

DC—in West Virginia made huge investments into their water infrastructure system to ensure the system could handle the volume of water that the brand-new Procter & Gamble plant needed. And it is massive amounts of water, and it is a massive plant. We are very happy that they are there employing over 1,000 West Virginians.

So with that upgraded water system, P&G was able to operate more efficiently and even to expand—and they are still expanding—and that meant more jobs. That kind of opportunity needs to be available everywhere, not just in my home State but in Connecticut and in other places around the country.

These are just a few of the provisions that address and are informed by the particular challenges that face my State. But based on the feedback of my colleagues in both parties and the groundswell of support from various water advocacy groups, it is clear these provisions have broad applicability to help communities all across this beautiful country.

It is why we have such a diverse and growing coalition of more than 70 supporters—from water systems to local governments, to industry, to labor, to environmental organizations—who are supporting this legislation, not to mention that we had a unanimous vote out of committee.

These organizations recognize the value of this legislation and its commonsense and responsible approach to addressing our water infrastructure issues. We will be discussing more of the valuable provisions of this bill on the Senate floor this week, and I look forward to that debate.

In closing, I just want to urge my colleagues to vote in favor of advancing this bill and, later, for final passage. I mentioned it passed unanimously out of committee. There is a big debate in the broader sense: Can Congress get together on infrastructure? This is what I would define as basic, core infrastructure. This, I think, is a good test case for us, and this, I think, is one in which we all have a great interest. Conservatives, moderates, and liberals all came together on this.

I would like to thank my counterpart and my chairman, Senator CARPER, and his staff for their work, as well as our Water Subcommittee counterpart chairman, Senator DUCKWORTH, and Ranking Member LUMMIS.

This bill is proof that we can work together on infrastructure. This is a bipartisan, responsible, meaningful investment. We are taking care of pipes, we are looking out for our environment, and we are putting special emphasis on helping rural and disadvantaged communities. At the end of the day, this bill is really about helping people. This is a bipartisan bill that we can all be proud of.

Again, I ask my colleagues to vote yes on the motion to proceed and again on the underlying bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARKEY). The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be able to complete my remarks, given the time constraints.

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

NOMINATION OF COLIN HACKETT KAHL

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the nomination of Colin Kahl to serve as Undersecretary of Defense for Policy.

Our Nation needs leaders at the Department of Defense who are not driven by a partisan agenda and are committed to making sure our troops have all the resources and support they need to succeed. We need leaders who understand that our adversaries are regimes like those in Communist China and Iran and that our friends are countries like Israel and its partners in the Middle East. That is not Dr. Kahl. I have grave concerns about Dr. Kahl's lack of support for one of our great allies, Israel, weakness toward Communist China and desire to rejoin the disastrous Iran Deal.

The Undersecretary of Defense for Policy serves as the Defense Secretary's top national security adviser, a position that requires sound judgment and an even temperament. Dr. Kahl's history of partisan rhetoric makes him unfit for this position.

For all these reasons, I oppose Mr. Kahl's nomination and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I rise today to oppose Colin Kahl's nomination for Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, and I advise my colleagues to do the same, as we are getting ready to take a vote on this very important position in the Pentagon. That, to me, is one of the most important positions we have at the Department of Defense.

While I have many policy disagreements with Dr. Kahl, which I have discussed at length with him, I want to say I have a long history of working across the aisle, with Democrats and Republicans, on defense issues, even with those with whom I don't agree on their policies. As a matter of fact, the Presiding Officer and I have a very strong working relationship, and we don't agree on a lot of issues, particularly on issues of the military.

I serve on the Armed Services Committee, and I take these matters very seriously. They are some of the main reasons I ran for the U.S. Senate 6½ years ago. I focus a lot on military personnel, uniform and civilian, whom we put in the Pentagon and who have this enormous responsibility to oversee the Department of Defense.

Whether they are Assistant Secretaries, Under Secretaries, admirals, or generals, I try to understand where they are coming from, and I have a record of strongly supporting almost all of them, whether they have been in the Obama administration, the Trump administration, or even are in the

Biden administration. For example, I not only supported the Secretary of Defense, Lloyd Austin, knowing that I wasn't going to agree with him on everything, but I actually introduced him at his confirmation hearing because I served with him in the military, and I know he is a man of honor and character. I strongly supported the Deputy Secretary of Defense, Kath Hicks, given her background and knowledge. Yet some nominees I have not and I will not support, particularly in this area that is so important to our Nation's defense. I will object to these people because, like Dr. Kahl, I don't believe he has the temperament or judgment to do the job.

