

dollars on big pumps and raising the level of the road to try to alleviate this problem. This is happening with some frequency in South Florida. Dr. Sellers testified back in 2014 that not projections or forecasts but actual measurements showed the sea had risen over the last four decades 5 to 8 inches.

Let's take another look at other flooding. That photo was Miami Beach, which is down at the southeast part of the peninsula of Florida. This photo was taken in downtown Sarasota. Sarasota is on the Gulf Coast and is closer to the middle of the peninsula; in other words, about 150 miles north of the latitude of Miami Beach. The vice mayor brought me these pictures of Sarasota. Look at this car on the street. Pictures don't tell the full story.

We held another field hearing in West Palm Beach a year ago, and the Broward County resilience officer came to Palm Beach County for that hearing and showed a video of a man biking along the city of Fort Lauderdale, where the sidewalk is submerged in water. In other words, what has happened in Miami Beach is happening in the Las Olas section of Fort Lauderdale.

Then we took the committee to St. Petersburg, which is on the opposite coast, the gulf coast, where the city has designed its new pier out of floating docks to accommodate the rising sea as they rise up and down in Tampa Bay.

Or how about St. Augustine, where the public works department is seeing nuisance flooding from high tides that are overwhelming their storm water system.

All of these are examples of how sea level rise affects coastal Florida on sunny days, not rainstorm days. The NASA scientist at our hearing was talking about how climate could exacerbate damage from hurricanes. Why? Because if the water is warmer, that is the fuel for a hurricane, and that is what is sucked up into that vortex as the hurricane feeds itself. The hotter the water it is over, the more ferocious—and likely frequent—those storms will be. Warmer ocean water fuels hurricanes, making them more intense, and the sea level rise compounds the storm surge and the rain-induced flooding.

Let me show you another image. Here is an image that shows what Florida's coastal communities face when the Sun is not shining. This is during a rainstorm. Here is flooding in Jacksonville. Where is Jacksonville? It is at the north end of the peninsula. It is almost right next to the Georgia line. You can see a sign that says "no skateboarding" is almost completely engulfed by the rising water.

Then you think: What about a place further south on the latitudes, Puerto Rico? Hurricane Maria absolutely ravaged that island, and it is not an exaggeration to say that climate change and sea level rise are putting people's

lives and their property at risk. It is the reality.

I am going to continue to extend an invitation to our colleagues. I want you to come with me to Florida, and I want to show you these impacts. I have had the privilege of taking several of our colleagues to the Florida Everglades, where alligators are plentiful, to see this unusual ecosystem as we travel about in an airboat. I want you to come and see what is happening as a result of the rising water, and the real question is, What are we going to do about it?

There are two pieces to the solution. One is that we are going to have to stop putting so many greenhouse gases into the air. CO₂, which is carbon dioxide, and methane are the two big culprits. Part of the solution is climate mitigation, which means we must invest in new technology, in the economy of the future—things like wind, solar, electric vehicles, and more efficient buildings. We are going to have to make our communities more resilient to the greenhouse gasses and the warming that they already have caused in the system. This is called climate change adaptation.

You don't have to agree with climate science to know that it makes sense; it makes dollars and cents to do this. We are talking about strengthening our building codes to withstand wind events. We are talking about restoring the function of the floodplains so that when 2 to 3 feet of rainwater suddenly gets dumped in one place, it can absorb and gradually recede. We are talking about rebuilding natural flood protection, like sand dunes and beaches. In the Commerce Committee we have heard countless stories from local government officials that if they could have invested before the natural catastrophe that hit them, they would have saved the Federal Government a lot of money by avoiding the enormous cost of the disaster response and relief itself, not to mention reducing the risk to human life.

The proof is in front of our very eyes. The photos we have shown—let's show the rest of them here—don't lie. Yet here we are upon another hurricane season. Of course, we hope the big storms don't come, but the likelihood is that they will. Remember, they don't necessarily go just to Florida. Remember Hurricane Sandy? Look what it did to the Northeast.

