

to explain to the American people why he thinks abandoning our partners and retreating in the face of the Taliban will make America safer.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, on one final matter, \$865,000 dollars—\$865,000. That is roughly the cost of every new job the White House claims their so-called American Jobs Plan would create, \$865,000.

This is how the math shakes out if you use the most favorable estimates that the Biden administration itself prefers. Figures reported by Bloomberg News come out to about \$865,000 per job. Other analyses have found numbers actually north of \$860,000.

Here is where the number comes from. The White House has tried to claim their spending plan would create 19 million jobs over the next decade. That is completely false. The Washington Post Fact Checker gave Democrats multiple Pinocchios for this false claim.

Nineteen million jobs is one estimate of the total number of jobs the entire country would add over the next decade, from all sources—all sources. The same estimate says we are on track to add more than 16 million of those same jobs without the bill.

So this proposal to tax, borrow, and spend \$2.25 trillion would only create 2.6 million new jobs. And remember, these are the rosiest—rosiest—best-case estimates that the White House itself has been pushing.

Now, I know a whole lot of Kentucky entrepreneurs and business owners who create more than one job if we gave them \$865,000 to invest and expand.

Mr. President, I am sure you represent a lot of smart people who could turn an \$865,000 investment into more than just one job.

The awful arithmetic just underscores how disappointing the proposal is. When the American people think of infrastructure, they think of honest-to-goodness public works projects that truly invest in the public good—things that build our Nation’s backbone. And when Congress tackles real, tangible infrastructure issues in a smart fashion, there is big, broad bipartisan support.

The 2015 highway bill, the FAST Act, was a huge bipartisan lift that Senator INHOFE and former Senator Boxer hammered out together. I was proud to play a major role in that accomplishment myself. It was the first full 5-year highway bill that Congress had passed in 20 years. And it won 83 votes in the Senate and about the same percentage over in the House.

Even more recently, in 2018, the Senate passed America’s Water Infrastructure Act, 99 to 1—the new investments in water infrastructure across the country to create jobs, grow the economy, and ensure that American families get the safe drinking water they deserve, 99 to 1.

Just last year, another water infrastructure package came out of the EPW Committee unanimously and cleared the Senate in a package that passed 92 to 6.

So there is bipartisan appetite for smart infrastructure bills that are built the right way. The Senate has proven that over and over again. There isn’t much appetite for using the word “infrastructure” to justify a colossal—colossal—multitrillion-dollar slush fund for unrelated bad ideas.

A Harvard economist and infrastructure expert says, and listen to this, “It does a bit of violence to the English language” to call this an infrastructure proposal. That is a Harvard economist.

An expert at Columbia says big chunks of the proposal are “really social spending, not productivity-enhancing infrastructure of any kind.”

One political analyst wrote:

[T]he plan . . . reads like a liberal wish list for everything the left has wanted.

Less than 6—6 percent of the proposal goes to roads and bridges, less than 6 percent. It would send more money to just electric cars than it would spend on our Nation’s roads, bridges, ports, airports, and waterways combined.

And while this proposal chases every green fad, it would also slam our economy with the largest tax hikes in a generation.

Experts at the Wharton School of Business have projected the plan would decrease GDP, decrease capital stock, and reduce workers’ hourly wages 10, 20, and 30 years down the road.

Economists at Rice University recently looked at a similar package of Democratic tax hikes and found it would lead to a loss of a million jobs here in our country over just 2 years. Exactly when American workers are counting on an economic recovery, Democrats want to slap the economy with a massive set of tax increases.

So look, this noninfrastructure “infrastructure” plan is cut from the same cloth as the Democrats’ nonvoting rights “voting rights” bill.

Both these subjects are ripe for bipartisan work. Both are subjects the Senate has addressed in the past with thoughtful compromises that have earned broad support. And both are issues where the American people will reject a far-left approach that makes their lives worse.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive ses-

sion to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Polly Ellen Trottenberg, of New York, to be Deputy Secretary of Transportation.

RECESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:52 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. SINEMA).

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All postcloture time has expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Trottenberg nomination?

Ms. WARREN. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 82, nays 15, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 144 Ex.]

YEAS—82

Baldwin	Hassan	Peters
Barrasso	Heinrich	Portman
Bennet	Hickenlooper	Reed
Blumenthal	Hirono	Risch
Blunt	Hoeben	Romney
Boozman	Hyde-Smith	Rosen
Brown	Inhofe	Rounds
Burr	Johnson	Sanders
Cantwell	Kaine	Sasse
Capito	Kelly	Schatz
Cardin	King	Schumer
Carper	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Casey	Lankford	Sinema
Cassidy	Leahy	Smith
Collins	Lujan	Stabenow
Coons	Lummis	Sullivan
Cornyn	Manchin	Tester
Cortez Masto	Markey	Thune
Cramer	Marshall	Toomey
Crapo	McConnell	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Menendez	Warner
Durbin	Merkley	Warren
Ernst	Moran	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murkowski	Wicker
Fischer	Murphy	Wyden
Gillibrand	Murray	Young
Graham	Ossoff	
Grassley	Padilla	

NAYS—15

Blackburn	Hagerty	Rubio
Braun	Hawley	Scott (FL)
Cotton	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cruz	Lee	Shelby
Daines	Paul	Tuberville

NOT VOTING—3

Booker Tillis Warnock

The nomination was confirmed.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAINE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 35, Wendy Ruth Sherman, of Maryland, to be Deputy Secretary of State.

