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 Luján, 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	Luján	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 influence 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—noted their goal 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