

To the winning students from Snowflake Junior High School: Congratulations. You make me proud to be a Lobo, and, as always, proud to come from Snowflake and proud to be an Arizonan.

## NAFTA

Mr. President, we can't simply ignore the benefits of NAFTA for the U.S. economy. Experts have said that more than one-quarter of global GDP—some \$20.5 trillion—is produced in NAFTA's combined markets of the United States, Canada, and Mexico. Canada and Mexico are the largest export markets for the United States. U.S. trade with Canada and Mexico has more than tripled since 1993, and that was before NAFTA came into effect.

In 1993, U.S. foreign direct investment in Mexico was slightly more than \$15 billion. In 2016, it was more than \$92 billion in foreign direct investment.

NAFTA increased U.S. agricultural exports to Canada and Mexico by 350 percent, supporting U.S. farmers and ranchers like those back in Arizona. NAFTA has resulted in an integrated supply chain between the United States and other countries.

For example, the Wall Street Journal reported that "tens of thousands of parts that make up a vehicle often come from multiple producers in different countries and travel back and forth across borders several times." Abandoning NAFTA would destroy these supply chains, making it harder for our country's private sector employers to grow and to do business.

Arizona has certainly benefited from NAFTA. In 2016, Arizona's trade with Mexico exceeded \$15 billion. Total trade between Arizona and NAFTA countries reached nearly \$20 billion last year.

The Arizona Daily Star noted back in November that "trade with Mexico supports about 100,000 jobs in Arizona and retailers depend on roughly \$8 million Mexican shoppers spend daily in Arizona."

The bottom line is that trade is good for American businesses, it is good for American workers, and it is good for American consumers.

Trade deals like NAFTA make inputs for U.S. manufacturing cheaper than they would be otherwise. Cheaper inputs mean lower production costs for U.S.-based businesses, which, in turn, allows these companies to expand production and to reduce prices. That means everyday consumer products are more affordable for middle-class families.

If the protectionist trade policies of the past have taught us anything, it is that when we increase trade barriers, nobody wins. Do I agree that we should work to make U.S. businesses more competitive? Absolutely. Do I agree that we can modernize NAFTA? You bet. Pro-growth trade policies have been at the top of my list of priorities since I came to Congress. But any efforts to impose new restrictions on our ability to trade with Mexico and Can-

ada will have serious consequences for Arizona, leading to jobs being lost and higher costs for consumers.

If we just think, in 2003 total U.S. trade with Mexico was just around \$50 billion. Today, it is between \$500 billion and \$600 billion.

What is not to like about NAFTA? It is good for Americans. It is good for the Mexican economy. It is good for Canada.

We have noted many times that with regard to border security, the net flow of Mexican migrant workers has been south, not north, over the past couple of years. One of the biggest reasons for that, obviously, is the Mexican economy is doing better, and part of the biggest reason for that is because of NAFTA and their ability to trade. That is good for the United States. It is good for Mexico.

Trade is not a zero sum game where one party wins and the other party loses. Free trade benefits everyone. I hope that we remember this as we look toward NAFTA's future. We need to improve it and to modernize it, certainly, but we shouldn't abandon it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, before I begin my remarks, I just want to say, while the Senator from Arizona is still here, what a privilege it is to hear somebody come to this floor and actually speak about facts as they actually are—economic facts, facts related to immigration. If we had more people in the Senate who spoke on the floor the way the Senator from Arizona just did, there is nothing we wouldn't be able to accomplish together. It is a privilege to serve with him. It is a privilege to hear the clarity with which he spoke about these important issues. So I want to thank him through the Chair for that speech.

## ANTIQUITIES ACT

Mr. President, at the close of the 19th century, many of our country's—almost all of our country's—most historic sites were completely unprotected. Places like Chaco Canyon and Cliff Palace, home to some of the most ancient dwellings in North America, faced looting and desecration. So in 1906, Congress actually passed pieces of legislation and thought about the next generation of Americans. Congress acted to protect these places by passing the Antiquities Act. The act empowered Presidents to preserve sites of cultural and historic importance and protect our most spectacular landscapes by designating them as national monuments using that authority.

Teddy Roosevelt moved to protect places like Devil's Tower, Muir Woods Forest, and even the Grand Canyon. Looking back, it is hard to imagine our country without those iconic places. It is hard to imagine our country without the legacy of those people who were thinking not between sound bites on the television but across generations.

Since Teddy Roosevelt, administrations from both parties, Democratic

and Republicans—he was a Republican, as it happens, but both parties have used the Antiquities Act to preserve places critical to our heritage, including the designation of Colorado National Monument in 1911. I just visited there.

