‘Do nothing’ what they’re saying is ‘Let the programs go broke.’” [Fox Business via YouTube, [3/30/11](#)]

2011: RUBIO CALLED ON FUTURE RETIREES TO ACCEPT “CERTAIN REALITIES” THAT THEY “WILL NEVER FULLY ACCESS” SOCIAL SECURITY

2011: Rubio Called On Future Retirees To Accept “Certain Realities” That They “Will Never Fully Access” Social Security And Medicare, But That They Should Continue To Pay In To Fund Promises To “Our Parents And Grandparents.” According to Senator Rubio’s website, “I personally believe that you cannot make changes to these programs for the people that are currently in them right now. My mother just – well she gets mad when I say this. She is in her eighth decade of life and she is on both of these programs. I can’t ask my mom to go out and get another job. She paid into the system. But the truth is that Social Security and Medicare, as important as they are, cannot look for me how they look for her. My generation must fully accept, the sooner the better, that if we want there to be a Social Security and a Medicare when we retire, and if we want America as we know it to continue when we retire, then we must accept and begin to make changes to those programs now, for us. [...] It will actually really call upon a specific generation of Americans, those of us, like myself, decades away from retirement, to assume certain realities – that we will continue to pay into and fund for a system that we will never fully access – that we are prepared to do whatever it takes in our lives and in our generation so that our parents and grandparents can enjoy the fruits of their labor and so that our children and our grandchildren can inherit the fullness of America’s promise.” [Official Website of Senator Marco Rubio, [8/24/11](#)]

Rubio Supported Raising The Retirement Age

RUBIO PROPOSED RAISING THE RETIREMENT AGE

Rubio On Raising The Retirement Age: “We Would Continue To Allow It To Increase The Retirement Age For Future Generations Until It Hit 70.” According to the Washington Post, “BASH: Senator, the question was specific though. You made your plan very clear about generally what you want to do, but how high would the retirement age go and how much would you cut those benefits? RUBIO: Well, I’m sorry I didn’t answer that part. So the thing is that my -- my generation, someone my age would retire at 68. We would continue to allow it to increase the retirement age for future generations until it hit 70. And so my children would retire at 70. I would retire at 68. It would be a graduating scale over a period of time.” [Washington Post, [3/10/16](#)]

2010: Rubio Proposed Raising The Retirement Age To 70. According to the Associated Press, “Marco Rubio wants Americans to work longer and retire later to places like Florida, a stand that has drawn criticism from his Senate rivals and unnerves some in the Sunshine State where one out of every seven residents gets a Social Security check. As the nation grapples with the fast growing insolvency of entitlement programs, likely Republican nominee Rubio has proposed raising the retirement age and cutting benefits to younger workers. Rubio wants to raise the full retirement age, which now ranges from 65 to 67 depending on a person’s birth year, until it reaches 70 in the next century. He would exempt people currently over 55.” [Associated Press, 5/26/10]

VIDEO: Rubio Called For Raising The Retirement Age. According to Fox News Sunday via YouTube, “RUBIO: But certainly, I think if you’re 55 years of age or older, or close enough to retirement, 55 is the number that the Ryan plan uses, I think this is off the table. We’re not talking about you. We are talking about folks like me that are 39 years of age, many years away from retirement. Social Security, whether we want it to or not, in its current form cannot survive and will not exist for us. In fact, just this week we received the news that for the first time Social Security is now paying out more in benefits than it’s taking in. That was something that was supposed to happen in 2016. It’s now happening in 2010. WALLACE: So, direct question... RUBIO: Absolutely. WALLACE: ... would you raise... RUBIO: Yes. WALLACE: ... the retirement age? Rubio: I think that has to be on the table. That’s got to be part of the solution, the retirement age gradually increases for people of my generation. I think it’s got to be part of.” [Fox News Sunday via YouTube, [3/28/10](#)]

2014: Rubio Expressed Support For Raising The Retirement Age Beyond 67

2014: Rubio Expressed Support For Raising The Retirement Age Beyond 67 “To Account For The Rise In Life Expectancy.” According to Senator Rubio’s official website, “People are working longer because people are living longer. If you turned 21 in 1940, your chances of living to retirement age were only about 55 to 60 percent. But if you turned 21 today, your chances of reaching retirement age are around 80%. What this means in practical terms is that we now have a record number of Social Security beneficiaries. And these beneficiaries, on average, are living another five to ten years longer than Social Security’s earliest recipients. But in the past 80 years, Congress has only increased the retirement age by two years, from 65 to 67. This simply won’t be enough in the long run. The answer is to gradually increase the retirement age for future retirees to account for the rise in life expectancy. And if we act soon, we can do this without changing the retirement age for people who are currently over the age of 55.” [Official Website of Senator Marco Rubio, [5/13/14](#)]

2011: Rubio Suggested “Raising The Retirement Age For Younger Generations”

