

are satisfied with the childcare they are providing, but by whatever Washington bureaucrats determine to be appropriate measures of performance.

I am not sure why Washington bureaucrats are better suited than parents to identify quality childcare providers, but as the Democrat candidate for the Governor of Virginia recently made clear, Democrats do not seem to think that parents are best suited to make decisions for their children.

Mr. President, I can go on. I can talk about the confusing government bureaucracy parents will have to navigate under the Democrats' new childcare program, or I can talk about the fact that this new childcare benefit could drive up childcare costs for middle-class families over the next 3 years by a staggering \$13,000 a year, according to one estimate. Yeah, \$13,000 a year.

But, today, what I really want to emphasize is something Democrats conveniently omit from discussions of their new government programs, and that is, as I said, that with government money comes government control. Democrats are setting the stage for a government takeover of childcare, where you can choose your provider only as long as Democrats agree with your choice.

#### ABORTION

Mr. President, before I close, I want to mention one other aspect of the Democratic bill, and that is the bill's commitment to taxpayer funding of abortion.

While the Democratic Party has long supported an abortion agenda, there has at least been bipartisan agreement when it comes to appropriations bills that we are not going to use taxpayer dollars to fund abortion.

For decades—decades, going back to the 1980s—the Hyde amendment and other riders have helped prevent taxpayer dollars from paying for abortions. No longer, if Democrats have their way.

In the Democrats' tax-and-spending spree, taxpayer funding of abortions is the order of the day. Restrictions on the use of taxpayer dollars for abortion funding are omitted, and in at least one case, Democrats actively require funding of abortion and would override State laws on insurance coverage of abortion.

Let's be very clear. This bill is a slap in the face to every American who believes in the sanctity of human life and doesn't want his or her tax dollars going to pay for killing unborn human beings.

You would think that if we can't agree that the human rights of unborn children should be protected, we could at least agree that taxpayers shouldn't be forced to pay for killing unborn children.

Well, apparently, even that is too much to ask for Democrats, even though nearly 60 percent of Americans oppose having their tax dollars go to abortion. That's right, almost 60 per-

cent of Americans do not want their tax dollars going to pay for abortions.

But that doesn't seem to matter to the Democratic Party, which is squarely in the pocket of the radical abortion lobby. The Democrats' legislation contains a radical commitment to government funding of abortions against the wishes of the majority of the American people.

It is just one more reason why the Build Back Better plan is a bad deal for the American people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PADILLA). The Senator Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, how much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 2 minutes.

Mr. CARPER. Thanks very much.

Mr. President, I don't have enough time to respond to everything that my colleague from South Dakota has said. If I did, it would take a long while.

I would say this: A couple of years ago, when we passed with only Republican votes in the House and Senate, signed by President Trump, a tax-cut bill that was supposed to pay for itself, it didn't. It increased our deficit by hundreds of billions of dollars.

I think most of us know, with respect to abortion, the law of the land for many years—over 30 years—has been *Roe v. Wade*; and, essentially, after a certain point, when you have viability in the womb, abortions cannot be performed except in very limited cases, including rape, incest, and the life of the mother.

The legislation that we passed and considered in the House does not provide for changing those limitations, and that needs to be made clear.

The other thing I would say, with respect to the reconciliation bill, the Build Back Better legislation that the House is considering today in the Rules Committee, it is paid for. It is actually paid for, and it is paid for largely by making sure that everybody is paying their fair share.

Folks don't mind in my State—and other States don't mind—you know, seeing their taxes raised, but they want to make sure that everybody else is paying their fair share. As it turns out, there are a lot of wealthy people in this country and a lot of wealthy corporations who don't pay their fair share—in some cases nothing—and that is just wrong.

And the legislation actually cuts taxes for most Americans.

#### VOTE ON CONNOR NOMINATION

Mr. President, now to the issue at hand. We are about to vote today on the nomination of Michael Connor to serve as Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works.

As we all know, this is a critical leadership position for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The Corps of Engineers Civil Works program is the nation's primary provider of water resources infrastructure, and with the increasing impacts of climate change,

having someone of Mr. Connor's caliber at the Corps is critical.

He has the experience and character to be successful in this role. During the Obama administration, he served as Deputy Secretary of the Interior, and he proved himself to be a capable leader. He will bring that experience to the Corps.

If confirmed, Mr. Connor will lead efforts that dramatically impact every corner of this country, from coastal to inland to small, disadvantaged, rural, and Tribal communities.

It is critically important that we get Mr. Connor confirmed now, today. I urge my colleagues to support his nomination.

I think my time has expired.

I yield the floor.

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the Connor nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Michael Lee Connor, of Colorado, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Army.

#### VOTE ON CONNOR NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Connor nomination?

Mr. CARPER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been called for.

Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

(Mr. PETERS assumed the Chair.)

(Mr. SCHATZ assumed the Chair.)

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

The result was announced—yeas 92, nays 5, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 463 Ex.]

