

the House Republican budget would end Medicare as we know it for future generations. The House Republican budget would increase costs for current beneficiaries right away, and the House Republican budget would do real damage to seniors across this country and in my home State of Rhode Island.

With gas prices at near-record highs and unemployment numbers still in double digits, most folks are focused on making ends meet. They deserve a budget that will improve the economic opportunity in our country, balance our budget, and maintain Medicare, Medicaid, and other programs on which so many Americans rely. The House Republican budget fails every one of these tests. It ends Medicare, it lowers taxes for most corporations and the most fortunate, who too often already pay lower tax rates than the average American, all while failing to balance the budget.

The House Budget Committee chairman has claimed that "our budget makes no changes for those in or near retirement." This claim that this budget resolution will not affect Americans who are already retired is simply flatout false. The House budget reopens the Medicare Part D doughnut hole that we closed in the reform bill. That will cost nearly 17,000 Rhode Island seniors, in 2012 alone, nearly \$9.5 million out of pocket.

Seniors at the DaVinci Center in Providence, The Meadows in North Smithfield, and so many other places have gone without a cost-of-living adjustment in their Social Security benefits for 2 straight years even as costs have steadily risen at the pharmacy, at the grocery store, and at the gas pump. Taking away their prescription drug assistance, charging them an additional \$9.5 million hits them too hard and too soon—in 2012, literally right away.

The Republican budget also ends Medicare as we know it for future generations. Planning to retire in 11 years? No Medicare. You instead will be forced to buy private health insurance from insurance companies standing between you and your doctors instead of the reliable, affordable insurance provided by Medicare.

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office has estimated this would double what retirees would pay out of pocket under the current system—more than \$6,000 extra for retirees.

The Republican attack on Medicare overlooks a basic fact—that all health care costs are skyrocketing, irrespective of who the insurer is. Recently, Defense Secretary Gates said, "Everybody knows that we are being eaten alive by health care." There is a cost problem in health care, but attacking Medicare fundamentally misdiagnoses the problem. But that is another speech.

I recently held an official Senate Aging Committee hearing at the Johnston Senior Center in Rhode Island to give Rhode Islanders the chance to

make their voices heard. Audrey Brett, a Middletown resident who relies on Social Security and Medicare, said this:

For all those Americans who worked, paid their taxes, added to the betterment of the country, served in military and civil service—we cannot let them live and die in poverty. We owe them their final days of security and dignity.

Audrey is right. But the Republican budget gets rid of that promise of security and dignity contained in Medicare. Medicare as we know it is lost. Here is what is protected: low taxes for the superrich, who already pay lower tax rates than the average taxpaying American family—protected; low taxes for many large corporations, which for too long have been gaming the system and paying too little—protected. And remember, the Republicans just voted last week to protect Big Oil tax subsidies.

Wreck Medicare but protect those tax cuts and subsidies. Those are not America's priorities. Let's put real priorities first—Medicare and allowing our seniors to enjoy a stable and dignified retirement.

I see the majority leader on the floor. I yield back the remainder of my time.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BEGICH). The majority leader.

MR. REID. Mr. President, it is my understanding that we have 5 minutes. I will take that time.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The leader is recognized.

MR. REID. Mr. President, the vote we are going to have shortly is about more than just public policy; it is about priorities, about whether we hold fast to our values or break our promises.

There is a lot wrong with the House Republican budget on which Senators are about to cast their vote. But the most irresponsible and indefensible is a radical plan to end Medicare as we have known it. Doing so would break a solemn promise between our society and our seniors. It is a promise that for more than four decades has saved seniors from poverty, illness, and worse.

The promise of Medicare is this: If you work hard and contribute, America will make sure you are protected in your golden years from the hardships of affording health care. The Republican budget would break this promise. It would make life significantly more difficult and painful for America's seniors. It is as simple and as serious as that.

