you hear expressed right across the political spectrum. The President made a brilliant choice with Judge Gorsuch.

We are all looking forward to what the President has to say tonight. It is a big moment for him. More importantly, it is a big moment for our country. Americans are ready to move forward. They are ready to get our economy moving. They are ready to leave the failures of the status quo behind, such as ObamaCare, and move toward a more hopeful future. After 8 long years, believe me, it is something we can all use.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, morning business is closed.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS TO CONGRESS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, this evening, the President will give his first address to a joint session of the House and Senate. We look forward to hearing from him. Tonight's speech from the President will be far less important than past Presidential addresses for one very simple reason, this President has shown throughout his campaign for the Presidency and now his first month in office that there is a yawning gap between what he says and what his administration actually does for working Americans.

He talks like a populist but governs like a pro-corporate, pro-elite, hard-right ideologue. He promised to be a champion for working people in his inauguration, and then 1 hour later signed an Executive order making it harder for working people to afford a mortgage. He told raucous crowds that he would tear down the power structure in Washington and drain the swamp, but he has spent his first month in office appointing bankers and billionaires and titans of Wall Street to fill his administration. He ran a campaign against the elites, promising to stand up to Wall Street, but as soon as he was in office, he started to try to roll back Wall Street reform and consumer protections designed to prevent another economic crisis and protect the interests of hard-working Americans.

In his inauguration, he said that Washington and the special interests have enriched themselves while ''the people did not share in its wealth.'' Then, one of the first bills he signed made it easier for large oil, gas, and mining companies to hide payments—potentially bribes—they make to foreign governments.

That is the swamp. He is not cleaning it; he is making it worse. Despite all his talk, he seems to be full steam ahead on a program to help big business, the special interests, and Wall Street. Meanwhile, a massive infrastructure proposal, a centerpiece of his pitch to working America, is nowhere to be found. A program to stop jobs from moving overseas—not just tweeting about a few hundred jobs at Carrier plants staying in the United States—is nowhere to be found.

President Trump ran as a populist and still talks like one, but his first month has been a boon for corporations, the wealthy, and the elite in America and has provided absolutely no relief to folks who are struggling to make ends meet—no relief to the middle class and those struggling to get there. In fact, many of his proposals shift the burden off the backs of the special interests and keep it on the backs of working families. He likely isn't finished yet.

Tonight, the President might discuss his tax plan. He said that every decision on taxes would be made to ''benefit American workers and American families.'' It is another grandiose promise. But every indication we have gotten about the administration's plan is that it would give tax breaks to the wealthy and shift the burden onto the middle class and working class.

So no matter what the President says tonight, we will have to look at the details of his proposal and see who it really helps, and every American should, as well.

Tonight, if past is prologue, the President will use populist rhetoric in his speech, but he won't back it up with real actions. He will use populist rhetoric in his speech to hide what he is actually doing, which is helping the special interests and making it harder to stay in the middle class. He talks like he favors working people, but his actions ultimately desert them.

He will present himself as a President for the forgotten man, but he will forget him the moment it comes to governing. So while I hope the President offers a message of inclusivity and talks about some issues where Democrats and Republicans can perhaps find common ground, his speech tonight will mean nothing the very instant after it is delivered unless he backs up his words with real actions.

His speech tonight will be nothing if his Cabinet of billionaires and bankers, his main advisers who seem to favor the wealthy, and an agenda far away from what America wants, continue to govern from the hard right, which is very far from the American mainstream and even the Republican mainstream. His speech tonight will mean nothing if he continues to do as he has done these first few months since being elected—breaking promises to working people and putting an even greater burden on their backs while making it easier to be wealthy and well-connected in America.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read the nomination of RYAN ZINKE, of Montana, to be Secretary of the Interior.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the nomination of Congressman RYAN ZINKE to be Secretary of the Interior.

The Secretary of the Interior is one of the most important jobs in the Federal Government and even more so for people in the West. I know the Presiding Officer would agree with that.

The Department of the Interior has an incredibly broad portfolio. It is responsible for managing our Nation's public lands, our national parks, our national wildlife refuges, and overseeing mineral and energy development on our public lands and in our Federal waters offshore, making sure that the taxpayers of the United States get a fair deal for the resources that the public—the public—actually owns. The responsibilities of the Department of the Interior also include ensuring that tribal trust responsibilities are met, as well as attending to our insular affairs. The Secretary of the Interior also manages a large part of water resources in Western States—again, which I know the Presiding Officer knows so well because there are so many issues related to drinking water and hydroelectric facilities that affect millions of our citizens.