Charles E. Schumer, Robert Menendez, Chris Van Hollen, Tammy Baldwin, Richard J. Durbin, Thomas R. Carper, Tina Smith, Richard Blumenthal, Ben Ray Lujan, Debbie Stabenow, Ron Wyden, Cory A. Booker, Alex Padilla, Jack Reed, Mark R. Warner, Chris Van Hollen, Robert P. Casey, Jr.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Wendy Ruth Sherman, of Maryland, to be Deputy Secretary of State, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 55, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 145 Ex.]

YEAS—55

Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bennet	Hirono	Romney
Blumenthal	Kaine	Rosen
Brown	Kelly	Rounds
Burr	King	Sanders
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schatz
Capito	Leahy	Schumer
Cardin	Lujan	Shaheen
Carper	Manchin	Sinema
Casey	Markey	Smith
Collins	Menendez	Stabenow
Coons	Merkley	Tester
Cortez Masto	Murkowski	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Murphy	Warner
Durbin	Murray	Warren
Feinstein	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Padilla	Wyden
Hassan	Peters	
Heinrich	Portman	

NAYS—42

Barrasso	Graham	Moran
Blackburn	Grassley	Paul
Blunt	Hagerty	Risch
Boozman	Hawley	Rubio
Braun	Hoeven	Sasse
Cassidy	Hyde-Smith	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Inhofe	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Johnson	Shelby
Cramer	Kennedy	Sullivan
Crapo	Lankford	Thune
Cruz	Lee	Toomey
Daines	Lummis	Tuberville
Ernst	Marshall	Wicker
Fischer	McConnell	Young

NOT VOTING—3

Booker Tillis Warnock

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 55, the nays are 42.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Wendy Ruth Sherman, of Maryland, to be Deputy Secretary of State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

GEORGIA

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, over the past several weeks, all eyes have been on Georgia and the State legislation that is being considered on voting rights of Georgia's citizens. In response to the new voting restrictions the State's Governor signed into law last month, American leaders from many walks of life responded. It has really brought the issue of voter suppression to the forefront at the beginning of a national debate.

We are told that hundreds—hundreds—of bill changes and amendments are being offered in State legislatures across the country, all modeled after the Georgia goal, the Georgia outline, of reducing the opportunity to vote in America.

If you have a functioning democracy where people actually count votes, the number of people who show up is as important as how they vote, and I think the people in Georgia have realized that with this new approach they are taking. There has been a broad condemnation of the Georgia voting law, and it has inspired a display of unity in support of our fundamental right to vote across America. It seems that some of my Republican colleagues would rather silence the law's critics than address the very real issues that the law creates.

Over the recess, the minority leader, Senator McCONNELL, issued a warning to the leaders of corporations who were voicing their opposition to the Georgia law. He said to them: You stay out of politics. He apparently did not say "Keep your money out of politics" because he has been a fan of the Citizens United decision, which gives those same corporations not only the opportunity but the experience of spending millions of dollars in every election cycle to affect the outcome.

I appreciate the Republican leader's newfound passion for addressing the in-

fluence of big corporations, but rather than silencing leaders in the private sector from speaking their minds, which is their constitutional right, I would invite my Republican colleagues to join Democrats in taking more meaningful steps to protect our political system from corporate overreach.

They can join us if they wish in supporting the For the People Act, the democracy defense bill. The For the People Act would limit the influence of dark money and special interests in our politics, require big money contributors and special interests to actually drop the veil and show us who they are, and tighten the rules that affect the super PACs. It is a commonsense solution for protecting every American's First Amendment right to free speech, and it would level the playing field of the political system so that everybody has an equal say.

I would also invite my Republican colleagues to revive the bipartisan spirit of the Voting Rights Act. I can remember a time when renewal of the Voting Rights Act was a virtually unanimous bipartisan effort. Unfortunately, that changed, and the Supreme Court decision didn't make it any easier. So we are trying with the John Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act to return to the days of bipartisanship in addressing the issue of race and politics. It is especially important given the scourge of voter suppression laws we have seen in State legislatures across the country, Georgia being the most recent example.

This new Georgia law isn't new at all. It emerges from the playbook that is over 120 years old. It goes all the way back to the 1890s, when Reconstruction was followed by the Jim Crow era in the South, with the creation of something known as the Mississippi Plan. Historian Dr. Carol Anderson, who teaches at Emory University, has referred to the Mississippi Plan, a template of State law, as "a dizzying array of poll taxes, literacy tests, understanding clauses, newfangled voter registration rules, and 'good character' clauses—all intentionally racially discriminatory but dressed up in the genteel garb of bringing 'integrity' back to the voting booth."

A politician who sought to replicate the Mississippi Plan in the State of Virginia noted that their goal—he was very blunt in what he said—was to "[eliminate] every [Black] voter who can be gotten rid of, legally, without materially impairing the numerical strength of the white electorate."

Today's voter restrictions might not involve poll taxes, literacy tests, or counting the number of beans in a jar, but like the laws passed during the Jim Crow era, Georgia's new voting law is a deliberate effort to suppress voters, particularly voters of color. There is no other way to describe it when the law includes provisions that make it harder for Georgians to vote.

Let me give you some examples. I read an article last week in the New