2011: Rubio Suggested “Raising The Retirement Age For Younger Generations.” According to the Sun-Sentinel, “Florida Senator Marco Rubio, a Republican, said Congress must move beyond cutting discretionary spending, which makes up less than one fifth of total federal spending. He launched a publicity campaign on Wednesday calling for reform of entitlement programs to keep them solvent and ease the debt. Rubio, 39, suggested gradually raising the retirement age for younger generations to receive full benefits. He opposes lifting the cap or other tax increases because he believes that would stifle economic growth.” [Sun-Sentinel, 3/31/11]

2010: Rubio Supported Raising The Retirement Age For Those 10 Years Or More Away From Retirement

2010: PolitiFact: Rubio Supported “Raising The Retirement Age And Potentially Reducing Benefits” For Those 10 Years Or Further From Retirement. According to PolitiFact, “Crist’s ad, ‘Protect’ is correct in pointing out that Rubio

supports proposals to keep Social Security solvent past 2037 by raising the retirement age and potentially reducing benefits. Rubio says changes are necessary or the Social Security program will go broke, a sentiment shared by the trustees who manage the federal program. But the ad fails to mention that Rubio's proposals would not affect any current retirees, or people nearing retirement (Rubio most often has said people within 10 years of reaching the Social Security retirement age)." [St. Petersburg Times, 10/6/10]

RUBIO SUPPORTED RAISING THE SOCIAL SECURITY RETIREMENT AGE

Rubio Said He Believed Raising The Social Security Retirement Age Was Necessary. According to Politico, "When asked about raising the future Social Security retirement age for those who are in their 40s now, Rubio said it was necessary. 'For younger workers there's going to have to be some smaller changes or it won't exist,' Rubio said. Asked how he would protect Social Security without cutting benefits or raising the retirement age, Murphy said he supports raising the income level that's taxed for Social Security, or payroll tax." [Politico, [10/26/16](#)]

2015: Rubio Wanted To Raise The Social Security Retirement Age For Future Retirees. According to American Dreams: Restoring Economic Opportunity For Everyone, "Failing to modernize Social Security, however, will eventually lead to an outcome we can't buy our way out of, no matter how high we might raise taxes. [...] We need to increase the retirement age for future retirees." [American Dreams: Restoring Economic Opportunity for Everyone, 1/13/15]

Rubio Advocated For Raising The Retirement Age For Future Social Security Recipients

2013: Rubio Advocated For Raising The Retirement Age For Future Social Security And Medicare Recipients. According to the Palm Beach Post, "Rubio and other Republicans have advocated changes that include raising the retirement age for future Social Security and Medicare recipients and giving future Medicare beneficiaries the option of taking a federal subsidy to buy private health insurance." [Palm Beach Post, 2/28/13]

2013: Rubio Supported Raising The Social Security Retirement Age For People Under 55. According to Florida Today, "Rubio, R West Miami, supports raising the Social Security retirement age for people now under 55." [Florida Today, 1/13/13]

2010: RUBIO FLOATED THE IDEA OF ALLOWING THE RETIREMENT AGE TO FLUCTUATE

2010: "Rubio: Perhaps We're Going To Have To Continue To Allow The Retirement Age To Fluctuate." According to CBS News via YouTube, "RUBIO: Younger workers like myself, people 39 years of age like I am, we're going to have to accept that there's going to be some changes to Social Security. And perhaps they're going to have to change the way the benefit is indexed. Perhaps we're going to have to continue to allow the retirement age to fluctuate, as it has been doing since the early 1980s. But again, that's for younger workers like myself, who have 20 or 30 years to prepare for this. People that are on the system now, or let's say 10 years from retirement or 12 years from retirement, these folks can't all of a sudden make a change to adjust for it. So, I think we have to start talking honestly about the long-term challenges facing a very important program, Social Security, because we want to save it. It's important. We want to preserve it." [Face The Nation via YouTube, [9/26/10](#)]

2010: Rubio: Raising Social Security And Medicare Eligibility Age "Have To Be Talked About" For Those 55 And Younger. According to Palm Beach Post, "Rubio told the group that addressing the long term solvency of Social Security and Medicare is key to bringing the federal budget deficit under control. Rubio said there should be no change in those programs for people who are now 55 and older. But he said raising the retirement age and changing the way annual benefit increases are calculated are 'proposals that have to be talked about.' Rubio added, 'I guarantee right now that in this campaign one or both of my opponents will run a commercial that says Marco Rubio wants to take away your Social Security.'" [Palm Beach Post, 8/13/10]