In Washington, we may differ over policies—sometimes sharply. There is no surprise that is true. But both parties have long risen above partisan squabbles of today to protect these special places for tomorrow. But with yesterday's Executive order, President Trump has upended that tradition by opening the door to attacks on our national monuments for generations to come.

I know there are people in this administration who have said they are "lifetime supporters and admirers of Teddy Roosevelt's policies." If they are, now is the time they need to be heard because today's action is an offense to Teddy Roosevelt's vision for America and threatens his bipartisan legacy of conservation. The administration's latest Executive order initiates a review of all national monument designations since 1996 that are larger than 100,000 acres, with an interim report on its findings just 45 days later. I wonder if they know how long it takes to build a consensus in the West and in other places that a place is sacred enough that it should have one of these designations, and in 45 days they are going to threaten to disturb the work of people all over the West who have supported these designations.

Speaking yesterday, President Trump justified this action by calling earlier monument designations an "egregious abuse of federal power." I wonder what he would call a Washington-led effort to undo protections for national monuments that enjoy deep support from communities all across the country, including in my State of Colorado?

For all their rhetoric about Washington overreach, this administration and its allies in Congress seem to have no problem substituting their rash judgment for the thoughtful, community-driven designations of national monuments across the United States of America. Had they studied this issue at all, they would have learned that existing monument designations come from exhaustive consultation and hundreds of meetings over thousands of hours.

Unlike this administration, western communities did our homework. We laid the groundwork and paved the way for these designations, which leads me to wonder what the administration's review hopes to achieve. I would challenge anybody in the Senate to come down here to this floor and explain exactly how this 45-day review will uncover information that somehow our western communities missed. They can't. They can't because that is not the point of this review, which is no more than a Trojan horse for advancing the agenda not of the West but for advancing the agenda of partisan think

tanks and politicians in Washington instead of the real-world interests of western communities.

Worse, if the administration ultimately repeals national monument designations—which I hope they will not—as a result of this order, it would cause real economic pain to Western States, especially in rural areas. A recent study found that rural counties in the West with protected public lands saw jobs grow at a rate more than three times faster compared to areas without protected lands. It just makes sense. Just ask outfitters and guides near Browns Canyon, a national monument, or local business owners around Chimney Rock, a national monument, what the effect has been on their businesses. In fact, those businesses were huge champions of both those national monuments. You can go buy a beer in Pagosa Springs from a brewery that is brewing it and putting a label on it that says “Chimney Rock National Monument.” You can buy the beer and take it rafting through Browns Canyon with outfitters who strongly support the monument.

National monuments not only preserve our heritage, they strengthen rural communities by supporting outdoor economies and attracting visitors from around the country and around the world. We should be more encouraging of that. Let's do more of that. Instead, this Executive order takes aim directly at our rural economies in the West.

Look at this. As we can see here, nationwide, Americans spend \$887 billion on the outdoor economy each year, supporting \$65 billion in Federal tax revenue and 7.6 million American jobs which can't be exported anywhere. There is not a country in the world that has a system of public lands like the United States of America and in particular the Western United States of America. There is not a country in the world that has what we have.

If this administration really is serious about creating jobs, strengthening our economy, and remaining faithful to the bipartisan legacy of Roosevelt, it should keep our national monuments intact and uphold the traditions honored by every President since 1906.

These are treasured places. Even though they have a huge value in dollars and cents, their value goes far beyond the economic value. It goes to the heart of who we are as a nation. It goes to our cultural heritage and to the legacy we want to pass on from our grandparents to our grandchildren.

Teddy Roosevelt called conservation “a great moral issue, for it involves the patriotic duty of ensuring the safety and continuance of the nation.” We must do our duty, our patriotic duty, and I will use every tool at my disposal to protect the Antiquities Act and our national monuments because in the end our character as a nation is revealed in what we choose to preserve now and for generations to come.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative 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. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, yesterday President Trump issued an Executive order that undermined the protection of dozens of our national monuments that were established over the past two decades by three different Presidents. In continuing his administration's war on our public lands, President Trump and Secretary of the Interior Zinke have attacked one of our Nation's most prized conservation laws—the Antiquities Act, which gives the President the authority to protect our nationally important lands and waters on Federal land by designating them as national monuments.

In the 111 years since the Antiquities Act was signed into law by President Teddy Roosevelt, 16 Presidents—8 Republicans and 8 Democrats—have used the law's authority to designate over 150 national monuments. President Trump is trying to undo over 100 years of conservation in just a few days.

Many of our Nation's iconic national parks were first protected by using the authority of the Antiquities Act, including the Grand Canyon, Acadia, Glacier Bay, Joshua Tree, Zion, and in my home State of Washington, Mount Olympus National Monument, which later became Olympic National Park.

