

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

do their job. Washington, DC, is the only place I can think of where people believe it is OK not to do their job, miss their deadlines, make up a new deadline, and then repeat that same process year after year after year.

I am upset that continually I have to remind everyone in Congress that the most basic responsibility that we have is to pass a budget and all of the appropriations bills and we should do it on time. It seems like Members of Congress now depend on the countdown clock at the bottom of every news channel to remind them to do their job.

Here we are, 4 months into 2017, and we still have not completed the appropriations process that was supposed to have been done half a year ago. If that is not bad enough, we only have 15 legislative weeks left to finish funding for the next fiscal year. My colleagues, I believe we are setting ourselves up for failure.

Washington is a consequence-free zone. That is why I will continue to advocate for my No Budget, No Pay Act. I have personally never seen Congress pass all 12 appropriations bills on time, on their own, without an omnibus or a CRomnibus. Regardless of who is in the majority, regardless of who is in the minority, my No Budget, No Pay legislation says that if Members of Congress do not pass an annual concurrent bipartisan budget resolution and all 12 spending bills on time, each year, then, they should not get paid.

Let me repeat that last part. If Congress fails to pass all 12 spending bills on time each year, then, they should not get paid. The American public is just as frustrated as I am. Since I have introduced No Budget, No Pay, I have been getting some much positive support for this idea. A woman by the name of Patricia from Fernley, NV, wrote to say No Budget, No Pay is long overdue.

Dorothy from Henderson, NV, wrote me to say No Budget, No Pay is a wonderful solution. Just last week, speaking in Reno, NV, I was asked when Congress is going to finally pass the No Budget, No Pay Act. Until the No Budget, No Pay Act is passed into law, I don't see any other way to motivate Members of Congress to do their job and avoid these continuing resolutions in the future.

I cannot support a CR that just boots our problems to another day without enacting the principles that are outlined in my No Budget, No Pay Act. There are important issues that need to be addressed through the appropriations process. For my home State of Nevada, we are looking at proposals from this new administration to cut funding to vitally important programs, such as the Southern Nevada Public Lands Management Act, better known as SNPLMA, or payments in lieu of taxes, better known as the PILT program.

While these programs may not mean much to some of my colleagues, for Nevada they are vitally important to en-

suring economic viability and competitiveness for our State. Moreover, Nevada has been a good steward of these dollars by utilizing them for job-creating projects within my State.

By taking up individual appropriations bills and engaging in debate on programs important to particular agencies, Members have the opportunity to fight for priorities that are important to their State. Right now, I am fighting to fund these programs. Sometimes this fight needs to ensure certain programs are not funded because they are a waste of taxpayer dollars, like Yucca Mountain. I cannot say it enough times for my colleagues: Congress should not provide any funding to this failed project that has already wasted so many taxpayer dollars.

Nevada will not be a federally subsidized national nuclear waste dump, plain and simple. If I can repeat that, Nevada will not be a federally subsidized national nuclear waste dump, plain and simple. Without exercising the power of the purse, which my No Budget, No Pay legislation ensures, we will all be right back here in a week, a month, or several months, making the same speeches, taking the same votes over and over.

So I would like to say to any of my colleagues who are tired of these continuing resolutions, regardless of what specific issues they are fighting for, to support the No Budget, No Pay Act. I believe the Congress can work again, but it will take some of that accountability—like the No Budget, No Pay Act—to get us there.

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.

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

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

REGULATORY ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about legislation to give our economy a shot in the arm and to help raise wages for Americans all across our country.

When I am back home, whether it is at a small auto body shop or whether it is at a big steel plant or whether it is at a soybean farm, I hear the same thing, which is people coming up to me and saying: Hey, ROB, with all of these regulations coming from Washington, I would love to hire more people, but I am spending too much time and money trying to keep up with these regulations.

I think that is true with every Member here, whether you are a Democrat or a Republican, when you are back home talking to people. They get frustrated. Sometimes it is local and State regulations as well, but a lot of them are coming from the Federal Government.

One example would be the Whitacre Greer Company, which makes bricks. It

is a small family-owned business in Alliance, OH, just outside of Youngstown. They told me recently that complying with just one regulation is now costing this small company almost a million bucks a year that they don't have. They have had to go out and borrow the money, and that has been difficult for them. The cost of just complying with this one new regulation is about 10 percent of their annual revenue. Otherwise, that roughly million bucks would have been invested, they say, in plant, equipment and people. In other words, they would be able to create more jobs and modernize their facility if not for that compliance cost.

They are not alone. It is happening all over Ohio and across the country. Costly regulations are causing companies to pull back on expanding jobs and creating more opportunity for the people we represent.

Look, regulation has its place. There is no question about it. We need regulations. I think everybody acknowledges that. It has a proper role. We need reasonable laws that protect our health and the environment and prevent dishonest business practices. But let's make sure that, as we regulate more and more and more, we have smart regulations—regulations that make sense and that don't affect these small businesses, as I talked about with this brick company in Alliance, OH.

The reality today is that a lot of Federal regulations are more extensive in scope, more expensive to these companies—and, therefore, these workers—more unpredictable than they have to be to meet whatever the policy objectives are.

So Congress writes a law, and we have certain policy objectives, but then the regulators take that and they change the spirit of the congressional law instead of meeting that objective in the most cost-effective way possible. So I get that from my constituents, and the question is this: What do we do about it?

The other thing I hear about is the fact that regulators aren't accessible. People don't feel like they have any influence over it.

By keeping new businesses from starting and small businesses from growing, regulations are just making it harder for people to be able to make a living.

So how did we get here? Why are regulations so expensive and so burdensome on workers and jobs? I think a big reason is the way the Federal Government goes about writing regulations. Too often the process is unaccountable to the people. Too often it is based on sloppy or even bad information.

The current law that gives us the basic framework for all this process is called the Administrative Procedure Act. This has been around for a long time. But guess what. It has not been reformed in any significant way in 70 years.

The APA, or the Administrative Procedure Act, is something I have studied