

FACT: REHBERG PROPOSED PARTIAL PRIVATIZATION OF SOCIAL SECURITY

Rehberg “Said He Believes In Privately Investing Social Security Funds.” In June 2000, the AP reported: “Rehberg said he favored immediate prescription drug coverage for the needy and for others through insurance companies, and said he believes in privately investing Social Security funds. ‘I think that we can better manage our money,’ he said.” [AP, 10/12/00]

AP: “Rehberg Said People Ought to Have Right to Invest Their Social Security Payments in Mutual Funds.” As reported by the Associated Press, “Rehberg said people ought to have the right to invest their Social Security payments in mutual funds. This would mean accepting a certain level of risk, he said, but it would also assure that, if the investor died, the money would go to his or her family and not to the government. ‘We shouldn’t be propping up a failed system,’ Rehberg said.” [AP, 6/24/00]

“Rehberg Argued In Favor Of Partial Privatization Of Social Security.” In October 2000, the National Journal reported: “Rehberg argued in favor of partial privatization of Social Security, and Keenan came out as ‘adamantly opposing any such efforts.’” [National Journal, 10/12/00]

Rehberg “Supported Privatizing Social Security For Younger People.” In November 2000, the AP reported: “Rehberg, a rancher and former lieutenant governor who unsuccessfully tried to unseat Democratic U.S. Sen. Max Baucus in 1996, said his goals were to tap the growth potential of Montana’s resource industries and improve education. He supported privatizing Social Security for younger people and providing the elderly with prescription drug coverage through Medicare.” [AP, 11/8/00]

Rehberg Discussed “Controversial Plan to Let Younger Americans Invest Part of Their Social Security Contribution in Private Account.” As reported by the Great Falls Tribune, “Republican congressional candidate Denny Rehberg joked about the campaign, talked about the joys of fatherhood in his mid-40s and charmed a half-dozen Belt senior citizens. By the time he got to his party’s controversial plan to let younger Americans invest part of their Social Security contribution in a private account, nobody was alarmed.” [Great Falls Tribune, 10/18/2000]

Rehberg Explained Plan for Younger Workers to Invest Portion of Social Security Contributions in Private Fund. As reported by the Great Falls Tribune, “[Rehberg] approached the sensitive Social Security topic gingerly. There used to be 401 workers making contributions to Social Security for every recipient. Now the ratio is 31-to-1 and falling, so the country needs to find a way to make the system stable with better returns for younger generations, he said. The president, Congress and other federal workers already have a thrift plan, in which they choose investment options for their retirement money. “If it’s good enough for them, it should be good enough for the rest of us,” he said. Rehberg explained the Republican plan, in which younger workers could invest a small portion of their Social Security contributions in a private fund. People who are now under Social Security or soon will be would not be affected, he said.” [Great Falls Tribune, 10/18/2000]

Rehberg Signed DeMint Letter Supporting Privatization of Social Security. In 2001, Rehberg signed a letter to the President’s Commission to Strengthen Social Security urging support for privatization. In the letter, Rep. Gutknecht wrote to the Commission: “Social Security reform must offer younger workers the opportunity to improve their rates of return using personal retirement accounts. [DeMint White Paper, “DeMint Solution to Save Social Security”]

“Rehberg Said He Agrees With GOP Presidential Candidate George W. Bush’s Proposal to Start Letting People Invest Up to 2 Percent Privately.” As reported by the Great Falls Tribune, “On other matters, Rehberg said: The Social Security system needs to be preserved and protected to honor the commitment to retirees and older workers, but Congress should give younger workers the option of investing part of their retirement funds privately, as federal employees now do. Rehberg said he agrees with GOP presidential candidate

George W. Bush' proposal to start by letting people invest up to 2 percent privately. Young people, who aren't sure Social Security will be there for them, could earn a greater return that way, Rehberg said." [[Great Falls Tribune](#), "Rehberg hits campaign themes at Pachyderm Club," 07/28/00]