No doubt Presidents of both parties have used the Antiquities Act to preserve the most beautiful places in our country. However, President Trump appears to be very uninformed on the history or the importance of the Antiquities Act. In his remarks signing the Executive order yesterday, he described the designation of national monuments as an “egregious use of federal power” and vowed he would “give that power back to the States.” He truly does not understand the Antiquities Act, nor does he appreciate the bold leadership of all of those Presidents, both Democrats and Republicans, over a period of time—eight Republicans and eight Democrats—who have used this authority in an appropriate way to preserve for all Americans in the future and those in the past who have enjoyed these beautiful places—and to preserve our access to public lands.

I can't tell you how important access to public lands is for schoolchildren, our returning veterans, our families, hunters, fishermen, and hikers. Putting the Antiquities Act and the millions of acres of national monuments that have been protected back into the hands of a few who are more aligned with special interests to try to open these areas up to oil and gas exploration is the antithesis of what the Antiquities Act is all about.

We plan to continue to emphasize how wrong the President's Executive order is.

First and foremost, in the Executive order, the President directed the Secretary of the Interior to review the designation or expansion of national monuments under the Antiquities Act where the Secretary deems that the designation or expansion was made without adequate public comment or coordination with relevant stakeholders. That literally gives the Secretary of the Interior broad authority to look at all the land that has previously been designated since 1996 and potentially open it up to saying they are going to try to reverse that.

There have been many discussions about the last 20 years of the designation of some unbelievable, beautiful places in America that are so special—the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument in Utah, which is 1.7 million acres; the Grand Canyon-Parashant National Monument in Arizona; the Giant Sequoia National Monument in California; the Canyon of Ancients National Monument in Colorado—I know my colleague Senator BENNET from Colorado was speaking about it earlier; Hanford Reach National Monument in Washington, which covers 195,000 acres; the Ironwood Forest National Monument in Arizona; the Vermilion Cliffs National Monument in Arizona; the Carrizo Plain National Monument in California; the Sonoran Desert National Monument in Arizona; the Upper Missouri River Breaks National Monument in Montana; the Rio Grande del Norte National Monument in New Mexico, on which my colleague Senator HEINRICH worked so hard; the Organ Mountains-Desert Peaks National Monument, also in New Mexico; the San Gabriel Mountains National Monument in California; the Berryessa Snow Mountain National Monument in California; the Basin and Range National Monument in Nevada; the Mojave Trails National Monument in California; the Sand to Snow National Monument in California; Bears Ears, as I have mentioned, in Utah; and the Gold Butte National Monument in Nevada. That sounds like a lot of designations that we have made over the last 20 years. Presidents were very judicious about those designations. It took a lot of public comment, many community meetings, and a lot of scientific analysis about the preservation of these areas. The end result is that for these generations and future generations, national monuments have been designated on public lands that are in our national interests.

This has been so important to us as a nation. As I said, places like the Grand Canyon, Olympic National Park in my State—many places have created what has become an outdoor recreation economy. That outdoor recreation economy is now over \$800 billion of annual revenue and dwarfs what the oil and gas industry represents as an economy of the future. In fact, this industry sector is on par to compete with

other large sectors of our economy—the financial service sector and the healthcare sector. So why are we taking away the very tool that has launched so much outdoor activity and a burgeoning job economy, with 7 million outdoor industry workers? Why are we taking away national monument designations that have been the priority of past Presidents and trying to return them because someone doesn't understand what the Antiquities Act is all about?

In addition to those large monuments that I just mentioned, also under review will be a group of other monuments that are marine national monuments. Yes, according to the definition I mentioned earlier, Secretary Zinke could review all of these monuments. In fact, I noticed that there were several people at the President's signing who represented some of these monuments. I don't know if they are urging the President to remove their areas, but it raises great concern about how important these marine monuments have been.

There is the Papahānaumokuākea marine national monument in the Hawaiian islands that was established in 2006; the World War II Valor in the Pacific National Monument, also in Hawaii; the Rose Atoll National Monument in American Samoa; the Pacific Remote Islands National Monument in Hawaii; the Marianas Trench National Monument in the Mariana Islands; and the Northeast Canyons and Seamounts Marine National Monument in the Atlantic.

In addition to all of those maritime national monuments of grand scale, these also under consideration are an additional two dozen or so—I think it looks like 25—smaller national monuments that could also be reviewed by the Secretary of the Interior. Even though they were designated with this Presidential authority, in previous administrations after great review, they could, by this President and this Interior Secretary, be wiped away very quickly.

We definitely do not believe the President has this legal authority, and we will pursue a vigorous fight. Why should we be wasting taxpayers' money when taxpayers' money was already spent to make these designations, and the taxpayer is getting the huge economic benefit of having these outdoor areas?