RUBIO EFFECTIVELY VOTED AGAINST REQUIRING 60 YEAS VOTES IN THE SENATE TO INCREASE THE SOCIAL SECURITY RETIREMENT AGE

2017: Marco Rubio Effectively Voted Against Requiring 60 Yeas Votes In The Senate To Increase The Social Security Retirement Age. In January 2017, Marco Rubio effectively voted against an amendment that would have, according to the text of the amendment, ""(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would— (1) result in a reduction of guaranteed benefits scheduled under title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.); (2) increase either the early or

full retirement age for the benefits described in paragraph (1); (3) privatize Social Security; [...] (b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).” The underlying legislation was an FY 2017 budget resolution designed to being the process of repealing the Affordable Care Act. The vote was on a motion to waive a budget point of order against the amendment. The Senate rejected the motion by a vote of 49 to 49. [Senate Vote 6, [1/9/17](#); Congressional Record, [1/5/17](#); Congressional Quarterly, [1/9/17](#); Congressional Quarterly, [1/10/17](#); Congressional Actions, [S. Amdt. 19](#); Congressional Actions, [S. Con. Res. 3](#)]

Rubio Spoke Negatively About Social Security And Medicare, Said The Programs “Weakened Us As A People” And Were “Bankrupting” The Country

2011: RUBIO SAID THAT SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE “WEAKENED US AS A PEOPLE”

VIDEO: Rubio Said That Social Security And Medicare “Weakened Us As People.” According to the Reagan Library via YouTube, “RUBIO: These programs actually weakened us as a people. You see, almost forever, it was institutions in society that assumed the role of taking care of one another. If someone was sick in your family, you took care of them. If a neighbor met misfortune, you took care of them. You saved for your retirement and your future because you had to. We took these things upon ourselves in our communities, our families, and our homes, and our churches and our synagogues. But all that changed when the government began to assume those responsibilities. All of a sudden, for an increasing number of people in our nation, it was no longer necessary to worry about saving for security because that was the government’s job.” [Reagan Library, [8/23/11](#)]

Rubio Denied Ever Saying That Social Security And Medicare “Weakened Us As A People”

2011: Rubio Denied That He Had Said Social Security And Medicare Had “Weakened Us As A People.” According to Politico, “He said Social Security and Medicare have ‘weakened us as a people,’ said Murphy, accusing Rubio of wanting to privatize Medicare. Rubio also denied that he said Social Security and Medicare ‘weakened us as a people’ in 2011. He said he was talking about the debt. However, news reports and video of his remarks at the time indicate Rubio was also discussing the social costs of having government assume care for people that used to be provided by family members.” [Politico, [10/26/16](#)]

RUBIO: “SOCIAL SECURITY, MEDICARE, AND MEDICAID ARE BANKRUPTING OUR COUNTRY”

2011: Rubio Stated That “Social Security, Medicare And Medicaid Are Bankrupting Our Country.” According to the Tallahassee Democrat, “Rubio said entitlement spending, which the legislation didn’t address, also must be reduced. [...] ‘While reducing discretionary spending is an important goal, Washington is devoting a disproportionate amount of time to a tiny slice of the budget while ignoring the fact that continued inaction on saving Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid is bankrupting our country.’ [Tallahassee Democrat, [3/10/11](#)]

Rubio Advocated For The Privatization Of Social Security

2010: RUBIO ADVOCATED FOR THE PRIVATIZATION OF SOCIAL SECURITY

Tampa Tribune: “Rubio Advocated Privatization” Of Social Security “As Recently As February 2010.” According to the Tampa Tribune, “Social Security is jumping to the front of the U.S. Senate race...Republican Marco Rubio says he’s the only candidate who can be trusted to preserve the program in its current form. In a three way duel reminiscent of a Clint Eastwood western, each is dodging incoming rounds and hurling attacks in two different directions. [...] Meek, meanwhile, says the program can be preserved without the changes advocated by Rubio, and advocates a panel of experts to propose long term solutions. He says both Crist and Rubio favor partial privatization of Social Security, and that he is the only candidate who will ‘stand up to make sure we can preserve Social Security and not privatize it.’ Crist and Rubio both deny that, although Rubio advocated privatization as recently as February.” [Tampa Tribune, [9/25/10](#)]

2010: Rubio Supported Private Accounts, Changed Position After “Reviewing The Data.” According to the Sarasota Herald Tribune, “Rubio himself once supported putting Social Security in private accounts - a move opposed by the AARP,

among others - but has since backed off that proposal, drawing charges of ‘flip-flopping’ from his Senate rivals. ‘It’s hard to keep up,’ said Gov. Charlie Crist, a former Republican who is running as an independent in the Senate race. ‘Obviously, he is all over the map as far as Social Security.’ Rubio’s aides said the former state House speaker changed his position after reviewing the data. [Sarasota Herald Tribune, 10/4/10]