Rehberg Supported "Private Alternatives" to Reduce Dependence on Social Security. According to the [Great Falls Tribune](#), "Rehberg wants to encourage private alternatives to Social Security, in the hopes that people will become less dependent on Social Security. Once that dependence lessens, social security taxes could be reduced and the program reduced, he says." [[Great Falls Tribune](#), 5/12/96]

Rehberg Proposed Allowing Senior Citizens Instead to Set Money Aside in an Account, Let People Take It Out for Various Purposes. During a 1996 Senate debate in Livingston, Rehberg said a better idea for Social Security would be allowing senior citizens to set money aside and take money out along the way for different expenses. REHBERG: I think a better idea is the American Dream IRA where we allow senior citizens to set money aside, after tax dollars, up to \$2000 per individual, \$4000 per couple. Put it in an account. If it stays there at least 5 years they can take it out once they rec...re...reach the age of 59 and a half. We'll have some relief. If they need it for medical costs, they can take it out. If they need it for a home, they're a first time home buyer, let them do that as well. If they need it for educational opportunities let them retrieve it. But let people keep some of what they earn. Don't make them so dependent on Social Security. I cannot, once again, look my kids in the eye and know, for sure with any certainty that Social Security is going to be there. We must now start begin talking about alternatives for the next generation and protect those that believe it is gonna be there for them now. [Baucus/Rehberg Livingston Senate Debate, 6/22/1996]

Rehberg Called Social Security "A Failed System." In June 2000, the Associated Press reported that Rehberg said people ought to have the right to invest their Social Security payments in mutual funds. This would mean accepting a certain level of risk, he said, but it would also assure that, if the investor died, the money would go to his or her family and not to the government. "We shouldn't be propping up a failed system," Rehberg said. [AP, 06/24/00]

2005: Rehberg Voted Against Prohibiting Social Security Dollars to Be Diverted to Create Private Accounts. In 2005, Rehberg voted against a Democratic proposal to add a provision to the budget resolution stipulating that money from the Social Security Trust Fund could not be diverted to create private investment accounts. [HCR 154, [Vote 78](#), 3/16/05; Associated Press, 3/16/05]

Rehberg Voted Against Protecting Social Security and Medicare Benefits from Privatization. In March 2011, Rehberg voted against a measure that would have prohibited continuing appropriations funds for fiscal year 2011 for being used in developing or implementing a system that cuts Social Security benefits or that privatizes Social Security. The amendment also prohibited funds from being used to develop or implement a system that cuts Medicare benefits, eliminates guaranteed health coverage for seniors or establishes a Medicare voucher plan that limits payments to beneficiaries in order to purchase health care in the private sector. The motion failed 190-239. [HJR 48, [Vote 178](#), 2/15/11]

SOCIAL SECURITY PLANS THAT DIVERT MONEY INTO PRIVATE ACCOUNTS WILL FORCE BENEFIT CUTS

CBO Estimated That A Social Security Plan That Diverts Money Into Private Accounts Will Force Benefit Cuts. According to non-partisan Congressional Budget Office, President Bush's private accounts plan "would reduce expected retirement benefits relative to scheduled benefits, even when the benefits paid from IAs [individual accounts] under CSSS Plan 2 are included... For example, benefits for the 1980s birth cohort would be 30 percent lower, and benefits for the 2000s cohort would be 45 percent lower." [CBO, "Long-term Analysis of Plan 2 of the President's Commission to Strengthen Social Security," 7/21/2004, page 15 and Table 2]

National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare: Partial Privatization “Likely to Reduce Benefits, Even for People Who Do Not Opt for Private Accounts.” According to a press release issued by the National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare, ““The partial privatization of Social Security is likely to reduce benefits, even for people who do not opt for private accounts,” Barbara B. Kennelly, President and Chief Executive Officer of the National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare told a Spring Hill, Florida audience. ‘Diverting payroll taxes into individual retirement accounts reduce benefits for most beneficiaries and make long-term Social Security solvency more difficult to achieve,’ she told an audience at a forum on Social Security reform sponsored by Rep. Karen Thurman (D-Fla.). Kennelly was the ranking member of the Ways & Means Social Security Subcommittee from 1994 to 1998 and was a top-ranking official at the Social Security Administration from 1999-2000.” [National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare, 7/1/2002]