What else could be on the President's list according to this Executive order? The California Coastal National Monument; Cascade-Siskiyou National Monument; President Lincoln and Soldier's Home National Monument in Washington, DC; Kasha-Katuwe Tent Rocks National Monument in New Mexico; Minidoka National Historic Site in Idaho; Pompeys Pillar National Monument in Montana; Virgin Islands Coral Reef National Monument; Governors Island National Monument in New York; the African Burial Ground National Monument in New York; Fort

Monroe National Monument in Virginia; Fort Ord National Monument in California; Chimney Rock National Monument in Colorado; the Cesar Chavez National Monument in California; San Juan Islands National Monument in the State of Washington; the Harriet Tubman Underground Railroad National Monument; the First State National Historic Park in Delaware; the Charles Young Buffalo Soldiers Monument; the Honouliuli National Monument in Hawaii; the Pullman National Monument in Illinois; Browns Canyon National Monument in Colorado; Waco Mammoth National Monument in Texas; Castle Mountains National Monument in California; the Belmont-Paul Women's Equality National Monument; Stonewall National Monument in New York; the Birmingham Civil Rights Monument in Alabama; the Freedom Riders National Monument in Alabama; and the Reconstruction Era National Monument in South Carolina.

The Executive order says the Secretary of the Interior can review any national monument designation since 1996 “Where the Secretary determines that the designation or expansion was made without adequate public outreach and coordination with relevant stakeholders.”

The Executive order says that for any national monument on the list I just mentioned, the Secretary of the Interior could decide there was not appropriate public outreach. Even though the process used by Presidents under the Antiquities Act makes sure you have that, this Secretary could decide there wasn't enough and recommend to undo any of these monuments and eliminate access to the public for the purposes of recreation and enjoyment.

So this administration has it dead wrong. He is no Teddy Roosevelt. In fact, I saw he had a press conference with a statue of Teddy Roosevelt behind him. Teddy Roosevelt would be appalled because his concept of preserving Federal land was so important. Teddy Roosevelt was an outdoorsman who spent many a time in these great places of our Nation and understood their great significance. That is why we have the Antiquities Act. He knew that these resources strengthened our country. They made us strong as a nation. They show the crown jewels of the United States of America in all their glory and beauty. He knew it was important to protect them for future generations to enjoy, not just for the special interests to take advantage of in the near term.

We have a lot of Federal land and offshore land that is used for resource exploration and development. As people know, natural gas is at an all-time high in the United States and driving an all-time low price. It is not as if you need access to Bears Ears National Monument to drive down the price of natural gas or other fossil fuel. What you are going to do by pursuing this wrongheaded approach on Bears Ears is

take away one of the historic and beautiful archaeological histories of Native Americans and early Americans in the United States—and an area that has excellent outdoor recreation opportunities—and throw it, along with the concept of the Antiquities Act, over the side just because someone wants to try to reverse what our previous Presidents, starting with Teddy Roosevelt, have done to protect these monuments in our national interest.

Representing a State where we have several counties that have lots of Federal land, whether forest lands or BLM lands, I know that it can be challenging for local communities to maintain the infrastructure, the education, the hospitals, the law enforcement. I am a big believer in making sure that what are called PILT payments and the Secure Rural School Program are well funded and financed to make sure that these communities can be there to help us support these public lands. But the notion that with one act we would throw in Teddy Roosevelt's face all of these national monuments and now say that we are going to try to use it in reverse to review the work in the near term, of 3 different Presidents who used this authority is simply wrong-headed.

What we need to do is embrace the outdoor economy. As I said, it is 7 million jobs with over \$800 billion of economic activity. In fact, since the last time they did their report, there has been a \$200 billion annual increase in the economic impact in the United States of America. What great news. An industry and sector, particularly in retail, is growing by leaps and bounds. It is an industry that is providing people with more tools and opportunity to enjoy our beautiful places. The only thing we can do to screw that up is start taking away the beautiful places where people go to recreate. I would say we should be examining how well these areas we have protected are being used and figure out how we can continue to communicate to the general public about these wonderful experiences.

Do not think for one minute that the American people in their souls are not connected to the spiritual nature of these beautiful lands. They are. And that is what Teddy Roosevelt knew. He knew this is where we go to rejuvenate. Let's not take it away for some oil and gas exploration.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). The Senator from Nevada.

NO BUDGET, NO PAY ACT

Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, as we approach yet another deadline to continue funding for the government, I rise to speak today regarding my frustration and disappointment that Congress is once again kicking the can down the road. I am frustrated that I keep having to have this same conversation with my colleagues. I am disappointed in the lack of responsibility of everyone here in Washington, DC, to