The Republican plan would kill Medicare. Even the conservative Wall Street Journal admitted this, even though most Republican U.S. Senators still refuse to face this reality; that is, as the Wall Street Journal said, the Republican plan would kill Medicare.

Here is what it would do. It would turn over seniors' health to profit-hungry insurance companies. It would let bureaucrats decide what tests and treatments seniors get. It would ask seniors to pay more for their benefits, for their health care, charging every

senior \$6,000 more every year in exchange for fewer benefits. That is a bad deal all around.

Those voting for this Republican plan would be forcing seniors in Nevada to pay more than twice as much as they pay today in out-of-pocket costs. Sadly, that is just not a Nevada problem, it is an Alaska problem, too, and a problem that faces every State in the Union—\$6,000 more for every senior.

Those voting for the Republican plan to kill Medicare would be voting to reopen the doughnut hole we closed to help seniors afford expensive prescription drugs. Opening the doughnut hole would send drug prices literally through the roof, costing, for example, 27,000 seniors in Nevada and every other State thousands of dollars more between now and the year 2020.

Those voting for the Republican plan to kill Medicare would also be forcing our seniors to pay almost a million dollars more for annual wellness visits that we put in our health care bill, and it would make it harder for seniors to access nursing home and long-term care. It would make at least 34 million more Americans uninsured.

The Republican plan to kill Medicare was written in the name of saving money. Listen to this, Mr. President. It costs seniors so much money that it doesn't do anything they said it would do. One study found that seniors would spend \$14 more for every dollar the government saves. That is 14 to 1 in the wrong direction. That is not effective economics anyplace. It is certainly not worth endangering the health of our seniors.

The Republican plan is a plan that tries to balance the budget literally on the backs of America's seniors. This is a clear window into the other party's priorities, though. While it asks seniors to pay more and more, it allows the wealthiest to pay less and less. It gives even more tax breaks to those who need it the least—oil companies, billionaires, and multinational companies that ship jobs overseas.

It comes down to this: The Republican plan to kill Medicare is a plan to make the rich richer and the sick sicker. A well-worn metaphor characterizes the Senate as a saucer, a deliberative body that cools the intense heat and occasional zeal of the House of Representatives. In voting down the radical Republican House-passed plan in Medicare, and keeping our priorities straight, and keeping our promise to our seniors, we are bringing that image to life that our Founding Fathers had of this great body, the United States Senate.

ESTABLISHING THE BUDGET FOR THE U.S. GOVERNMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012—MOTION TO PROCEED

MR. REID. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 36, H. Con. Res. 34, and I ask for the yeas and nays on my motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) would vote "nay."

Mr. KYL. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WHITEHOUSE). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 57, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 77 Leg.]

YEAS—40

Alexander	Enzi	McCain
Ayotte	Graham	McConnell
Barrasso	Grassley	Moran
Blunt	Hatch	Portman
Boozman	Heller	Risch
Burr	Hoeven	Rubio
Chambliss	Inhofe	Sessions
Coats	Isakson	Shelby
Coburn	Johanns	Thune
Cochran	Johnson (WI)	Toomey
Corker	Kirk	Vitter
Cornyn	Kyl	Wicker
Crapo	Lee	
DeMint	Lugar	

NAYS—57

Akaka	Gillibrand	Murray
Baucus	Hagan	Nelson (NE)
Begich	Harkin	Nelson (FL)
Bennet	Inouye	Paul
Bingaman	Johnson (SD)	Pryor
Blumenthal	Kerry	Reed
Boxer	Klobuchar	Reid
Brown (MA)	Kohl	Rockefeller
Brown (OH)	Landrieu	Sanders
Cantwell	Lautenberg	Shaheen
Cardin	Leahy	Snowe
Carper	Levin	Stabenow
Casey	Lieberman	Tester
Collins	Manchin	Udall (CO)
Conrad	McCaskill	Udall (NM)
Coons	Menendez	Warner
Durbin	Merkley	Webb
Feinstein	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Franken	Murkowski	Wyden

NOT VOTING—3

Hutchison Roberts Schumer

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader.