Like I said, I have looked at and focused on dozens and dozens of members with regard to their temperament and judgment who need Senate confirmation to the Department of Defense. The vast, vast majority, Democrat or Republican, I have supported but not this one. And this is a really important position. The Under Secretary of Defense for Policy is essentially the No. 3 position in the Pentagon.

As I mentioned, it is my view and, I believe, the view of most of my colleagues, at least on this side of the aisle, that Dr. Kahl does not have the temperament or judgment. In fact, I believe that he has the potential to be a liability to our national security and our defense and not to be viewed favorably by the men and women he is supposed to lead.

Let me talk about temperament and give a little bit of background.

Not even a year ago, a number of Senate Democrats, my colleagues, wrote of the official who was nominated by the Trump administration for this same position, the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, BG Anthony Tata. The letter that was signed by a number of my Senate Democratic colleagues, many of whom are on the Committee on Armed Services, focused on that nominee's record of "offensive and inflammatory comments which would disqualify you from serving in your current position and the position for which you have been nominated." That is one of the quotes. Remember, this was for the same position but with the Trump administration.

This letter also read that he had made inflammatory remarks regarding the President—that would be President Obama—and inflammatory remarks regarding rhetoric for Members of Congress as well. Again, that was last year. This is the standard that was being used.

This letter goes on to read:

Your multiple past statements cannot be dismissed as simple aberration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD this letter dated July 24, 2020.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, DC, July 24, 2020.

Brigadier General (ret.) ANTHONY J. TATA,
Senior Advisor, U.S. Department of Defense,
Washington, DC.

DEAR BRIGADIER GENERAL TATA: We write to urge that you withdraw your nomination to be Under Secretary of Defense for Policy at the Department of Defense (the Department) and resign your current position as a senior advisor. Your record of offensive and inflammatory comments disqualifies you from serving in your current position and the position for which you have been nominated.

If confirmed by the Senate to be Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, you would become “the principal official reporting to the Secretary of Defense who is responsible for policy development and planning [. . .], lead[ing] the formulation and coordination of national security and defense policy with the Department of Defense [. . .], integrat[ing] policies and plans to achieve desired objectives [. . . and] build[ing] partnerships and defense cooperation with U.S. friends and allies. In other words, you would have significant, wide-ranging influence on the policies and activities of the Pentagon and defense relationships with our most critical allies and partners.

Anyone nominated to be a high-ranking Pentagon official must be qualified and also a person of high character whose record is consistent with the values of our country and those of the U.S. military. Nominees should see the value diversity, inclusion, and unity bring to our institutions. Unfortunately, your history of public remarks does not meet this standard. In 2018, you said that Islam is the “most oppressive violent religion I know of,” and that the 2015 agreement to block Iran’s pathways to a nuclear weapon alone is more than enough evidence of [former President Barack Obama’s] drive to subvert U.S. national interests to Islam and a globalist agenda. You called President Obama a “terrorist leader” and alleged that the former president “made no secret of his belief that a weaker America made for a stronger world. Moreover, you falsely claimed that President Obama “is a Muslim—repeating a claim used by then-presidential candidate Donald Trump and others who attempt to incite anti-Muslim prejudice and otherize Islam by suggesting it is an inferior religion and synonymous with terrorism. You also said in a now-deleted tweet on July 2, 2018, “Never a doubt. Among dozens of clues, Obama supported Russian meddling in 2016 election & influenced Israeli elections to try to oust Netanyahu & help Hamas & Muslim brotherhood U.S. really did have Manchurian Candidate in White House.

Unfortunately, your inflammatory remarks did not stop there. You reserved further dishonorable and disqualifying rhetoric for members of Congress as well. For example, you claimed that Speaker Nancy Pelosi and Congresswoman Maxine Waters “have always been the same violent extremist” and referred to Congresswoman Waters in particular as a “vicious race baiting racist.” Only after your nomination became public and reports exposed your repugnant statements, many of which you deleted, you walked them back in a recent letter to the Senate Armed Services Committee Chairman and Ranking Member. In that letter, you reportedly refer to your offensive tweets as an “aberration in a four-decade thread of faithful public service. Furthermore, you noted that despite your “strong record of inclusivity and bipartisanship in my commentary,” you “did misspeak in 2018 on Twitter in hyperbolic conversations” and that “[t]here is no excuse for those comments, for which I take complete responsibility and also fully retract and denounce.”

Your letter to committee leadership appears to be a conveniently timed retraction by someone who has suddenly realized his nomination is in jeopardy. But your multiple past statements cannot be dismissed simply as an aberration. No one with a record of repeated, repugnant statements like yours should be nominated to serve in a senior position of public trust at the Pentagon. Your views are wholly incompatible with the U.S. military’s values.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. We call on you to withdraw your nomination.