RUBIO EFFECTIVELY VOTED MULTIPLE TIMES AGAINST MAKING IT HARDER TO PRIVATIZE SOCIAL SECURITY

2017: Rubio Effectively Voted Against Requiring 60 Yeas Votes In The Senate To Privatize Social Security. In January 2017, Rubio effectively voted against an amendment that would have, according to the text of the amendment, “(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would— (1) result in a reduction of guaranteed benefits scheduled under title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.); (2) increase either the early or full retirement age for the benefits described in paragraph (1); (3) privatize Social Security; [...] (b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).” The underlying legislation was an FY 2017 budget resolution designed to being the process of repealing the Affordable Care Act. The vote was on a motion to waive a budget point of order against the amendment. The Senate rejected the motion by a vote of 49 to 49. [Senate Vote 6, [1/9/17](#); Congressional Record, [1/5/17](#); Congressional Quarterly, [1/9/17](#); Congressional Quarterly, [1/10/17](#); Congressional Actions, [S. Amdt. 19](#); Congressional Actions, [S. Con. Res. 3](#)]

2013 – 2015: Rubio Effectively Voted An Additional Three Times Against The Same Legislation

2015: Rubio Effectively Voted Against Making It Harder To Privatize Social Security Or Reduce Benefits By Requiring 60 Votes In The Senate. In March 2015, Rubio effectively voted against an amendment to the Senate’s FY 2016 budget resolution that, according to Congressional Quarterly, “would [have] create[d] a 60-vote point of order against any legislation that would reduce Social Security benefits, increase the retirement age for benefits or privatize Social Security.” The vote was on a motion to waive a budget point of order, which required 60 votes to succeed. The Senate rejected the motion by a vote of 51 to 48. The presiding officer subsequently sustained the budget point of order, killing the amendment. [Senate Vote 84, [3/24/15](#); Congressional Quarterly, [3/24/15](#); Congressional Actions, [S. Con. Res. 11](#)]

- **While Underlying Budget Did Not Cut Social Security, Supporters Said Amendment Was To Send A Message.** According to The Hill, “Sen. Bernie Sanders (I-Vt.) said the amendment would require any proposal that cuts benefits or raise the Social Security retirement age meet a ‘point of order’ requiring a supermajority of 60 votes for passage. ‘This point of order is enormously important,’ Sanders said. ‘What this amendment says is do not cut Social Security.’ While the Republican budget doesn’t touch Social Security, Democrats have pledged to use their amendments to protect and bolster Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid.” [The Hill, [3/24/15](#)]

2015: Rubio Effectively Voted Against Making It Harder To Privatize Social Security Or Reduce Benefits By Requiring 60 Votes In The Senate. In March 2015, Marco Rubio effectively voted against an amendment to the Senate’s FY 2016 budget resolution that, according to Congressional Quarterly, “would [have] create[d] a 60-vote point of order against any legislation that would reduce Social Security benefits, increase the retirement age for benefits or privatize Social Security.” The vote was on a motion to waive a budget point of order, which required 60 votes to succeed. The Senate rejected the motion by a vote of 51 to 48. The presiding officer subsequently sustained the budget point of order, killing the amendment. [Senate Vote 84, [3/24/15](#); Congressional Quarterly, [3/24/15](#); Congressional Actions, [S. Amdt. 471](#); Congressional Actions, [S. Con. Res. 11](#)]

- **While Underlying Budget Did Not Cut Social Security, Supporters Said Amendment Was To Send A Message.** According to The Hill, “Sen. Bernie Sanders (I-Vt.) said the amendment would require any proposal that cuts benefits or raise the Social Security retirement age meet a ‘point of order’ requiring a supermajority of 60 votes for passage. ‘This point of order is enormously important,’ Sanders said. ‘What this amendment says is do not cut Social Security.’ While the Republican budget doesn’t touch Social Security, Democrats have pledged to use their amendments to protect and bolster Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid.” [The Hill, [3/24/15](#)]

2013: Rubio Voted Against Establishing Private Accounts For Social Security Beneficiaries, As Part Of Senator Rand Paul’s Proposed Budget. In March 2013, Marco Rubio voted against establishing personal accounts for Social Security Beneficiaries as part of Sen. Rand Paul’s (R-KY) proposed budget resolution covering fiscal years 2013 to 2023. According to a

press release from Sen. Paul, his budget included a provision to “[e]stablish personal accounts that allow savers greater discretion over their retirement options.” The vote was on an amendment to the Senate budget resolution replacing the entire budget with Paul’s proposed budget; the Senate rejected the amendment by a vote of 18 to 81. [Senate Vote 69, [3/22/13](#); Senator Rand Paul press release, [3/22/13](#); Congressional Actions, [S. Amdt. 263](#); Congressional Actions, [S. Con. Res. 8](#)]