So it is a far-reaching and diverse portfolio, and it requires the Secretary to take into account not only the demands of the extraction industry—the oil, gas, coal, and hard rock mining companies—the Secretary, above all, must protect the public's interests.

I think the public could probably best understand this by knowing what happened in the Gulf of Mexico and the implosion that happened with the Deepwater Horizon well. Here, the Department of the Interior and minerals management resource agencies, in my opinion, should have been doing a better job of protecting the public and protecting that vital resource.

The conclusion of hearings after this fact found that there were many recommendations to clean up and streamline the minerals management agency so that it was not catering to the interests of the oil and gas industry, but making sure that it adheres to what is the public interest. Now all that has been made famous in a movie, which many of the public I think should go to see. Taking shortcuts when it comes to extraction of mineral resources is not a good idea, and having an Interior Secretary who makes sure we manage these resources well is critical to our Nation.

Also, the outdoor recreation industry, in and of itself, in my opinion—and I am sure in the opinion of many others here who understand it—has become a juggernaut. I will talk about that in a little bit. It is an economy in and of itself. It is worth preserving. It is worth fighting for. It is a source of tax revenue, income, jobs, and, most importantly, a quality of life that so many Americans hold dear. I have been so touched by the letters I have gotten from veterans, who have said to me on their returning back from Iraq and Afghanistan that having the wonders of the outdoors as a place for peace and sanctuary has been so critical to them. They have argued in support of important programs like the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and others, to make sure that our public lands are there for them to enjoy and for their children to enjoy in the future.

So, in short, the Secretary must balance the short-term demands of developing resources on these public lands against the need to protect the environment and sensitive areas and preserve that natural heritage, as I said, for future generations. It is very important that we have a Secretary who understands what our Nation's leading stewardship responsibilities are, understands what those special places are, like the Grand Canyon, and other places such as Mount Rainier, and makes sure they are protected.

I had hoped to be able to support Congressman ZINKE's nomination based on his assurances that he would manage the Department of the Interior as a Teddy Roosevelt Republican. However, I cannot ignore the Trump administration's plans for our public lands and resources, and I cannot ignore Congressman ZINKE's commitment during our committee hearings to work to implement President-Elect Trump's energy independence policy, as well as a variety of positions on returning Federal land, taking public lands off the protection that they deserve today. These are very important public policy issues, and I note that President Trump has said to many people: ''My Cabinet is free to say whatever they want.'' So the fact that these important policies are going to be implemented that may erode what has been decades of policy for us in managing our public resources is quite concerning to me.

What exactly is the Trump administration's plan? Clearly, the Trump administration intends to pursue an aggressive agenda when it comes to mining and drilling on our public lands and waters. The President and his senior advisers have made clear their intention to undo what are reasonable protections put in place in environmentally sensitive areas. The administration will renew its efforts to reverse protections of important onshore and offshore areas. Based on energy plans posted on the White House website immediately after the President's inauguration, the President seems to be committed to simply opening up as much Federal land as possible to coal mining and energy development.

The administration has said it will use money from drilling and mining on all our public lands and waters to pay for a multibillion-dollar infrastructure package. My constituents want to know where they draw the line. Where does that stop?

The administration has already suspended rules ensuring polluters on our public lands don't have to pay their fair share. The President has signed into law a measure gutting the Obama administration rule that would have prevented coal companies from dumping toxic chemicals into our Nation's rivers and streams. So it is clear to me that the new administration will do everything it can to reverse the responsible management of our public land and instead pursue an aggressive energy development policy without regard to the environmental and public health consequences.

The bedrock principle, I believe, is that polluters should pay and they should clean up their messes on public lands. We may all have a different opinion here about how much public land should be developed, but I think everybody should be in agreement that polluters should pay, and they should leave our public land in a pristine nature.

