

would take us down the path toward government-mandated and government-run retirement plans. That is not really hyperbole. That is essentially the stated purpose of these types of regulations.

The current retirement savings system clearly demonstrates the superiority of the free market over government mandates when it comes to government savings. Private retirement savings vehicles, like 401(k)s and IRAs that have been encouraged but not mandated by Federal laws have produced nearly \$14 trillion in wealth and savings for the middle class.

Let me repeat that. Private retirement savings vehicles, with encouragements and investor protections but not mandates, have produced nearly \$14 trillion in wealth and savings for middle-class Americans.

I agree that we need to enhance this system to give more workers access and incentives to participate, but there is absolutely no justification for any effort to reinvent the retirement savings system in order to give primacy to government-run plans. I can only wonder why States think they will be able to produce better results than the private retirement savings system, which has been an unqualified success. I have to wonder how some of my colleagues who value consumer financial protection, as I do, would want to see abandonment of rules, under the guise of a safe harbor, that erode protections for the savings of workers and future retirees.

We can do our part to undo this harmful regulation by passing H.J. Res 66. Toward that end, I urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of this resolution.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

TRUMPCARE

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, a note on healthcare.

As the House Republican caucus continues their effort to revive TrumpCare, I just want to remind my friends in the House of a few things.

First, for all the significant changes House Republicans are proposing to the bill, it would still cause premiums and deductibles to rise, it will still jack up the costs on low-income and older Americans, and, most importantly, it doesn't change a thing about the 24 million fewer Americans who would get healthcare. It may actually increase that number, but it certainly will not decrease it.

Second, it is unwise and irresponsible to rush through a brandnew bill without a new CBO score, without committee hearings, and without any debate on the floor of the House. If this thing were so good, why wouldn't there

be open debate? Why wouldn't there be discussion? I hope, if the bill gets to the Senate—I don't know if it will. I hope it doesn't, but if it does, I hope we will not mimic the House, have no committees, no hearings, no CBO score, not much debate. That would be very wrong.

Third, even if the new version of TrumpCare passes the House—we hope it doesn't—its chances for survival in the Senate are small. We don't even know if the new version would survive under the rules of reconciliation.

The amendment to allow States to drop preexisting condition requirements, for instance, very possibly violates the Byrd rule. If the moderate group in the House gets an additional amendment to deal with the very same issue, that may violate the Byrd rule as well because if Republicans try to throw money at their problem, as it has been reported, they may end up violating the budget instructions to reduce the deficit, and they will not even know if it does violate the Byrd rule because, again, they will not have a CBO score.

As my friend, the Republican Senator from South Carolina, Mr. GRAHAM, said, talking about the TrumpCare bill, "I just don't see how you square the circle here. Some of the things the Freedom Caucus wants probably won't make it through the Senate."

The same is true for the group of moderates who are angling for more changes to the bill right now.

The reality is, TrumpCare cannot pass the Senate. So to my moderate Republican colleagues in the House, I ask: Why would you risk a "yes" vote for a bill that is devastating to your constituents and has virtually a minuscule chance—probably no chance—of becoming law?

Now, we Democrats—as we have said time and time again to both the President and to our Republican colleagues—are willing to work with you on ways to improve the Affordable Care Act and our healthcare system in general. Drop repeal, and then come talk to us about finding a bipartisan way forward. We are always willing to work in a bipartisan way, but, again, to repeat, "bipartisan" means talking to both sides and taking things from both sides, not just throwing a bill down and saying you have to support it. That is what bipartisanship is.

CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW ACT RESOLUTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, let me talk about the retirement CRA, the vote that is coming before us quite soon.