Rubio Supported Cuts To Social Security

RUBIO VOTED TO DECREASE BENEFIT PAYMENTS TO INDIVIDUALS WITH PRIOR OVERPAYMENTS IN SOME SITUATIONS

2020: Rubio Voted For An Amendment That Would Decrease Benefit Payments To Individuals With Prior Overpayments By At Least 10% If Full Decrease Would “Defeat The Purpose” Of The Social Security Act. In December 2020, Marco Rubio voted for an amendment to the ALS Disability Insurance Access Act of 2019 which would, according to Congressional Quarterly, “allow the Social Security Administration to modify decreases in benefit payments to individuals as a result of previous overpayments, if it determines that a resulting 100% decrease in payment to an individual would ‘defeat the purpose’ of the Social Security Act. It would still require such payments to be decreased by at least 10%.” The vote was on the adoption of an amendment. The Senate rejected the amendment by a vote of 48-49. [Senate Vote 249, [12/2/20](#); Congressional Quarterly, [12/2/20](#); Congressional Actions, [S.Amdt. 2689](#); Congressional Actions, [S. 578](#)]

RUBIO EFFECTIVELY VOTED FOR BUDGET CUTS THAT WOULD HAVE CUT SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE

Rubio Effectively Voted For The “Cut, Cap And Balance” Plan That Would Drastically Cut Federal Spending To Balance The Budget. In July 2011, Marco Rubio effectively voted for the so-called “Cut, Cap and Balance” legislation. According to Congressional Quarterly Today, “Along with the balanced-budget amendment provisions, the House passed ‘cut, cap, balance’ bill proposes drastic cuts in fiscal 2012 spending and setting future spending limits. Specifically, it would set fiscal 2012 discretionary spending at \$1.019 trillion, the level set in the House’s budget resolution for the year (H Con Res 34), and cap annual federal spending at 19.9 percent of gross domestic product by fiscal 2021, down from an estimated 22.5 percent for fiscal 2012.” The vote was on a motion to table the bill; the Senate agreed to the motion by a vote of 51 to 46, killing the bill. [Senate Vote 116, [7/22/11](#); Congressional Quarterly Today, 7/22/11; Congressional Actions, [H.R. 2560](#)]

- **CBPP: Cut, Cap And Balance Bill “Would Necessitate Deep Cuts” To Social Security And Medicare, “Big Cuts” To Social Security And Medicare Would Be “Inevitable.”** According to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, “The legislation would inexorably subject Social Security and Medicare to deep reductions. The measure does not cut Social Security or Medicare in 2012. And it does not subject them to automatic cuts if its global spending caps are missed. It is inconceivable, however, that policymakers would meet the bill’s severe annual spending caps through automatic across-the-board cuts year after year; if they did, key government functions would be crippled. Policymakers would have little alternative but to institute deep cuts in specific programs. And as noted elsewhere in this statement, before the debt limit could be raised, Congress would have to approve a constitutional balanced budget amendment that essentially requires cuts even deeper than those in the Ryan budget. Reaching and maintaining a balanced budget in the decade ahead while barring any tax increases would necessitate deep cuts in Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. After all, by 2021, total expenditures for these three programs will be nearly 45 percent greater than expenditures for all other programs (except interest payments) combined. Big cuts in these programs would be inevitable.” [Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, [7/16/11](#)]
- **Center For American Progress: Cut, Cap, Balance Means “Simply Massive Cuts” To Social Security And Medicare.** According to the Center for American Progress, “There is no way around the basic arithmetic. The only way to achieve that level of spending is by radically altering some fundamental public programs and services. A federal spending cap may sound innocuous but it is simply massive cuts to Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid by another name.” [Center for American Progress, [7/18/11](#)]
- **AARP Opposed Cut, Cap And Balance Because It Did Not Shield Social Security and Medicare From “Arbitrary Reductions.”** According to the AARP, “In addition, the Cut, Cap and Balance Act requires that a balanced budget amendment to the United States Constitution be transmitted to the states as a pre-condition of increasing the debt ceiling. Social Security and Medicare, which are not excluded under the balanced budget amendment, would therefore be at risk for arbitrary reductions under the constitutional amendment, and as such, AARP is opposed.” [AARP Letter, [7/21/11](#)]

RUBIO CALLED FOR REDUCING THE “GROWTH OF BENEFITS” FOR SOME SENIORS

May 2014: Rubio Called For Reducing “The Growth Of Benefits” For Some Social Security Recipients. According to Senator Rubio’s website, “We also need to look at how we calculate initial benefits. [...] For wealthy retirees, their monthly Social Security benefit is a less significant portion of their monthly finances. The answer is to reduce the growth of benefits for these upper income seniors while making the program even stronger for lower income seniors. This isn’t a cut, it’s simply a reduction in how fast the benefit will increase for wealthier retirees. Doing this will add years to Social Security’s solvency. It is one of the best ways to save the program for high income and low income beneficiaries alike.” [Official Website of Senator Marco Rubio, [5/13/14](#)]