It is equally clear that the new administration will be encouraged in this effort by the majorities in the House and the Senate by some of the legislation we have already seen, such as enabling coal companies to dump their mining waste into streams and impacting State drinking water, enabling oil companies to waste the public's natural resource without paying royalties on the gas they waste—that is costing taxpayers money—and reports that the President intends to issue an Executive order to overturn the current moratorium prohibiting new coal leases on Federal land. That is an issue about getting a fair deal for the taxpayer. The taxpayer is impacted by this coal extraction. Coal companies, instead of doing the job it takes to extract coal without an impact on the public, are taking Federal resources and making lots of money without responsibility to the taxpayer.

The previous Secretary, Secretary Jewell, basically said, for the first time in many years, that they would look at what the industry was paying as far as coal royalties. That process is underway, and we think it should be carried out. We think the taxpayer deserves a fair deal.

Unfortunately, I am not convinced that Congressman ZINKE will be willing or able to moderate the Trump administration's extreme views on exploiting our public lands, and I am not sure he will be willing or able to stand up to the President to protect the public interest and ensure that our public lands are managed and protected for the benefit of all Americans—not just the oil, gas, and mining companies and their commercial interests.

The Secretary's principal job is to be a guardian, a steward of our public lands. To me, stewardship is so important. So many of my colleagues come to the floor and act like they are managing this resource for their lifetime and their generation. Stewardship is about managing these resources for future generations as well. If our past ancestors had been so callus with these Federal resources, where would we be today? It is so important that we not look at these Federal lands so narrowly as a source of natural resources that someone has in their particular State or interest but also to make sure that stewardship protects these resources for future generations as well. With that in mind, I have seen several laws and regulations under attack that are fundamental to keeping that mission of stewardship at the Department of the Interior, including the Clean Water Act, the Federal Land Policy and Management Act, the Clean Air Act, the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act, and the Antiquities Act.

While Congressman ZINKE said he would oppose the transfer of Federal lands to the States, which I appreciate, at the same time, he has indicated he is willing to consider transferring away management of certain Federal lands to the States.

What does that mean? For example, you could have a monument or a designation of Federal land—it could be even Mount Rainier or some beautiful place in the Pacific Northwest—consequently transferred back to the State and that particular State—it wouldn't happen in Washington but might happen in some other State—decides to start managing that land and extracting resources. You might think that couldn't possibly happen. I have news for you. That is the debate du jour. This is exactly—exactly—the debate today.

Last Congress, Congressman ZINKE cosponsored and voted for a bill to transfer to the States management of red snapper fisheries in Federal waters. He supports transferring Federal management responsibilities to the States, and it clearly undercuts the commitment to Federal resources.

We also know he has previously supported efforts to restrict use of the Antiquities Act to designate national monuments. In fact, he appears open to efforts to weaken or repeal certain recently designated national monuments. He has indicated one of his first priorities, upon confirmation, will be to visit Utah to consider a Republican proposal to rescind the recently designated Bears Ears National Monument. This is despite the strong support of many across the Nation and in Utah, as well as tribal support from the Bears Ears Inter-Tribal Coalition, representing the five affected tribes in the region.

As somebody who enjoys the outdoors, I can state how important it is to be able to go and recreate. I have not been to Bears Ears, but I have heard incredible stories from climbers and those interested in seeing this unique terrain that it is a very special place.

As we enter this debate, the issue of the Bears Ears National Monument and whether they are going to roll back Federal land protection will be at the center of this discussion. Created by President Obama, Bears Ears encompasses 1.3 million acres of beautiful desert hills, mesas, sandstone canyons, spiritually significant lands to local tribes, and some of the best crack climbing in the world. The climbing community loves to recreate there.

The conservation community and tribes have fought for many years for this designation. If and when he is confirmed, Congressman ZINKE will be under intense pressure from some quarters to try to undo this designation. In fact, heated debate on this subject boiled over just a week ago as the Outdoor Retailer show decided to leave Salt Lake City, after two decades and contributing at least $40 million to the economy in various shows that they had each year there, because of Utah's stated desire and the congressional delegation's interest in basically claiming Federal lands and selling them off for extraction from the oil and gas industry.

I was so proud of retailers, such as REI in my State or others such as Patagonia, Black Diamond, Outdoor Research and others, basically put their money where their mouth is. They decided that if a State was going to attack the very economy that was so important to them in jobs and recreation, that they were going to do something about moving their impacted industry somewhere else.

I would like to read what the Salt Lake Tribune editorial board had to say about this issue.

''In the same week Utah announced that it had topped $8.17 billion in annual economic benefit from tourism, the $40 million Outdoor Retailer show announced it was leaving.