SETTING FORTH THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET REQUEST FOR THE U.S. GOVERNMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to S. Con. Res. 18, a resolution setting forth the President's budget, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) would vote "nay."

Mr. KYL. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANCHIN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 0, nays 97, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 78 Leg.]

NAYS—97

Akaka	Franken	Mikulski
Alexander	Gillibrand	Moran
Ayotte	Graham	Murkowski
Barrasso	Grassley	Murray
Baucus	Hagan	Nelson (NE)
Begich	Harkin	Nelson (FL)
Bennet	Hatch	Paul
Bingaman	Heller	Portman
Blumenthal	Hoeven	Pryor
Blunt	Inhofe	Reed
Boozman	Inouye	Reid
Boxer	Isakson	Risch
Brown (MA)	Johanns	Rockefeller
Brown (OH)	Johnson (SD)	Rubio
Burr	Johnson (WI)	Sanders
Cantwell	Kerry	Sessions
Cardin	Kirk	Shaheen
Carper	Klobuchar	Shelby
Casey	Kohl	Snowe
Chambliss	Kyl	Stabenow
Coats	Landrieu	Tester
Coburn	Lautenberg	Thune
Cochran	Leahy	Toomey
Collins	Lee	Udall (CO)
Conrad	Levin	Udall (NM)
Coons	Lieberman	Vitter
Corker	Lugar	Warner
Cornyn	Manchin	Webb
Crapo	McCain	Whitehouse
DeMint	McCaskill	Wicker
Durbin	McConnell	Wyden
Enzi	Menendez	
Feinstein	Merkeley	

NOT VOTING—3

Hutchison Roberts Schumer

The motion was rejected.

SETTING FORTH THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET FOR THE U.S. GOVERNMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012—MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, for the information of everyone, this next vote will be a 10-minute vote, and the next will be a 10-minute vote, so I wouldn't go too far from the floor.

I move to proceed to S. Con. Res. 21, a resolution submitted by Senator TOOMEY setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator seek to limit the vote to 10 minutes?

Mr. MCCONNELL. A 10-minute vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the following votes will be 10-minute votes.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Did we get the yeas and nays?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) would vote "nay."

Mr. KYL. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 55, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 79 Leg.]

YEAS—42

Alexander	Enzi	McCain
Ayotte	Graham	McConnell
Barrasso	Grassley	Moran
Blunt	Hatch	Murkowski
Boozman	Heller	Paul
Burr	Hoeven	Portman
Chambliss	Inhofe	Risch
Coats	Isakson	Rubio
Coburn	Johanns	Sessions
Cochran	Johnson (WI)	Shelby
Corker	Kirk	Thune
Cornyn	Kyl	Toomey
Crapo	Lee	Vitter
DeMint	Lugar	Wicker

NAYS—55

Akaka	Gillibrand	Nelson (NE)
Baucus	Hagan	Nelson (FL)
Begich	Harkin	Pryor
Bennet	Inouye	Reed
Bingaman	Johnson (SD)	Reid
Blumenthal	Kerry	Rockefeller
Boxer	Klobuchar	Sanders
Brown (MA)	Kohl	Shaheen
Brown (OH)	Landrieu	Snowe
Cantwell	Lautenberg	Stabenow
Cardin	Leahy	Tester
Carper	Levin	Udall (CO)
Casey	Lieberman	Udall (NM)
Collins	Manchin	Warner
Conrad	McCaskill	Webb
Coons	Menendez	Whitehouse
Durbin	Merkeley	Wyden
Feinstein	Mikulski	
Franken	Murray	

NOT VOTING—3

Hutchison Roberts Schumer

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader.

SETTING FORTH THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET FOR THE U.S. GOVERNMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the next vote be a 10-minute vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to S. Con. Res. 20, a resolution submitted by Senator PAUL, setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) would vote "nay."