RUBIO SAID COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENTS WERE “ON THE TABLE” FOR SOCIAL SECURITY

Rubio Stated That Cost-Of-Living Adjustments Were “On The Table” For Social Security. According to An American Son, “Wallace had asked me whether I would change the cost of living adjustment for Social Security. I had answered him honestly, saying that ‘all these issues have to be on the table,’ including ‘the way we index increases in the cost of living.’ The Florida press said I had handed Crist his next line of attack. In retiree rich Florida, talking about any changes to Social Security was political suicide.” [An American Son: A Memoir, 6/19/12]

2016: RUBIO PROPOSED MEANS TESTING SOCIAL SECURITY

Rubio: “I’ve Made A Lot Of Money, My Social Security Benefit Will Not Grow As Fast As Someone Who Made Less Money. And By The Way, Medicare Could Very Well Become The Option Of Using My Medicare Benefit To Buy A Private Plan That I Like Better.” According to the Washington Post, “If I’ve made a lot of money, my Social Security benefit will not grow as fast as someone who made less money. And by the way, Medicare could very well become the option of using my Medicare benefit to buy a private plan that I like better. Medicare Advantage does that now. These are not unreasonable changes to ask of someone like myself who is 25 or 30 years away from retirement, in exchange for leaving the program undisturbed for the people that are on it now or about to retire, and ensuring that we do not bankrupt our country and that this program still exists when my children retire, when my grandchildren retire, when I retire. (APPLAUSE)” [Washington Post, [3/10/16](#)]

Rubio Voted Against Expanding Social Security Benefits

RUBIO VOTED AGAINST AN EXPANSION OF SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

2015: Rubio Voted Against An Unspecified Expansion Of Social Security Benefits. In March 2015, Rubio voted against an amendment to the Senate’s FY 2016 budget resolution that, according a press release from the office of Sen Elizabeth Warren, would have “support[ed] a sustainable expansion of Social Security benefits and promote[d] the long-term solvency of the Social Security and Disability Insurance trust funds.” According to Congressional Quarterly, the amendment would have “created[d] a deficit-neutral reserve fund to allow for legislation that would expand Social Security benefits, the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund.” The Amendment was defeated by a vote of 42 to 56. [Senate Vote 131, [3/27/15](#); Press Release – Office Of Senator Elizabeth Warren, [3/27/15](#); Congressional Quarterly, [3/27/15](#); Congressional Actions, [S. Amdt. 1094](#); Congressional Actions, [S. Con. Res. 11](#)]

Rubio Introduced The “Let Seniors Work Act,” Which Would Make It Easier For People To Work Past Retirement Age

RUBIO INTRODUCED THE “LET SENIORS WORK ACT,” WHICH PROPOSED TO ELIMINATE THE 12.4% PAYROLL TAX FOR SENIORS

2015: Rubio Introduced The “Let Seniors Work Act,” Which Proposed To Repeal The Retirement Earnings Test And Allow Seniors Not To Pay The 12.4% Payroll Tax. According to the Sunshine State News, “On Tuesday, U.S. Rep. Ron DeSantis, R-Fla., reintroduced the ‘Let Seniors Work Act’ in the House, a bill he championed back in July. The bill, first

proposed by U.S. Sen. Marco Rubio, R-Fla., will repeal the Retirement Earnings Test and will stop the 12.4 percent payroll tax for working seniors.” [Sunshine State News, [3/17/15](#)]

- **The Retirement Earnings Test Defers Benefits For Workers Who Have Not Reached Social Security Retirement Age And Whose Earnings Are Above A Certain Level.** According to the Social Security Administration, “The retirement earnings test applies only to people below normal retirement age (NRA). Social Security withholds benefits if your earnings exceed a certain level, called a retirement earnings test exempt amount, and if you are under your NRA. One of two different exempt amounts apply — a lower amount in years before the year you attain NRA and a higher amount in the year you attain NRA. These exempt amounts generally increase annually with increases in the national average wage index.” [Social Security Administration, accessed [3/21/24](#)]

2014: Rubio Proposed Eliminating The 12.4% Social Security Payroll Tax Imposed On Those Who Have Reached Retirement Age To Make It Easier To Work Longer. According to the National Review, “[Rubio wrote] Our first goal of reform must be to make it easier for people to work longer. Working longer is not only financially attractive but is also a preference for many seniors. Currently, those who keep working past retirement age continue to pay Social Security taxes while receiving almost no extra benefits in return. In order to remove this disincentive to work, I proposed eliminating the 12.4 percent Social Security payroll tax for all individuals who have reached retirement age.” [National Review, [8/5/14](#)]

May 2014: Rubio Publicized The Introduction Of His “Let Seniors Work Act” Of 2014, Saying “Seniors Who Have Already Paid Their Fair Share Into Social Security Are Being Punished For Choosing To Keep Working Rather Than Immediately Cash In.” According to a press release from the office of Senator Marco Rubio, “U.S. Senator Marco Rubio (R-FL) today introduced the Let Seniors Work Act of 2014, legislation to promote retirement security in the 21st century and incentivize seniors to continue working past retirement age if they choose to do so by eliminating the 12.4 percent Social Security payroll tax and repealing the Retirement Earnings Test (RET).” [Official Website of Senator Marco Rubio, [5/14/14](#)]