''Surely we can take a half-percent hit, right?

''No. The exit of Outdoor Retailer is so much more than just losing the State's largest convention. There will be hospitality jobs lost, and hotel rooms from Sandy to Ogden vacant for those two weeks a year. We're now building a 900-room downtown convention hotel—with public bonding authority—largely on spec. There is now no convention currently on Salt Lake City's docket that demands it.

''The reason Outdoor Retailer is leaving—their rejection of Utah's political leaders' values as shown in the stubborn and pointless fight against a Bears Ears National Monument—should make this moment a turning point.

''In the 1960s, Utah found itself at a confluence. One flow was fed by a collection of downtown Chamber of Commerce types who hatched a longshot bid to obtain the 1972 Winter Olympics. They knew they wouldn't win, but they saw it as a chance to sell Utah's ''Greatest Snow on Earth.'' It was the first time Utah took its outdoor tourism message to the world, and it was well received.

''The other flow came from a fundamental change in the American people, who were waking up to the natural world and the treasures in their own presence. In Utah, there was recognition that we held those treasures. A national park was created in Canyonlands, and national monuments in Arches, Capitol Reef were elevated to national parks. Utahns of all creed and color united in their pride of our shared national icons.''

I am sure the Presiding Officer also agrees with the concept, being from the home of the Grand Canyon. Continuing to read from the editorial:

''Where once we were a peculiar backwater, we became known the world over. Were it not for pioneering efforts, there would be no ski industry. No Olympics. No Sundance Film Festival. No Flat Tire Festival. No steady stream of tour buses climbing to Bryce Canyon. No $8.17 billion per year.

''Losing Outdoor Retailer over Bears Ears represents a reversal of a half century of progress in inviting the world to appreciate Utah.''

''The seeds of that failure were shown in the rejection . . . of the unprecedented unity of five Indian nations coming together to protect their ancestral homeland. Instead of recognizing the significance, our leaders emboldened the local pioneer descendants who were claiming their 150 years of ranching took precedent over centuries of Indian presence in Bears Ears. The tribes had no choice but to go to the president.

''That blindness that can be sourced to Utah's one-party political system that has given us leaders who are out of touch with their constituents. Dismantling the Bears Ears was a slam dunk in the Utah Legislature last week, but it's an issue on which every poll has shown Utahns divided, a division encouraged by the false narrative that the monument was a trade-off between fat energy jobs and low-paying tourist jobs.

''The Bears Ears monument may be with us forever, and there is no bucket of gold waiting if it does go away. The presidential proclamation bent far toward the same boundaries and shared management Representative BISHOP pursued with his Public Lands Initiative. In that context, Utah political leaders' vehemence looks to much of the nation like white rejection of the legitimacy of a black president listening to Native Americans.''

''The damage may not be over. What does Utah's sports equipment industry have to look forward to? What are Ogden-based companies supposed to do when their congressman refuses to acknowledge that fossil fuel consumption reduces the snowpack upon which their products glide?

''Are we receding to the backwaters where our superiority is apparent only to ourselves? Are we bent on separating Americans from their national identity instead of inviting them to share it?

''This isn't about $40 million. It's about who we are and where we are headed. To get there, we need leaders with a better appreciation of the magnificent gifts God has given everyone, not just Utahns.''

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Salt-Lake Tribune, Feb. 20, 2017]

EDITORIAL: THE WORLD IS NOT SO WELCOME NOW, AS OUTDOOR RETAILER EXIT SHOWS

In the same week Utah announced that it had topped $8.17 billion in annual economic benefit from tourism, the $40 million Outdoor Retailer show announced it was leaving.

Surely we can take a half-percent hit, right?

No. The exit of Outdoor Retailer is so much more than just losing the state's largest convention. There will be hospitality jobs lost, and hotel rooms from Sandy to Ogden vacant for those two weeks a year. We're now building a 900-room downtown convention hotel—with public bonding authority—largely on spec. There is now no convention currently on Salt Lake City's docket that demands it.

The reason Outdoor Retailer is leaving—their rejection of Utah's political leaders' values as shown in the stubborn and pointless fight against a Bears Ears National Monument—should make this moment a turning point.