We hope we don't see any more of these harrowing images. But, as we hope, we are going to have to act because what we have shown here in these photos today is not about projections; it is about real-time observation. Let's quit ignoring the obvious.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE REPUBLICAN-LED CONGRESS

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, sometimes when I am traveling across Tennessee, someone will come up to me

and say: Why don't you guys in the U.S. Senate ever do anything? So I have taken to carrying around a little card that I keep in my pocket. I hand it to them and I say: Well, I can read this to you in about 30 seconds, and this is what has happened in the last 18 months: the best economy in 18 years; lower taxes; biggest reforms in 31 years; biggest increase in financial support for the military in 15 years; biggest pay raise in 8 years for the military; more repeal of regulations than anyone can remember; a Supreme Court Justice; 21 conservative appeals court judges; Alaska energy, which took 38 years, and the Presiding Officer knows all about that; a new National Labor Relations Board, which could be the most important change of all; repealed the ObamaCare individual mandate; the Dodd-Frank mortgage rules are gone; Veterans Choice, which the President signed yesterday; Iran, Russia, and North Korea sanctions.

All of that would not have happened without a Republican President, and it would not have happened without Republican majorities in the U.S. Congress. It took both.

The person who asks me "When are you guys ever going to do anything?" will often say "Well, I didn't know that; I hadn't realized that."

So I am very proud of that record; that is in 18 months. I think if you like a conservative government, a center-right government, you would have to agree that those are the most accomplishments in at least 30 years in this country. The President should be justly proud of that, and so should the Congress.

TARIFFS

Mr. President, despite the fact that I agree with President Trump on taxes, judges, regulations, and the list I just read, there is one area in which I have been supremely ineffective in persuading him, and that is in the area of tariffs.

I care about tariffs, especially because Tennessee has become, in many ways, the No. 1 auto state. I have spent a lot of time over the last 40 years watching the auto industry in Tennessee grow—ever since I helped to recruit the Nissan plant to Tennessee in 1980 as Governor at a time when we had literally no auto jobs—and suddenly today, one-third of our manufacturing jobs are auto jobs. They are not only in three big auto plants, like Nissan, General Motors, and Volkswagen, but they are in over 900 different auto suppliers in 88 of Tennessee's 95 counties.

Let me say that again: We have over 900 auto suppliers in 88 of 95 of Tennessee's counties—one-third of all of our manufacturing jobs. Nothing has done more in the last 40 years to move us from the third poorest State in average family incomes up toward the middle and heading toward the top. It has been the greatest source of benefit for Tennessee families of anything that has happened, so you can see why I become concerned when anything threatens that.

A 25-percent tariff on steel and a 10-percent tariff on aluminum threatens that because almost every one of those auto parts suppliers in Tennessee uses aluminum and steel in making their parts for cars and trucks that will be sold in the United States and exported around the world.

If your price goes up, what usually happens is your profits go down, your sales go down, and your wages don't go up as fast or jobs might disappear. That is what happened when President George W. Bush did something similar at the beginning of his term. I had just come to the U.S. Senate in 2003, and President Bush tried to protect the steel companies, but what he did was hurt everyone else more than the steel companies. There were more jobs lost in the companies that used steel than in the companies that produced steel.

Already, I am hearing stories all across our State about the effects of tariffs, and I was hearing stories about the potential effects of tariffs even before they were imposed. For example, not just auto parts but Electrolux—a big home appliance manufacturer planning a \$250 million new plant to make home appliances in Springfield, TN—buys 100 percent of its steel in the United States. But as soon as the steel tariffs were announced, it put that expansion on hold because when you raise the price of steel coming into the United States, then all the domestic suppliers raise their prices. Electrolux said that even though it bought all of its steel from U.S. suppliers, it couldn't be competitive in the marketplace with tariffs on imported steel. That is one example.