Mr. SULLIVAN. You have almost the identical situation here. What happened with General Tata is that his nomination, for a lot of these reasons, was withdrawn by the Trump administration. Yet now you have the same, almost identical issues with this nominee, and when I showed this letter to my Democratic colleagues, they were like, “Oh, no. That’s OK.” It is not OK. It is not OK.

So let’s talk about temperament and tweets with Dr. Kahl.

Really, the issue here is, is he more of a political hack who is tweeting all of the time—he tweets quite a lot—or is he somebody with the temperament of a partisan internet troll, or is he a measured national security professional who can lead the Pentagon in the No. 3 position? Unfortunately, I think it is the former issue, not the latter. He has a long history of tweets.

Just like the issues that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle objected to last year for this same position with the Trump administration’s nominee, who was withdrawn for these reasons, here is just a small example of Dr. Kahl’s tweets. These are the same issues that my colleagues were concerned about. There have been a lot of attacks on Members of Congress. OK. That is fine. We are in the public arena.

Here is what he wrote:

The GOP used to pride itself as the party that put values front and center in U.S. foreign policy. Now they are the party of ethnic cleansing.

OK. I don’t think we are the party of ethnic cleansing. That is pretty strong stuff.

He tweeted more:

Let’s not mince words. The Trump administration kidnapped children. The Republican Party, in terms of national security, are now part of a “death cult.”

He retweeted the now discredited Lincoln Project attacks. I know a lot about them. It spent a lot of money in my race. It is a very discredited group of people, by the way. Very disturbed are some of their leaders at the Lincoln Project.

He calls and tweets that the President of the United States, the Commander in Chief, is a moron, is repugnant, is a coward. He went on to call my colleagues in the Senate many additional things that I won’t repeat here. He did this a lot.

No matter what your views are of my colleagues or of the former President, words matter, and attacks matter. If

you can’t refrain from making them, maybe you don’t belong in the No. 3 position in the Pentagon. That was the conclusion that pretty much everybody made last year, so why should it be different with this candidate? It shouldn’t be different.

Don’t get me wrong. It is a free country. You are allowed to tweet and criticize the Commander in Chief and Members of Congress all the time. That is fine. That is what America is. That is what democracy is. But that doesn’t mean you get a free pass to be the No. 3 guy at the U.S. Department of Defense, which is what he wants.

So that is temperament, and I don’t think it is a good temperament with which to lead the Pentagon at all.

Let’s talk about judgment, especially policy judgment. The questions of temperament are often closely aligned with but they are not the same as judgment, particularly as it relates to policies. Judgment is being able to assess a situation, use history as a guide, and take appropriate action.

I think this nominee lacks judgment, which is something that was shown when he was then-Vice President Biden’s National Security Advisor. Let me provide a few examples.

First, as many know, he was a staunch advocate for the Iran nuclear deal and, I believe, an advocate on being soft on Iran.

By the way, it is not always said in public, but a bipartisan majority of U.S. Senators and a bipartisan majority of Members of the House all opposed the Iran deal, but in my view, appeasing the world’s largest state sponsor of terrorism, these terrorists—leaders with the blood of thousands of American troops on their hands—is not smart policy judgment.

Dr. Kahl doesn’t seem to know when we can press the Iranians, and this is a really big issue. Every time someone tried to press them—draw a redline, take aggressive action—he criticized it.

Dr. Kahl, in 2015, argued for sanctions relief on Iran, claiming that the vast majority of the relief would go to butter, not guns. Well, we know how that turned out. That money went to arming terrorists and the continuation of Iran’s proxies around the Middle East and around the world who were committing terrorism.

Dr. Kahl said that pulling out of the Iran nuclear deal was “a dangerous delusion.”

He said: The “hawks in Congress”—and I think he meant that as an insult. By the way, I view that not as an insult, particularly after the Obama-Biden administration cut defense spending by 25 percent and drastically reduced readiness—who are supporting pulling out of the Iran deal “won’t be satisfied until they get the war they have pushed for decades.” Really? I didn’t want war with Iran. Those who opposed the JCPOA—again, a bipartisan majority of the U.S. Senators—didn’t want a war with Iran. We just thought the JCPOA was misguided.

After the U.S. strike that killed Iranian terror commando Qasem Soleimani, Kahl tweeted the following: Trump has started a war with Iran and Iraq.