In the 1960s, Utah found itself at a confluence. One flow was fed by a collection of downtown Chamber of Commerce types who hatched a longshot bid to obtain the 1972 Winter Olympics. They knew they wouldn't win, but they saw it as a chance to sell Utah's ''Greatest Snow on Earth.'' It was the first time Utah took its outdoor tourism message to the world, and it was well received.

The other flow came from a fundamental change in the American people, who were waking up to the natural world and the treasures in their own presence. In Utah, there was recognition that we held those treasures. A national park was created in Canyonlands, and national monuments in Arches and Capitol Reef were elevated to national parks. Utahns of all creed and color united in their pride over our shared national icons.

Where once we were a peculiar backwater, we became known the world over. Were it not for those pioneering efforts, there would be no ski industry. No Olympics. No Sundance Film Festival. No Fat Tire Festival. No steady stream of tour buses climbing to Bryce Canyon. No $8.17 billion per year.

Losing Outdoor Retailer over Bears Ears represents a reversal of a half century of progress in inviting the world to appreciate Utah. We could be Hawaii, and instead our leaders want us to be Oklahoma. Gov. Gary Herbert, who has made economic development his reason for living, couldn't get a very lucrative 20-year visitor to keep coming.

The seeds of that failure were sown in the rejection—first by Rep. Rob Bishop and later by the governor and the Legislature—of the unprecedented unity of five Indian nations coming together to protect their ancestral homeland. Instead of recognizing the significance, our leaders emboldened the local pioneer descendants, who were claiming their 150 years of ranching took precedent over centuries of Indian presence in the Bears Ears. The tribes had no choice but to go to the president.

That blindness can be sourced to Utah's one-party political system that has given us leaders who are out of touch with their constituents. Dismantling the Bears Ears was a slam dunk in the Utah Legislature last week, but it's an issue on which every poll has shown Utahns divided, a division encouraged by the false narrative that the monument was a trade-off between fat energy jobs and low-paying tourist jobs.

The Bears Ears monument may be with us forever, and there is no bucket of gold waiting if it does go away. The presidential proclamation bent far toward the same boundaries and shared management Bishop pursued with his Public Lands Initiative. In that context, Utah political leaders' vehemence looks to much of the nation like white rejection of the legitimacy of a black president listening to Native Americans.

The damage may not be over. What does Utah's sports-equipment industry have to look forward to? What are Ogden-based companies supposed to do when their congressman—Bishop—refuses to acknowledge that fossil-fuel consumption reduces the snowpack upon which their products glide?

Are we receding to the backwaters where our superiority is apparent only to ourselves? Are we bent on separating Americans from their national identity instead of inviting them to share it?

This isn't about $40 million. It's about who we are and where we are headed. To get there, we need leaders with a better appreciation of the magnificent gifts God has given everyone, not just Utahns.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I think that editorial puts this debate squarely in front of my colleagues. We have a nominee who has been all over the map as it relates to public lands, and, certainly, he has been on record that he will implement the President's strategy. I know he plans to visit this area, and I am so concerned that it will be the first of many areas in which people run over the larger public and national interests in order to preserve special places just for immediate extraction when, in reality, the jobs from the outdoor economy are just as important and, if you add up numbers, may be more important economically in both the near term and the long term.

I should also note that those of us in Washington would gladly welcome the outdoor retailers with open arms. I am sure they will consider many different places, but we understand that protecting our most treasured places not only preserves them for this generation but for future generations, and it helps drive an economy.

In Utah, outdoor recreation is responsible for $12 billion in consumer spending—more than twice the value of oil and gas produced in that State. If we are talking about top dog economics, the outdoor industry wins. In Washington State, the outdoor economy supports 227,000 direct-paying jobs and wages of $7.1 billion. Nationwide, it is 6.1 million jobs and $646 billion in revenues from outdoor recreation, so this is a very valued part of the U.S. economy. It is also a very valued part of the American spirit.

Not only do the Bears Ears National Monument and others like it benefit county, State, and Federal coffers, but they also offer access to our shared heritage. As I said, it is that spiritual connection to nature that is so valuable to all of us, but I hold so dear that our veterans cherish it so much too. They deserve the relief of being able to go to our greatest and beautiful places and have some solace.

A second major responsibility of the Secretary is to manage the mineral resources that are on public lands and waters. One of the fundamental principles of the public resource management is that the American people should receive a fair market value for the energy and minerals that are extracted from our public lands. These resources are owned by every American.