#### YEAS—92

Baldwin	Crapo	Lankford
Barrasso	Daines	Leahy
Bennet	Duckworth	Lee
Blackburn	Durbin	Lujan
Blumenthal	Ernst	Lummis
Blunt	Feinstein	Manchin
Booker	Fischer	Markey
Boozman	Gillibrand	McConnell
Braun	Graham	Menendez
Brown	Grassley	Merkley
Burr	Hagerty	Moran
Cantwell	Hassan	Murkowski
Capito	Heinrich	Murphy
Cardin	Hickenlooper	Murray
Carper	Hirono	Ossoff
Casey	Hoehn	Padilla
Cassidy	Hyde-Smith	Peters
Collins	Inhofe	Portman
Coons	Kaine	Reed
Cornyn	Kelly	Risch
Cortez Masto	Kennedy	Romney
Cotton	King	Rosen
Cramer	Klobuchar	Rubio

Sanders	Sinema	Van Hollen
Sasse	Smith	Warner
Schatz	Stabenow	Warren
Schumer	Sullivan	Whitehouse
Scott (FL)	Tester	Wicker
Scott (SC)	Thune	Wyden
Shaheen	Tillis	Young
Shelby	Toomey	

NAYS—5

Cruz	Marshall	Tuberville
Hawley	Paul	

NOT VOTING—3

Johnson	Rounds	Warnock
---------	--------	---------

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

### 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 senior assistant 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. 312, Robert Luis Santos, of Texas, to be Director of the Census for a term expiring December 31, 2026. (Reappointment).

Charles E. Schumer, Chris Van Hollen, John Hickenlooper, Brian Schatz, Tina Smith, Jeff Merkley, Tammy Duckworth, Patrick J. Leahy, Christopher A. Coons, Sheldon Whitehouse, Ben Ray Lujan, Christopher Murphy, Martin Heinrich, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Michael F. Bennet, Ron Wyden, Raphael Warnock.

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

Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Robert Luis Santos, of Texas, to be Director of the Census for a term expiring December 31, 2026 (Reappointment), shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 61, nays 36, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 464 Ex.]

YEAS—61

Baldwin	Cantwell	Cornyn
Bennet	Capito	Cortez Masto
Blumenthal	Cardin	Duckworth
Blunt	Carper	Durbin
Booker	Casey	Feinstein
Brown	Collins	Gillibrand
Burr	Coons	Graham

Grassley	Menendez	Schumer
Hassan	Merkley	Shaheen
Heinrich	Murkowski	Sinema
Hickenlooper	Murphy	Smith
Hirono	Murray	Stabenow
Johnson	Ossoff	Tester
Kaine	Padilla	Toomey
Kelly	Peters	Van Hollen
King	Portman	Warner
Klobuchar	Reed	Warren
Leahy	Romney	Whitehouse
Lujan	Rosen	Wyden
Manchin	Sanders	
Markey	Schatz	

NAYS—36

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

NOT VOTING—3

Cramer	Rounds	Warnock
--------	--------	---------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 61, the nays are 36.

The motion is agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

#### BUILD BACK BETTER AGENDA

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, over the last year, America's economy has faltered and the American people are struggling. Families have been confronted with rising inflation, which is essentially a tax on their paycheck every time they go to the grocery store, every time they fill up the gas tank, and every time they go out and buy clothing or essentials for their family. America's small businesses, after suffering from the COVID shutdowns last year, are facing supply chain issues and labor shortages.

It is no surprise that the majority of Americans believe our economy is in poor health and they fear things are getting worse.

And the Democrats' answer to the growing economic anxiety?

Double down on Big Government policies.

President Biden and Democratic leaders are pursuing a \$2 trillion tax-and-spending spree that offers Americans more debt, more government, more taxes, and more inflation. They think that government is the answer to all our problems. This \$2 trillion bill is an attempt to fundamentally transform from an opportunity-driven society built on the American dream to a dependency-driven society powered by the Federal Government.

The Biden administration put a lot of work into trying to market their plan—their tax-and-spending spree. They claim it will bring down costs and help the middle class.

But what are their top priorities?

Tax cuts for their wealthy donors in New York and California and other blue States that have State and local taxes, giving them a deduction on those taxes imposed by State legislatures and Democratic Governors. They want to raise the SALT tax from

\$10,000 to \$72,000, a move that mainly benefits wealthy Americans.

Ninety-seven percent of the tax cuts would go to Americans making more than \$100,000 a year. Millionaires would get a \$23,000 tax cut. And, as Democrats' rich donors get richer, middle-class families get poorer.

Although Democrats are touting their childcare cost entitlement program, the devil really is in the details. While a single parent stands to receive thousands of dollars in childcare payments, married parents at the same income level would receive no assistance at all.

Once the regulations in the bill are factored in, the cost of unsubsidized childcare will skyrocket. Millions of middle-class families won't get subsidies because they make more than \$67,000 a year, and they will be on the hook for the rising costs of healthcare that their proposal will create. According to one analysis, parents making more than \$67,000 a year can see their childcare costs skyrocket by more than \$13,000 in the first year of the program.

How many middle-class families can afford that?

Democrats also want to meddle with our Nation's economy under the guise of promising that they just want to combat climate change.

The Democrats are proposing a new electric vehicle tax credit, which would subsidize high-cost electric vehicles for affluent Americans who can already afford them. To make matters worse, Democrats are offering a second tax credit only if you purchase an electric vehicle constructed by their Big Labor union allies. That's right, a car built in a non-union shop doesn't get the tax subsidy; a car built in a union shop does.

Look, I support clean energy, and I have got a record of supporting it here in the Senate and back in my time at the House of Representatives in North Carolina, but I don't support having the Federal Government unfairly pick winners and losers in the private markets.

Democrats also hope to create a Civilian Climate Corps to give young liberal activists paid jobs—jobs paid by the American taxpayer. That is an outrageous concept, considering that we already have a record number of jobs that private employers can't fill. The government is going to create jobs to compete with these businesses that are desperately looking for labor.

But this isn't about jobs. It is about the socialist wing of the Democratic Party having their own army of government-funded social justice warriors. It is no surprise that the Civilian Climate Corps is championed by the radical and anti-Semitic Sunrise Movement. Their activists have protested climate policy in the past by blocking traffic during rush hour and chaining themselves to boats. They also frequently go to homes of elected officials—including me, just back in August—to trespass on property and to