Here is a different kind of example. Bush Brothers in East Tennessee, in Newport, has a remarkable operation. They can one-third of all the beans in the United States. You have probably bought Bush Brothers beans. Well, the cans have a certain kind of steel that is mostly imported because not enough of it is made in the United States. Bush Brothers estimates that the tariff on steel will reduce their revenues by 8.5 percent. They are a big company. That is one-third of all beans in the United States. These aren't served in country clubs. These are people who are in ordinary homes around the country buying cans of baked beans. Their prices go up, and the revenues go down, profits go down, employees go down, jobs go down, and wages don't go up in Newport, TN.

Then we have two big tire companies in Tennessee. Bridgestone is one of them. All tires have a strengthening kind of steel to make them stronger. None of that is produced in the United States. All of it is imported. So when you put a 25-percent tax on that strengthening steel coming in for the tires there at Bridgestone and at Hankook, in Clarksville, TN, up goes the price for American consumers who buy tires, and down go the profits for Bridgestone and Hankook, and down go the revenues, and down go the opportunities for increased wages and jobs.

So think about the impact of a 25-percent increase on the materials you use to make parts in the companies that employ one-third of all the manufacturing jobs in Tennessee. We have a big, strong auto industry in the Southeastern United States. We think a lot about the Midwest, and we are proud of that. While the Midwest lost 3.6 million jobs in the last 20 years in the auto industry, the Southeast gained 3.6 million jobs. We have a good, strong auto industry in Tennessee, and we don't want to see it hurt.

That is why I have respectfully said to President Trump—I saw him in Nashville last week, and I said: Mr. President, as you know, I agree with you, and I am proud of what has happened with the best economy in the last 18 years with lower taxes, with fewer regulations, and all of those things. These are the most significant accomplishments in at least 30 years by a conservative government. I would like to persuade you to change your mind on tariffs. Our State is likely to be hurt more than any other State because, in many ways, we are the No. 1 auto State. What I would suggest, respectfully, is a focus shift from tariffs to reciprocity; in other words, say to every country: Please do for us what we do for you. We are going to insist on that. And then we have various tools and weapons—maybe including tariffs in some cases—to enforce that. But the goal should be, you do for us what we do for you.

Mexico and Canada can do that. That shouldn't be a problem. The trade deficit is not the right indicator with Mexico and Canada. We produce nearly 24 percent of all the money in the world in the United States. Mexico produces about 1 percent. So they spend 25 percent of their money buying stuff from us, and we spend one-fifth of 1 percent buying stuff from them.

Let's not focus on the trade deficit. Let's not start with tariffs. Say to other countries: Do for us what we do for you. Go country by country and enforce that. That would be consistent with all the other accomplishments that happened in the last 18 months. That would be consistent with the lower taxes and the fewer regulations and the other actions that have increased the best economy in the last 18 years. It is my hope that I can become more persuasive on that. Article I, section 8, gives Congress the specific right to deal with tariffs and trade, and I hope we do.

Madam President, if I may say one more thing about the vote we will be having at 12:30. Today the Senate is finally voting to confirm Ken Marcus, a well-qualified nominee, to serve as Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights at the Department of Education.

I worked to get a time agreement for this vote because Mr. Marcus did not deserve to be the subject of the Democrats' unreasonable and unnecessary obstruction and delays. I want to thank Senator MURRAY from Wash-

ington and the Democratic leader, Senator SCHUMER, for helping to bring these delays to a conclusion today.

For example, Mr. Marcus was nominated on October 30, 2017—220 days ago. He has been pending on the floor since the HELP Committee approved his nomination on January 18, 2018—140 days ago. To compare, President Obama's two nominees to this position, Russlynn Ali and Catherine Lhamon, were confirmed in 45 and 52 days, and both were confirmed by a voice vote. That doesn't mean that every Republican supported these nominees, but it means we knew that students would be better served when the Department of Education had a confirmed civil rights official in place even if Republicans might disagree with that person.