I think, sometimes, people get confused that these are the rights of these industries, that they own them. We have allowed that extraction and the leasing of that extraction, but we need to make sure that the taxpayers' interests and the costs of impact are well represented and that extraction is done in an efficient manner—that it protects the resources for the future, that it cleans up its mess, and that polluters pay.

An important principle is that our public lands be managed so that their use will not permanently harm the land or the environment and that, in allowing companies to mine on public land, they must minimize the harm they do, clean up the messes they make, and repair and pay for the damage. ''Polluter pays'' should be a basic principle.

The Secretary of the Interior must be committed to preserving and enforcing those important principles and to making sure that the taxpayers get a fair deal. The previous Secretary, as I said—Secretary Jewell—took important steps to advance those principles. On her watch, the Department issued its new stream protection rule, its methane venting and flaring rule, its mineral valuation rule, and the comprehensive examination of its coal leasing program.

Most of these initiatives involve updating existing policies that have been in place for 20 or 30 years. That is just another way of saying that whether the taxpayer is getting a fair deal by allowing these companies to mine these Federal resources has not really been evaluated for 20 or 30 years, so I am sure my colleagues could understand that that kind of updating should take place. During these three intervening decades, technology has improved and science has advanced, and we need to make sure technology recognizes that, when pollution happens, it needs to be cleaned up.

Attacks on Secretary Jewell's public health and taxpayer initiatives are already underway, and I am concerned that Congressman ZINKE will not stand up to make sure that the policies of ''polluter pays'' are followed and that the good work that has already been established is continued. At his confirmation hearing, Congressman ZINKE stated that the war on coal is real and that he supports lifting the coal leasing moratorium. This is completely contrary to the rational view of energy market dynamics, and it is at odds with the energy policies our constituents expect.

While Federal coal leasing is an issue of national concern, it is also critically important in my State. They want to make sure that taxpayers get a fair deal for the leasing of that land. As people have discussed here on the floor, the advent of natural gas and its cheap value has done more to drive down the use of coal than any of this discussion about whether taxpayers are getting a fair deal.

Finally, the Secretary of the Interior must be committed to upholding our trust and treaty obligations for our country's 567 federally recognized tribes. That Secretary must be committed to recognizing tribal sovereignty and self-determination, protecting tribal lands and waters and mineral resources, and supporting adequate resources for tribal education, social services, and infrastructure.

Congressman ZINKE has been a strong advocate of the Crow Tribes' coal resource in his home State; and while I respect his responsibility to his district, he will be required as Secretary of the Interior to have a much different position in representing all tribes across the United States.

I know that some of my colleagues think that one can be expedient on any of these issues whether it is on the Antiquities Act or on coal leasing or on making sure that we live up to tribal sovereignty. In reality, it takes very little to sign an Executive order; it takes a lot to overrule the law of the land. Many of these issues will end up in court, and many of them will be battled for several years. I would suggest to my colleagues that we find a common interest in preserving our stewardship, in preserving our natural resources, and in continuing to develop this kind of economy moving forward.

I am not convinced that Congressman ZINKE is going to show the leadership on these resources that is necessary, given his very different views on public lands as a Congressman—on all sides of the issue. We need someone who is going to stand up, just like those in Utah did, and say that the outdoor economy is worth it. The designation of public lands, as done by the President of the United States, should be preserved, and we should continue to fight for something that is providing so many jobs and such a great connection for so many Americans.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS TO CONGRESS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, tonight, President Trump will address a joint session of Congress for the very first time. This, of course, will be his first opportunity as President to talk about his agenda and his vision for the Nation with the American people, who will be listening. I look forward to hearing what he has to say.

He will, undoubtedly, talk about the promises he made during the campaign and how he is working to deliver on them for the American people. I know the cornerstone of that vision for America is that of reviving our economy and boosting job growth.

Fortunately, he has already taken a few steps—through Executive action—in that direction, for which I am grateful. He has also nominated top-notch financial and economic advisers to look at our archaic Tax Code and to review our trade agreements so as to get our country back on track. He has begun to trim the fat of our bureaucracy, and he continues to push for measures that keep the government from interfering unnecessarily in the lives of American families.

Congress has also played an important role. Earlier this month, we passed the first of several resolutions of disapproval under the Congressional Review Act—one, to roll back the erosion of Second Amendment rights and another to repeal a job-killing rule that targeted our energy providers. There were others as well.