“Privatization Could Force Cuts in Guaranteed Benefits and the Disability and Survivor Programs.” As reported by the Boston Globe, “A crucial question for the poor is how private accounts would affect the underlying Social Security structure. Privatization could force cuts in guaranteed retirement benefits and the disability and survivor programs, which provide financial support to millions of people. ‘The potential benefit is that [private accounts] may stimulate the ethic of developing assets, and it could potentially lead to a bequest,’ said Craig Copeland, senior researcher at the Employee Benefit Research Institute. ‘No one has really worked on what exactly is the tradeoff’ in terms of reducing guaranteed benefits.” [Boston Globe, 1/28/2001]

New York Times: “Diverting Portion of Payroll Taxes Into Private Accounts Would Greatly Accelerate Exhaustion of Social Security Fund.” According to the New York Times editorial board: “If Congress faced that kind of crisis, it’s safe to assume that everything would be on the table, including Social Security retirement benefits. This would be especially true if such a crisis were provoked by privatization. The reason: diverting a portion of payroll taxes into private accounts -- the centerpiece of Mr. Bush’s privatization scheme -- would greatly accelerate the exhaustion of the Social Security trust fund, unless the government made huge transfusions of other tax revenue into the fund. It could be difficult to justify such transfers if the economy were in dire straits. A dwindling trust fund, in turn, could create a political dynamic for benefit cuts that would be hard to resist.” [New York Times, Editorial, 1/24/2005]

New York Times: Privatization Would Require Debilitating National Borrowing Up Front, Drastically Reduced Social Security Benefits Later On. According to the New York Times editorial board: “Despite the risks to their own economic well-being in retirement, some older Americans might be willing to support Social Security privatization if it would ensure a stable retirement for their children and grandchildren. But it wouldn’t. Privatization would require potentially debilitating borrowing up front, in exchange for a drastically reduced benefit later on, no matter how well, or poorly, private accounts performed. So there’s no reason for senior citizens to support it and plenty of reasons to oppose it. Mr. Bush is wily, and wrong, when he tries to dismiss older Americans from the debate.” [New York Times, Editorial, 1/24/2005]

FACT: REHBERG SUPPORTED PLAN THAT WOULD FORCE DEEP CUTS TO SOCIAL SECURITY

Rehberg Voted For Cut, Cap and Balance Plan to Force Deep Cuts to Social Security. In July 2011, Rehberg voted for the Cut, Cap and Balance Act, which CNN reported “would impose strict caps on all future federal spending while making it significantly tougher to raise taxes -- the solution favored by hard-line conservatives.” [HR 2560, Vote 606, [7/19/11](#); CNN, [7/19/11](#)]

Cut, Cap and Balance “Is Simply Massive Cuts to Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid By Another Name.” 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, [7/18/2011](#)]

- **CBPP: “Claim That Social Security and Medicare Would Not Be Touched Falls Apart Under Scrutiny.”** According to a Center on Budget and Policy Priorities statement on the Cut, Cap and Balance Plan, “Talking points that the legislation’s proponents circulated on July 15 seek to foster an impression that the measure would protect Social Security and Medicare. Such an impression would not be accurate. The legislation would inexorably subject Social Security and Medicare to deep reductions.” [CBPP, [7/16/11](#)]

HEADLINE – Republican ‘Cut, Cap, and Balance’ Plan Would Require a 25 Percent Cut in Every Government Program. [Think Progress, [7/18/2011](#)]

- **Cut, Cap and Balance “Would Require a 25 Percent Cut to Everything in the Federal Budget – From Social Security to Veterans’ Benefits to the Pentagon to Education.”** According to the Center for American Progress, “Of that \$4.4 trillion in 2016, about \$520 billion will be interest payments on the debt—an area Congress can’t directly cut. That leaves about \$3.9 trillion in noninterest spending, from which Congress would have to slash about \$1 trillion in order to bring total spending down to 18 percent of GDP. This would require a 25 percent cut to everything in the federal budget—from Social Security to veterans’ benefits to the Pentagon to education. Congress could try to protect some programs from such severe reductions but then, of course, other areas would have to be slashed even more.” [Center for American Progress, [7/18/2011](#)]