I would remind my colleagues that when President Obama proposed to have John King serve as Acting Secretary of Education for 1 year, I said: Mr. President, the country is better served and we are better served if you send us a nomination and let us confirm Mr. King, even though we disagree with him. The President did that. I made sure he was confirmed within a month. That is what should happen when a President makes nominations.

It is time to confirm Mr. Marcus and give Secretary DeVos and our country an Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights. Mr. Marcus has a deep understanding of civil rights law. He founded the Louis D. Brandeis Center for Human Rights Under Law and served as Staff Director for the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights for four years. He effectively served in this position before. When he worked in the Department of Education under President George W. Bush, he was delegated the authority of Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights. In that position, he was charged with enforcing civil rights laws, such as Title IX, and he issued guidance reminding schools of their obligation, established in regulation, to have in place Title IX coordinators and procedures for when there was an alleged Title IX violation.

Mr. Marcus enjoys wide support. Sixty-eight organizations signed letters supporting his nomination, including Hillel International, the largest Jewish campus organization in the world, which had this to say:

"Mr. Marcus has been a longtime champion for civil rights and for college students. We have worked personally with him on several campuses across the country in response to specific issues of bigotry and discrimination, and we have found him to be extremely skilled and knowledgeable in Civil Rights laws."

As Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, Mr. Marcus will lead a very important office. The Office for Civil Rights has the responsibility of ensuring that Title IX and other civil rights laws, and the protections they provide to all students, are fully enforced. When Mr. Marcus is confirmed, he will get to work enforcing these laws so that all students feel safe at school.

I am glad we are having this vote today. I support the nomination, and I urge my colleagues to support Mr. Marcus as well.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I oppose the confirmation of Kenneth Marcus to be Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights at the Department of Education. Mr. Marcus has a long record of targeting First Amendment-protected speech and scholarship of people with whom he disagrees. His history also reflects a hostility towards civil rights, including making racially charged accusations and opposing affirmative action. In addition, Mr. Marcus has not publicly committed to upholding the civil rights protections of every student in the country, without regard to LGBTQI status, race, home language, gender, religion, disability, or immigration status.

I am particularly concerned with Mr. Marcus's nomination, given the important role that the Office of Civil Rights—OCR—plays in protecting students from discrimination in schools and on campuses, as well as holding schools accountable for their sexual assault prevention policies. As we are all aware, Secretary DeVos and Acting OCR Director Candice Jackson have already taken very concerning steps to roll back guidance and investigations of potential civil rights violations. Given his testimony before the Senate HELP committee, I fear Mr. Marcus will likely contribute to this troubling pattern of neglect at the Department.

According to a joint statement by UnidosUS and National Urban League: “Kenneth Marcus’ troubling record with regard to enforcing the rights of immigrant students and English learners, and past attempts to undermine critical policies aimed at remedying racial discrimination, including affirmative action. Mr. Marcus [also] has a demonstrated history of hostility toward affirmative action and all race-based remedies to discrimination. He lacks a commitment to enforcing civil rights protections for students of color, and does not believe in disparate-impact or unintentional discrimination. J Street released a statement expressing its concerns with Kenneth Marcus’ nomination, stating that “[s]tudents deserve an assistant secretary who will uphold all of our community’s values and priorities—including support for the fight against sexual violence and all forms of discrimination. We need government officials who will defend women and all those impacted by sexual violence, and who will fight this epidemic on college campuses and in our society. It’s evident that Marcus would be an obstacle and not an ally in this work. His record shows that he is not prepared to take a stand against the many forms of discrimination based on gender, race, sexual identity and disability that harm students today.”