Really? I think what the President and our fine military did when they killed General Soleimani was reestablish deterrence, which we had lost in the Middle East when this terrorist killed thousands and wounded thousands of U.S. service men and women and never had to pay consequences. We reestablished a redline and said: If you kill Americans, you are going to pay.

Guess what. That war never happened, although Kahl predicted it.

Even Iran's Foreign Minister, Mohammad Zarif, acknowledged in these tapes that we have been talking about here on the Senate floor that the killing of Soleimani "was when the United States delivered a major blow to Iran more damaging than if it had wiped out an entire city in an attack." That was from the Foreign Minister of Iran's knowing that what we did was very significant.

Dr. Kahl, if you look at his tweets, wouldn't have done that because he thought it would have "brought the war that the hawks want." We didn't want a war, and we didn't get a war.

Just like John Kerry, who is now being accused of leaking secrets that Israel had—one of our most important allies—to Iran, the world's largest state sponsor of terrorism, I believe he is soft on Iran.

We are going to get to the bottom of the Kerry issue, by the way. It is alleged what he did, but if he did it, if he sold out Israel for Iran, he needs to resign and be fired. We are going to get to the bottom of that.

Let me mention one other issue. It is a sensitive one—I admit it—but I think it is also an important one with Dr. Kahl.

At his confirmation hearing, he said that one of his priorities was to "stamp out 'systemic racism' within the ranks of the military."

Now, look, I care about this issue, and every organization has bad people in it. I spoke on the Senate floor last year about some of these issues. I put forward legislation last year in the NDAA that looks at why we aren't having promotions of African Americans at higher ranks and at the highest ranks of the military. This is an issue I care about, but when he said this in his confirmation hearing—systemic racism within the ranks—I was very curious. Has he served in the ranks, maybe? No, he hasn't. I have for 26 years—still serving. Where did he get the information? That is a broad statement to make about our troops whom you want to lead.

During the hearing, Dr. Kahl admitted he had "no credible evidence to back up that kind of statement." Well, that is a real lack of judgment.

You are besmirching a bunch—a big portion of the force, with no credible data to back it up, and you want to be the No. 3 leader in the Pentagon?

This is judgment, and this is one of the many reasons I am going to vote against him, and I hope that my colleagues do.

Let me end with one final thing. Dr. Kahl made a statement in his confirmation hearing about the requirements of the job:

The position of undersecretary of defense for policy, while it's a political appointment, is not a political job. It's a policy job, one that requires [whoever is in the position] to be nonpartisan.

Well, given his judgment, given his temperament, I don't believe Dr. Kahl has lived up to his own assessment of what is required to serve in the Pentagon's third most important defense role. I don't believe he has the qualifications for this position. There are plenty of good policy experts—Democrats, I am sure, who do—and I would encourage my colleagues to vote against this nomination for these reasons.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 7 minutes prior to the vote on the Kahl nomination.

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

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about Colin Kahl, the President's nominee to be Under Secretary of Defense for Policy.

The most basic responsibility of our government and our military is to protect the national security of the American people, which requires helping our allies and constraining our enemies. The Pentagon's policy chief is responsible for those evaluations.

Unfortunately, I have come to believe that Colin Kahl's judgment is irreparably marred by obsessive animosity toward Israel. I can think of no other way to explain his years of consistently wrong views regarding the Middle East—and not just wrong but impulsive and reckless.

He has repeatedly spilled out his conspiracy theories and attacks on Twitter and other public venues. He views the world through a cracked lens.

And I challenge my Democratic colleagues to explain one simple thing: What other explanation, other than animosity to the world's only Jewish state, could possibly account for all of these staggeringly wrong judgments?

I would like to begin with a topic the Senate has been united on: our opposition to anti-Semitism and to anti-Semitic conspiracy theories.

In 2019, this body came together unanimously to pass a resolution that I authored, along with Democratic Senator TIM Kaine, condemning anti-Semitism as a unique form of bigotry that distorts people's judgments.

Recently, a top adviser to the Ayatollah Khomeini acknowledged what the world long knew—that in 2018, in an operation right out of a Hollywood action movie, Israel seized Iran's na-

tional nuclear archive. The archive proved that Iran had been keeping nuclear weapons blueprints and materials on the shelf. The nuclear deal, of which Kahl was a principle architect, had been flawed from the start.

Kahl responded to the news of the raid by suggesting on Twitter the archive was fabricated by Israel, with the aim of dragging American boys and girls into another Middle East war. This was a pernicious, anti-Semitic conspiracy theory, a blood libel, not just pernicious but wrong.