These rules have one characteristic in common, which is that all of these rules that we are rolling back through congressional resolutions of disapproval were put in place under the Obama administration. They frequently represent overreach in executive authority or in, certainly, what is prudent when it comes to regulation. There is such a thing as prudent regulation and overregulation, and I think what we saw is regulatory overreach under the Obama administration.

We finally have a President in the White House who will sign these bills into law that we pass here. I am glad the President is delivering on his promise to protect American jobs and to grow our economy, and he is willing to work with Congress to do just that.

Another area in which Congress and the administration are working together is in repealing and replacing ObamaCare. ObamaCare is, perhaps, President Obama's signature legacy. His healthcare law, by all accounts, is completely unsustainable and is, essentially, creating a real crisis for the people who happen to be on those exchanges.

Texas families cannot afford these high monthly premiums or the sky-high deductibles that so often go along with them. In fact, here is an interesting statistic. In Texas, if you have a gross income of $24,000 a year, you could well end up spending 30 percent of your gross income on healthcare costs. That certainly doesn't sound affordable, which was the promise of ObamaCare.

I look forward to working with our colleagues to deliver on the promise we made to the American people to repeal ObamaCare and put in its place a healthcare law that actually works for people, not against them—one that provides them with more choices and fewer mandates; if they like their doctors, they can keep their doctors; if they like their plans, they can keep their plans; and, yes, they can even save money. All of this was promised under ObamaCare, but none of it has proven to be true.

We do know some of the basic principles of that replacement for ObamaCare—that of moving healthcare decisions, for example, away from Washington to where they belong—with patients, their families, and their doctors. Actually, I think this is sort of the healthcare counterpart of what we did with the Every Student Succeeds Act, which was the follow-on to No Child Left Behind in moving more of the decision-making out of Washington and back to the States—back to the people most intimately affected and the people most interested in the results.

We also believe in giving patients the right tools they can use, like health savings accounts, to make their healthcare more portable and more affordable; in breaking down barriers that restrict choice and prevent Americans from picking the insurance plans that are best for them and their families; and, finally, in empowering small businesses to provide employees with the same kind of affordable health coverage that meets their needs. Association health plans is, perhaps, one of the most commonly recognized means of doing that.

I am glad that we finally have a President in office who will work with us and not against us when it comes to repealing and replacing ObamaCare and in giving the American people more choices at a price they can afford when it comes to their health care.

For our economy to grow, we have to have a stable and safe country, though, where our people can flourish. That brings me to President Trump's latest promise to restore national security as the number one priority in our budgeting process. He has already nominated and we have confirmed two incredibly strong leaders to key posts in his national security Cabinet. That would be Defense Secretary Mattis and Homeland Security Secretary Kelly. I am confident that these men will do a stand-up job. America is lucky to have them continuing to serve our Nation in these new positions, and I am grateful to them for their service. The safety of our communities and the safety of our country and world peace is our chief job.

As Ronald Reagan demonstrated, the best way to keep the world peaceful is for America to remain strong because when America retreats from the world stage, when America no longer leads or when we underfund our national security requirements, all it does is encourages the bullies and the tyrants and the thugs around the world to fill the gap. That is what we have seen time and time again, ranging from Vladimir Putin in Russia—the best message we can send to Vladimir Putin is not necessarily additional Russian sanctions, which I would vote in favor of, but to quit the reversing of our spending on national security priorities. That is something he understands—strength. That is something he will respect. He does not respect weakness. In fact, it is an enticement to him to dangerous activities, as we have seen not only in Crimea and Ukraine but also now in Syria and the Greater Middle East.

I have to say that the truth is, since the Budget Control Act of 2011 and the sequestration process that came along with that, we haven't made national security our No. 1 priority—the priority it should be. I hope, working together with our colleagues and the administration, we can fix that because there are a lot of things the Federal Government funds that are simply things that we would like to do but are not absolutely essential to our existence, our prosperity, and our welfare, such as national security.

I think President Trump has demonstrated that he understands what the priorities should be, and I know he will keep the goal of national security at the forefront. We ought to do everything we can, working together with this administration, to make that a success.

I look forward to hearing the President talk about some of his accomplishments in the 5 short weeks since he has been in office. You look at the stock market, for example, at historic