In addition, the following various education, civil and disability rights

groups oppose the nomination: American Association of University Women, AAUW; American Federation of Teachers; American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee; Americans for Peace Now; Arab American Institute; Asian Americans Advancing Justice; Autistic Self Advocacy Network; Center for Law and Social Policy, CLASP; Disability Rights Education & Defense Fund; End Rape on Campus; Feminist Majority Foundation; Hispanic Federation; Human Rights Campaign; J Street; Jewish Voices for Peace; Lambda Legal; Lawyers’ Committee for Civil Rights Under Law; The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights; League of United Latin American Citizens; Middle East Studies Association of North America; Muslim Advocates; NAACP; NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund; National Alliance for Partnerships in Equity, NAPE; National Bar Association; National Center for Lesbian Rights; National Center for Transgender Equality; National Council of Jewish Women; National Education Association; National Urban League; National Women’s Law Center; Know Your IX; People for American Way; Policy Link; Poverty & Race Research Action Council; Southeast Asia Resource Action Center; Southern Poverty Law Center; TASH; UnidosUS, formerly NCLR; and YWCA USA.

Given the widespread opposition to Mr. Marcus’s nomination, his troubling testimony in support of his confirmation, I cannot support his nomination. I urge my colleagues to likewise oppose it.

(At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

• Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. President, I rise today to oppose the nomination of Kenneth L. Marcus, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, Department of Education.

The U.S. Department of Education’s Office for Civil Rights, OCR, was established to address discrimination that prevents all students from receiving an equal opportunity to learn. No student should experience harmful discrimination because of their race, gender, disability, religion, ethnicity, sexual orientation, or gender identity.

Based on Mr. Marcus’s record and performance during his confirmation process, I have no confidence that he is ready to effectively lead OCR and robustly enforce civil rights protections throughout the country. Mr. Marcus’s demonstrated lack of commitment to the mission of OCR and his failure to understand that all children, regardless of citizenship status, have a right to attend public schools, are warning signs that the nominee is not the right person to lead OCR.

Students in Illinois and across the Nation deserve a leader of OCR who will actively investigate and enforce civil rights protections, particularly in cases where there is evidence of systemic discrimination. An unwillingness or inability to address comprehensive,

systemic discrimination in education is disqualifying, and I must oppose Mr. Marcus’s confirmation.●

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). The Senator from Kansas.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BILL

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, I want to speak briefly about the National Defense Authorization Act, which will soon be our topic of business.

I compliment the Armed Services Committee for their diligence and their efforts to authorize appropriations for our Armed Forces in a very thoughtful and deliberative manner.

I have submitted several amendments. I want to talk about a particular one to that underlying bill, amendment No. 2269, which is cosponsored by the senior Senator from Kansas, Mr. ROBERTS, as well as Senator GILLIBRAND from New York and the Democratic leader, Senator SCHUMER from New York.

Our amendment takes the same approach that the committee takes by addressing the Army’s internal process on force structure—to thoughtfully deliberate how and where the Army makes smart investments, which includes the stationing decisions for soldiers and families that have a consequence not only on those soldiers and families but also on the cost of defending our country for decades to come.

Fortunately, both the Department of Defense and the Army are now experiencing a much-needed period of time in which there is growth—opportunities for us to spend additional dollars to defend our Nation. Our Armed Forces are modernizing, and they are increasing their readiness and lethality to be in a position to better deter, confront, and defeat adversaries in a security environment more complex and volatile than possibly anytime in our country’s history, certainly within recent time. During this moment of growth, the Army ought not miss the opportunity to conduct due diligence in all of their decisions and invest wisely to pay down the cost in the future.

The Army is focusing on reform and seeking to maximize the value of every dollar, to operate transparently, and to appropriately use the resources that the Congress has entrusted to them. They are taxpayer dollars. With this focus on reform, transparency, and on using every dollar wisely, this amendment No. 2269 helps the Army maximize the value of every dollar, operate transparently with Congress, and appropriately use the resources entrusted to them.

I have been working with Army staff and senior leadership since February of this year to better understand their process, and I thank them for their efforts and the straightforward conversations we have had during this process.

Based upon our conversations and testimony, my amendment codifies the transparency they are seeking and updates to the Army’s stationing process that will better ensure that the Army