RUBIO CRITICIZED THE RETIREMENT EARNINGS TEST AS STIFLING SENIOR EMPLOYMENT

2015: Rubio Called The Retirement Earnings Test “Anti-Senior And Anti-Growth.” According to Sunshine State News, “Rubio is also still on board with the legislation, bringing it out again in the Senate. ‘Older Americans who have spent their whole lives paying into Social Security should have the choice of leaving the workforce when they reach the retirement age, or continuing to work well into their golden years without having to pay Social Security payroll taxes or get hit by the Retirement Earnings Test,’ said Rubio, who is considering running for the Republican presidential nomination in 2016. ‘Eliminating these two anti-senior and anti-growth measures makes a lot of sense in the 21st century when people are living longer and more productive lives than ever before.’” [Sunshine State News, [3/17/15](#)]

May 2014: Rubio Argued In Favor Of Eliminating The Retirement Earnings Test, Saying It “Would Raise Employment Among Early Retirees By 5.3 Percent.” According to Senator Rubio’s official website, “‘Those who choose to claim their benefits early while they keep working are subject to what’s called the Retirement Earnings Test. Under this test, benefits are reduced approximately 50 cents for every dollar a person between the ages of 62 to 65 earns in excess of \$15,000 a year. This essentially equates to a 50% tax on benefits on top of all other taxes being paid, such as the payroll tax I just discussed. The result is that Americans often work right up until the age of 62, and then enter retirement before they start incurring this penalty. Here is what is even more puzzling about this policy: it doesn’t save any money. Because when a senior hit by this tax finally reaches 65, their benefits are hiked way up to make up for any loss caused by the Retirement Earnings Test. In the end, the benefits end up being mostly the same over the course of a retirement with or without the Retirement Earnings Test. But most people aren’t aware of this, so many leave the labor force when they turn 62 to avoid paying the 50% tax on their Social Security benefits. We should eliminate this test altogether. One economist estimates that abolishing the Retirement Earnings Test would raise employment among early retirees by 5.3%, a significant increase for a reform that has no long term budgetary cost.’” [Official Website of Senator Marco Rubio, [5/13/14](#)]

May 2014: Rubio: “By Eliminating The Social Security Payroll Tax For Seniors And Repealing The Retirement Earnings Test, Older People Are Incentivized To Continue Working Well Into Their Golden Years.” According to a press release from the office of Senator Marco Rubio, “‘While our economy is rapidly changing, retirement programs and savings plans have failed to adjust accordingly,’ said Rubio. ‘Currently, seniors who have already paid their fair share into Social Security are being punished for choosing to keep working rather than immediately cashing in. By eliminating the Social Security payroll tax for seniors and repealing the Retirement Earnings Test, older people are incentivized to continue working well into their golden years,’ Rubio continued.” [Official Website of Senator Marco Rubio, [5/14/14](#)]

Rubio Effectively Voted To Require Fewer Votes To Reduce Guaranteed Social Security Benefits

RUBIO EFFECTIVELY VOTED AGAINST REQUIRING 60 YEARS VOTES IN THE SENATE TO REDUCE GUARANTEED SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

2017: Rubio Effectively Voted Against Requiring 60 Years Votes In The Senate To Reduce Guaranteed Social Security Benefits. In January 2017, Rubio effectively voted against an amendment that would have, according to the text of the amendment, “(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would— (1) result in a reduction of guaranteed benefits scheduled under title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.); (2) increase either the early or full retirement age for the benefits described in paragraph (1); (3) privatize Social Security; [...] (b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).” The underlying legislation was an FY 2017 budget resolution designed to being the process of repealing the Affordable Care Act. The vote was on a motion to waive a budget point of order against the amendment. The Senate rejected the motion by a vote of 49 to 49. [Senate Vote 6, [1/9/17](#); Congressional Record, [1/5/17](#); Congressional Quarterly, [1/9/17](#); Congressional Quarterly, [1/10/17](#); Congressional Actions, [S. Amdt. 19](#); Congressional Actions, [S. Con. Res. 3](#)]

Rubio Voted To Confirm Trump’s Nominee To Be Commissioner Of Social Security

RUBIO VOTED TO CONFIRM TRUMP’S NOMINEE TO BE COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY

2019: Rubio Voted For The Confirmation Of Andrew Saul To Be Commissioner Of Social Security. In June 2019, Rubio voted for the confirmation of Andrew Saul to be Commissioner of Social Security. According to Congressional Quarterly, the vote would be a “confirmation of President Donald Trump’s nomination of Andrew Saul of New York to be Commissioner of Social Security.” The vote was on confirmation. The Senate approved the confirmation by a vote of 77-16. [Senate Vote 133, [6/4/19](#); Congressional Quarterly, [6/4/19](#); Congressional Actions, [PN94](#)]