So far this Congress, the Republican majority has passed 13 CRAs—Congressional Review Act resolutions—all on party-line votes. Far from being a major accomplishment, these CRAs just overturn rules passed at the very end of the Obama administration. To make them a major accomplishment of

the first 100 days misreads what they are and history, when compared to many other Presidents. Most of them, to boot, even worse, rather than benefiting the American people, just benefit large, wealthy, special interests—not just this one but just about all of them. They are not for working people. They are not for middle-class Americans. If there is some narrow special interest that doesn't like it, then this Republican-led Congress goes along. It is not right. Let me give a few examples.

The Republicans passed a CRA that removed protections for our waters and streams from the harmful pollution that comes from the runoff of mining sites. Why? Large mining companies wanted it. The American people weren't crying out for it.

This Republican Congress passed a CRA that would make it easier for the adjudicated mentally ill to purchase firearms—a priority of the gun lobby, certainly not of the American people. They even passed a CRA that allowed large oil, mining, and gas companies to make payments to foreign governments—essentially bribes—without even having to disclose them.

That is not the America we know. That is not the Shining City on the Hill. That is not the lady in the harbor with a torch.

Today, the Republican majority is going to have a vote on another CRA. This one may be the worst of all because it would block initiatives by States to provide alternative retirement savings options for millions of Americans. Is that because Americans are clamoring: Take away my ability for retirement if my company doesn't give me one. No, we haven't heard a peep about that. It is because the private financial institutions—Wall Street—that manage retirement plans don't want to see any competition from city or State retirement plans. This is just another giveaway to the wealthy special interests that will hurt working Americans who should have more low-cost choices when it comes to their retirement.

We all know our Nation faces a serious retirement security problem. Pensions, often a guarantee for large numbers of Americans, are vanishing. New employers often don't provide pensions. Older employers' pension plans are running low. People who used to feel, when they retired, there would at least be something there so they could live their final years in dignity, are worried, as they should be. Fifty-five million working Americans do not have a way for retirement to save through their employer. That is nearly half—half—of all private sector workers aged 18 to 64. It is a huge concern.

So what did the Obama administration do in its last few months? Wisely, they said States could set up initiatives for employees to save through their employers' payroll systems. The Obama administration acted to allow States to pursue these initiatives by exempting them from overreaching

Federal regulations and then provided necessary consumer protections. That is what people want. Now, maybe some of these big financial interests don't want it because the plans the States head up will be a lot cheaper than the private sector plan, but we have to adapt to the 21st century. Any way we can help people with security in their golden years with retirement savings, we should.

Here is another issue. We hear a lot from our colleagues on the other side of the aisle about States' rights. This regulation doesn't force the States to do it. It allows the States to do it. It gives them a choice. This CRA vote would re-regulate the States.

My Republican friends—who spare no opportunity to decry regulation and exhort States' rights—will impose a new regulation on States from Washington. My Republican friends talk about increasing Americans' freedom of choice in all sorts of matters. What about their choice in terms of retirement, one of the most important things to the American people. Middle-class incomes are squeezed in so many different directions. It is harder to scrape and save for retirement when the cost of college, medicine, and other essentials go up while take-home pay is stagnant. It makes sense to give Americans a choice to start saving earlier, at a lower cost, for retirement. That is why 23 State Treasurers from States across the political spectrum—across Utah and Kentucky, our two speakers before me—have written to their Senators opposing this CRA. Red States and blue States alike want to pursue this option. Polling shows that across party lines, 77 percent of voters support State-facilitated retirement savings, but Republicans want to block it. We haven't heard one good reason—one good reason. We know the real reason. Financial institutions don't want competition, particularly if it is a little cheaper for the worker.

Another example of special interests taking hold of the Republican agenda: Almost every one of these CRAs has been at the behest of a narrow special interest over the interests of working Americans. Unfortunately, it is a metaphor for both the new Trump administration and how our Republican colleagues are marching in lockstep to support the wealthy—people doing great—over the middle class and working people who need help.