AARP Opposed Cut, Cap and Balance Because It Did Not Shield Social Security and Medicare From “Arbitrary Reductions.” In a July 2011 letter to Senators, AARP CEO Addison Barry Rand wrote, “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](#)]

Center for American Progress: “Level of Cuts Required Is So Dramatic, So Draconian, That Any Way You Slice It, Congress Would End Up Making Severe Cuts To Some Very Important Programs.” In a July 2012 report on the Cut, Cap and Balance Plan, the Center for American Progress stated, “Capping federal spending at 18 percent of GDP—a level not seen in half a century—would actually require cuts that are even larger than those in the original House Republican budget plan. The last time federal spending dipped below 18 percent of GDP was 1966 ... Even the budget passed by the Republican-led House, with all its draconian cuts to Medicare and Medicaid, keeps spending above 18 percent of GDP for the next 30 years ... But it turns out that the level of cuts required is so dramatic, so draconian, that any way you slice it, Congress would end up making severe cuts to some very important programs.” [Center For American Progress, [7/18/12](#)]

Rehberg on Deficit Reduction: “Everything Ought to Be Looked At, As Well as Medicare and Social Security.” During an April 2011 listening session in Columbus, Rehberg said “everything ought to be looked at as well as Medicare and Social Security” in deficit reduction discussions. DR: And so, I don't like the statement where you need to look at all discretionary funding except Defense and Homeland Security because I think the American public wants value for their dollar and everything ought to be looked at as well as Medicare and Social Security. We want to protect Medicare and Social Security so it's there for many years to come. And that's where we have to look at the efficiencies, creating effectiveness, and once again, it's coming from taxpayer dollars we want to know it's going the right way, to the right people, in a timely fashion. [Columbus Listening Session, 4/26/2011, Video Footage]

FACT: REHBERG SUPPORTED RAIDING THE SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUND... TO PAY FOR TAX BREAKS FOR MILLIONAIRES

Rehberg Supported Spending Every Penny of the Social Security Trust Fund. In 2005, Rehberg voted in favor of a budget conference report that spends \$1.1 trillion of the Social Security Trust Fund over five years to pay for other government spending. According to the non-partisan Congressional Quarterly, “the budget deficits in the conference agreement are produced, however, only by using surpluses in the Social Security trust fund.” “Without counting these Social Security surpluses, the deficit would be much larger. If the Social Security funds are excluded, the FY 2006 deficit under the conference agreement would be \$571.5 billion, instead of \$382.7 billion, and the FY 2010 deficit would be \$470.8 billion, instead of \$210.9 billion. Over the five-year period, the agreement counts \$1.1 trillion in Social Security funds to produce these deficits.” The budget agreement passed, 214-211. [CQ House Action Reports, “The Budget Agreement,” 4/28/05; HCR 95, [Vote 149](#), 4/28/05]

Rehberg Supported Raiding the Social Security Trust Fund. In 2005, Rehberg voted in favor of a GOP budget resolution to raid the Social Security Trust Fund of more than \$1.1 trillion over the following five years. According to the non-partisan Congressional Quarterly House Action Reports, the GOP budget, “projects spending and revenues that would result in budget deficits for all five years covered by the resolution ... surpluses in Social Security would offset spending on other programs ... Without counting these Social Security surpluses, the deficits would be much larger . . . Over the five-year period, the budget resolution counts \$1.1 trillion in Social Security funds to produce these deficits.” The budget passed the House, 218-214. [CQ House Action Reports, “Budget Resolution for FY 2006,” 3/14/05; HCR 95, [Vote 88](#), 3/17/05]