- **Saul Had Ties To The Manhattan Institute, Which Criticized Social Security.** According to Social Security Works, “[Saul] did, however, serve on the board of the right-wing Manhattan Institute which has consistently been hostile to Social Security, including publishing articles advocating for drastic cuts to benefits.” [Social Security Works, [10/1/18](#)]
- **Saul Had No Work Experience Related To Social Security.** According to the Strengthen Social Security Coalition, “Mr. Saul has no previous work experience related to Social Security or SSA. While the experience Mr. Saul gained from his time working on the federal thrift savings plan (TSP) was undoubtedly valuable, it has little value to helping him run the Social Security system, unless he seeks to privatize the program.” [Strengthen Social Security Coalition, [9/25/18](#)]

Rubio’s “New Parents Act” Would Have Forced Parents To Take Money Out Of Their Future Social Security Earnings To Pay For Parental Leave

RUBIO INTRODUCED THE “ECONOMIC SECURITY FOR NEW PARENTS ACT”

Rubio Introduced Legislation Which Would Have Given Parents The Option To Pull A Portion Of Future Social Security Benefits To Finance Paid Parental Leave According to the Washington Post, “Sen. Marco Rubio unveiled legislation Thursday to provide paid leave to new parents by drawing from their future Social Security payments. The senator and 2016 GOP presidential candidate from Florida touted the plan as a novel approach to an issue on which Congress has not taken significant action, despite high-profile involvement by Ivanka Trump. ‘This is important legislation. It is also unique,’ Rubio said at a news conference at the Capitol. ‘This is a dramatic readjustment of the way we deal with economic insecurity in the modern era.’ Rubio’s bill would allow parents of newborns to receive a Social Security benefit paying a portion of their

wages for at least two months. Later in life, they would delay the date at which they begin receiving Social Security retirement benefits to make up for the amount withdrawn during their leave.” [Washington Post, [8//18](#)]

Rubio’s Legislation Would Have Given Parents A Benefit Roughly Equal To The Amount They Would Have Given Up Later In Exchange For Delaying Their Retirement By Three To Six Months. According to an op-ed in USA Today from Marco Rubio and Ann Wagner, “This week, Senator Marco Rubio is introducing the Economic Security for New Parents Act, which would give parents the option to pull a portion of their future Social Security benefits to finance paid parental leave. In exchange for delaying their retirement by three to six months, parents would receive a benefit roughly equal to the amount they’re giving up later. Rep. Ann Wagner will introduce a similar proposal in the House in September. Like Social Security, the benefits under our plans would be most generous to working class families. Parents taking the option would receive monthly payments that will help cover costs like rent, groceries and new baby supplies during a time of significant income constraints. The benefit will also be transferable between parents in the household. And unlike other paid parental leave proposals, this option would be available to working and stay-at-home moms and dads alike.” [USA Today, Op-Ed- Marco Rubio and Ann Wagner, [8/1/18](#)]

RUBIO RENEWED HIS PROPOSAL TO PAY FOR PARENTAL LEAVE WITH FUTURE SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS AFTER THE OVERTURNING OF ROE V. WADE

After Roe v. Wade Was Overturned, Rubio Renewed His Plan To Force Parents To Sacrifice Future Social Security Benefits In Order To Pay For Family Leave. According to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, “In the wake of the recent Supreme Court decision overturning Roe v. Wade, Senator Marco Rubio has renewed his deeply flawed proposal that would force parents to choose between the paid leave they need to care for new babies and their future Social Security benefits. That proposal, which he and Senator Mitt Romney originally introduced in 2019, would undercut Social Security’s benefits and structure, weakening the retirement security it offers workers. The United States needs paid leave, but it shouldn’t be financed by cutting Social Security benefits. Under the Rubio proposal, parents opting for parental leave would face permanent cuts to their Social Security retirement benefits that ultimately would far exceed their parental leave benefits. The cuts would amount to their parental leave benefits plus decades of interest, as well as an additional reduction to cover the cost of the parental benefits provided to other parents who die or become disabled before they reach retirement and can’t repay their own leave benefits.” [Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, [7/5/22](#)]

Parents Who Took Three Periods Of Parental Leave Under Rubio’s Plan Would Lose Roughly 10% Of Their Lifetime Social Security Retirement Benefits

Parents Who Took Three Periods Of Parental Leave Under Rubio’s Plan Would Lose Roughly One-Tenth Of Their Lifetime Social Security Retirement Benefits. According to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, “All told, this amounts to losing about 3 to 4 percent of lifetime Social Security retirement benefits for each three months of leave. So parents who take three periods of parental leave (after three births or adoptions) would lose roughly one-tenth of their lifetime Social Security retirement benefits.” [Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, [7/5/22](#)]