President Trump promised over and over again in his campaign to stick up for working Americans. He said he would be their voice and their champion. Since he has taken office, President Trump sure hasn't governed that way. He is pursuing policy after policy that would help the wealthy and hurt the middle class, breaking promise after promise after promise to working Americans. I ask him to veto this legislation.

Leader PELOSI and I are putting out a statement that asks just that. Stand up for working people. There is no good

argument against what the Obama administration did. There is no good argument against letting workers decide on their own volition that they want a retirement plan and are willing to put some money into it.

This CRA is another test. If our President and our Republican colleagues were truly a champion of working men and women, they wouldn't support this resolution. If President Trump were truly a champion of working men and women, he would veto this resolution. We call on him to do so.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMEMBERING ROSE LANDRY LONG

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I rise to pay honor to Rose Landry Long. This past week, the State of Louisiana lost a caring mother, loving grandmother, supportive spouse, and, to me, my wife, and so many back home, a dear friend. Rose Landry Long left us too soon, but she will always be remembered. My wife Laura and I had the pleasure of knowing Rose and her wonderful family for over 10 years. We taught two of her grandchildren in our Sunday school class.

Rose was born in Natchitoches, LA, to a French-speaking Cajun family. English was her second language. She graduated from Gueydan High School and became the first person from her family to attend college. There she met her husband, Gerald Long, at Northwestern State University.

A sidenote about Gerald: He is a member of the famous Long family, which includes Huey Long, Earl Long, Speedy Long, Jimmy Long, and many others—respectively, Senators, Governors, Congressmen, and State elected officials.

When Gerald was elected to the Louisiana Senate, Rose came to Baton Rouge and befriended everyone, Republicans and Democrats alike. Just out of being so concerned and loving toward others, she quickly became the center of activity and encouragement for so many. Rose had a way of reaching out to people, connecting with them and making them understand how much she cared for them. You could see each person respond to that care and love.

Rose was a tremendous woman of God. She loved the Lord and was always interested in sharing her love for Him with others. She led Bible studies in every town in which she lived. In Baton Rouge, she led a Bible study for Senate staff, legislators' spouses, which my wife Laura attended. Her

commitment to Jesus Christ was embedded in her values and made her the great woman we will remember. Her ability to pass these values to friends and family will live on as a part of her legacy.

Rose Landry Long will be remembered as a great mother, grandmother, and wife, but more than anything, as someone who served others by loving others.

Mr. President, I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW ACT RESOLUTION

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I am on the floor today to talk about the CRA resolution pending before the Senate today.

I really can't keep track of when my colleagues on the Republican side are for State innovation and when they are against State innovation.

When it comes to Medicaid, the Republicans seem to be very willing to hand a bunch of money over to the States, no strings attached, and let them figure out what to do with it. That is the essence of the bill that cuts \$800 billion from Medicaid that is pending before the House of Representatives today. When it comes to retirement, right now we are engaged in a debate that would rip away from States the ability to innovate on behalf of their constituents to try to get them access to retirement savings.

I can't figure out when my Republican friends want States to innovate and when they want to take away from States the ability to deliver results to their constituents.

Let's be honest. We have a retirement crisis in this country right now. The majority of Americans barely have enough money saved to last 2 or 3 years after they retire. Everybody knows this. And the people who are affected by this retirement crisis aren't exclusively Democrats. They aren't exclusively Republicans. They aren't just liberals. They aren't just conservatives. No matter where you live, today you are more likely than not to not have enough money in order to retire. So States have figured this out. My State is one of them.

Many States have recognized that one of the biggest barriers to retirement savings today is the fact that if you work for a small employer, you probably don't have an employer-sponsored retirement plan. In fact, there are over 50 million Americans today who do not have, through their employer, a retirement plan available to them.

Why is that a big deal? Well, it is a big deal because that is the most likely way you save today. In fact, for those 50 million Americans who don't have access to retirement through their employer, only 5 percent of them are going outside of their employer to set up a retirement plan. There are a variety of reasons for that. Sometimes,