Rehberg Opposed Proposal to Balance Budget & Protect Social Security. In 2005, Rehberg voted against a budget plan to balance the budget by 2012 and implement budget enforcement procedures (pay-go) to block additional spending or tax cuts that require further borrowing from the Social Security trust fund. Compared to the Republican budget, the Democratic alternative provided \$41 billion more for education and training programs over five years, \$17 billion more for veterans and \$9 billion more than the GOP budget for community and regional development efforts such as Community Development Block Grants. The alternative was defeated 165-264. [House Budget Committee Democratic Caucus, Fact Sheets for House Consideration of the 2006 Budget, 3/16/05; HCR 95, [Vote 87](#), 3/17/05]

Rehberg Voted For \$350 Billion Tax Cut For The Rich While Raiding the Social Security Trust Fund. In 2003, Rehberg voted for an irresponsible tax cut package that deepened the nation’s fiscal crisis and left middle-income households out in the cold. Some 53% of all U.S. households would receive a tax cut of \$100 or less in 2003, while 36% of households would receive no tax cut at all. At the same time, tax filers who make \$1 million or more per year would receive an average tax cut in 2003 of \$93,500. Former Sen. Tom Daschle argued that the bill “is steeply tilted against the middle class and the poor and gives huge tax breaks to the privileged few by spending the Social Security Trust Fund.” The bill passed 231-200. [HR 2, [Vote 225](#), 5/23/03; Center for Budget & Policy Priorities, 5/28/03; UPI, 5/28/03]

Rehberg Voted For \$550 Billion Tax Cut Favoring Corporations & Wealthy At Expense Of the Social Security Trust Fund. In 2003, Rehberg voted for tax cuts that would give the majority of the benefit to the wealthiest people in the country. Taxpayers with incomes of more than \$1 million would receive average tax cuts of \$93,500 in 2003, while the middle fifth of households would receive an average tax cut of just \$217. House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi said the \$550 billion plan “irresponsibly piles up debt; it raids the Social Security Trust Fund to pay for massive tax cuts for the wealthy; and it continues the failed economic policies that do nothing to pull us out of our current slump.” The bill passed 222-203. [HR 2, [Vote 182](#), 5/09/03; Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, 5/21/03; Washington Post, 5/07/03]

Rehberg Voted To “Spend Every Penny of the Social Security Trust Fund” on Risky Tax Cuts. In 2003,

Rehberg voted for a budget resolution containing deep cuts in basic domestic programs, including \$92 billion from Medicaid and \$14 billion from veterans programs, to make room for almost all of President Bush's \$1.4 trillion in tax cuts. House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi argued, "The Republican budget spends every penny of the Social Security Trust Fund." The non-binding resolution passed the House 215-212. [HCR 95, [Vote 82](#), 3/21/03; Center for Budget & Policy Priorities, 3/28/03, 3/24/03; Capitol Hill Press Releases, 3/13/03]

Rehberg Supported Spending 86 Percent of Social Security Surplus. In 2002, Rehberg voted in favor of a budget that the Office of Management and Budget said would spend 86 percent of the Social Security over the fiscal year plus the following five-year budget window (2002 through 2007). In total, the Republican plan called for raiding \$2 trillion from the Social Security Trust Fund surplus. The budget resolution passed 221-209. [House Budget Committee, Democratic Caucus, 3/20/02; House Budget Committee, Minority Caucus, 10/25/02; HCR 353, [Vote 79](#), 3/20/02]

Rehberg Supported Republicans' \$600 Billion Raid of Social Security. In 2001, Rehberg voted in favor of a budget that called for using about \$600 billion of the Social Security surplus to fund new privatized retirement accounts for stock market investment. The budget resolution passed 221-207. Rehberg also voted in favor of the previous version of resolution. The budget passed 222-205. [House Budget Committee, Democratic Caucus, 3/27/01; HCR 83, [Vote 104](#), 5/09/01; HCR 83, [Vote 70](#), 3/28/01]

Rehberg Supported Budget Busting Tax Cut for the Wealthy, Raid on Social Security. In 2001, Rehberg voted in favor of the Bush tax cut package that reduced taxes by \$1.35 trillion through 2010 through income tax cuts, relief of the marriage penalty, a phase-out of the federal estate tax doubling the child tax credit, and providing incentives for retirement savings. Critics of the bill warned that the tax cut was too large and would jeopardize future Social Security benefits. According to the [Wall Street Journal](#), the entire Social Security Trust Fund will be used "to fund the government over the next two years," while "well over \$100 billion of Social Security funds in each of the following three years" will be used for other purposes. Over the next ten years, more than \$1.8 trillion of the Social Security Trust Funds will be spent on other purposes. The bill passed 240-154. [[Wall Street Journal](#), 2/5/02, Congressional Budget Office; Campaign for America's Future; HR 1836, [Vote 149](#), 5/26/01]

REHBERG OPPOSED \$250 FOR ALL MONTANA SENIORS ON SOCIAL SECURITY TO MAKE ENDS MEET IN TOUGH TIMES

Rehberg Voted Against Providing Additional Payment to Social Security Recipients. In 2010, Rehberg voted against providing a one-time \$250 payment to Social Security recipients who otherwise would not receive a 2011 cost-of-living adjustment. Democrats argued that hard economic times justified the additional assistance and despite inflation being too low to trigger an automatic payment, prices had gone up on many items most important to Social Security recipients, like home heating oil and prescription drugs. "At a time when Congress is considering measures that would provide vast amounts of relief to the wealthiest who need it the least, you would think we'd be able to [win] support for \$250 to seniors living on Social Security checks unable to meet their expenses," said Rep. Earl Pomeroy. Republicans argued that the payments were simply unnecessary and would only increase the deficit and national debt. The measure failed to receive two-thirds support and was rejected, 254-153. [CQ Today, [12/08/10](#); HR 5987, [Vote 611](#), 12/08/10]

REHBERG CUT SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION BY \$764 MILLION

REHBERG CUT ALLOWS \$6 BILLION IN WASTE AND FRAUD

Rehberg's Labor-HHS Budget Cuts Social Security Administration By \$764 Million. In July 2012, [The Hill](#) reported: "But other areas are slashed. The bill ends Obama's signature Race to the Top education initiative and cuts millions from advanced appropriations for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, which funds NPR and PBS. The agency that monitors child labor abroad is cut by 68 percent and the agency that distributes Social Security payments gets cut by \$764 million. The Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services gets \$1.4 billion less than Obama was seeking and the bill prevents it from implementing 'Obamacare' including setting up a new Center for Consumer Information and Insurance Oversight." [[The Hill](#), [7/17/12](#)]

HEADLINE – Social Security Cut \$750 Million Could End Up Costing \$6 Billion. [[Huffington Post](#), [7/26/12](#)]

Rehberg's Cut to Social Security Administration Could End Up Costing Social Security \$6 Billion in Increased Waste And Fraud. In July 2012, the [Huffington Post](#) reported: "A Republican push to cut Social Security integrity efforts by \$750 million could end up costing \$6 billion in increased waste and fraud, according to the independent official who monitors the program. The House Republican budget appropriation for Social Security proposes to spend \$272 million on 'program integrity' -- a huge cut from the more than \$1.024 billion that Congress agreed last year to spend combating waste in Social Security disability." [[Huffington Post](#), [7/26/12](#)]

Rehberg's Cut To Social Security Funding "Is Particularly Ironic" Given Republicans' Claims That Social Security Is Increasingly Bloated By Fraudulent Claims. In July 2012, the [Huffington Post](#) reported: "The proposed cut is particularly ironic because a growing chorus of Republicans have alleged that the disability system is increasingly bloated by fraudulent claimants. Disability rolls have indeed swelled with the aging of the Baby Boom and an economy that makes it harder for the disabled to find work. But the increased integrity efforts were supposed to help trim costs. According to the actuary, each dollar spent on disability reviews saves \$6, and each \$1 spent on SSI redeterminations saves \$9." [[Huffington Post](#), [7/26/12](#)]