That was not the only time Kahl leveled troubling conspiracy theories about Israel and Iran. He suggested on Twitter that Trump's policies regarding the Iran deal and Jerusalem were linked to donations from Jewish billionaire Sheldon Adelson. This is not the judgment of anyone who should be anywhere near power or policy.

Another decision the Trump administration made was to move our Embassy in Israel to Jerusalem. There was an active debate within the Trump administration. I leaned in vigorously with the President, and the President agreed with the view I articulated; that we should say to our friends and our enemies that we stand unshakably with the nation of Israel.

Kahl spent years fighting against that move, fighting against moving our Embassy. According to reports from 2012, Kahl was personally responsible for trying to remove language from the Democratic Party platform embracing Jerusalem as the capital of Israel.

This is a long-abiding passion of his. And when President Trump recognized Jerusalem, Kahl predicted it would isolate the United States and Israel and even potentially trigger a third intifada. He was wrong.

Just like he was wrong about supporting Israel, he was wrong about opposing Iran. In 2017, Congress passed legislation mandating that the President declare Iran's IRGC a terrorist organization. Kahl said we were playing "politics" so that we could show we were tough on Iran, and again he predicted disaster. Again, he was wrong.

Kahl has even attacked Democrats on this issue. For instance, he has repeatedly attacked Chairman MENENDEZ for trying to "kill" and use "poison pills" to block appeasement of the Iranian regime.

Turning to current topics, the Obama-Biden team shamefully, repeatedly, recklessly used leaks to leak secrets about Israeli operations against Iranian terrorists and forces.

Now there are new reports on a taped phone call that then-Secretary of State Kerry may have leaked Israeli attacks to Iranian Foreign Minister Zarif, with whom he is personally close. If verified, these reports would mean he maliciously endangered not just Israeli national security but American lives. If these reports are true, John Kerry should resign, and if he doesn't resign, President Biden should fire him.

Colin Kahl was prominent in shaping Obama-Biden policies on Israel and

Iran, and he has been credibly accused of weaponizing and leaking classified information.

I recently joined 17 other Senators in a letter to FBI Director Wray, requesting that the FBI immediately investigate whether he did so. But we are not going to have the answer before we vote today, and I don't see how he can be principally advanced without it.

On issues of foreign policy, this body is often united when standing up against our enemies and standing for our friends. This nominee, I believe, is the most virulently anti-Israel nominee who would serve in the entire Biden administration.

Many of our friends on the Democratic aisle like to say they support the nation of Israel. Well, this is a chance to demonstrate you mean it because you cannot vote to confirm a rabid, anti-Israel, conspiracy theory-tweeting radical to the No. 3 position in the Department of Defense and then claim you are a reliable friend of Israel.

Colin Kahl's record is extreme, fringe, and radical. He has a lifelong obsession with and antipathy to the State of Israel, and he has demonstrated a willingness to endanger Israeli lives and American lives to advance that hostility.

I urge our colleagues on both sides of the aisle to oppose this nomination.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

VOTE ON KAHL NOMINATION

Ms. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all remaining debate time be expired.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

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

Ms. SMITH. 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 bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMMER), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS), and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY) would have voted "NAY".

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

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 171 Ex.]

YEAS—49

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

NAYS—45

Barrasso	Graham	Murkowski
Blackburn	Grassley	Portman
Boozman	Hagerty	Risch
Braun	Hawley	Romney
Burr	Hoever	Rubio
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Cassidy	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Collins	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cotton	Lankford	Thune
Crapo	Lee	Tillis
Cruz	Lummis	Toomey
Daines	Marshall	Tuberville
Ernst	McConnell	Wicker
Fischer	Moran	Young

NOT VOTING—6

Blunt	Cramer	Rounds
Cantwell	Paul	Shelby

The nomination was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will immediately be 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 the debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 34, S. 914, a bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize programs under those Acts, and for other purposes.

Charles E. Schumer, Thomas R. Carper, Tammy Duckworth, Jeff Merkley, Debbie Stabenow, Richard Blumenthal, Jacky Rosen, Michael F. Bennet, Amy Klobuchar, Mazie Hirono, Richard J. Durbin, Tammy Baldwin, Alex Padilla, Maria Cantwell, Sheldon Whitehouse, Cory A. Booker, Patty Murray, Elizabeth Warren.

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 motion to proceed to Calendar No. 34, S. 914, a bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize programs under those Acts, and for other purposes, 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.

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

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS), and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 92, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 172 Ex.]

YEAS—92

Baldwin	Hassan	Portman
Barrasso	Hawley	Reed
Bennet	Heinrich	Risch
Blackburn	Hickenlooper	Romney
Blumenthal	Hirono	Rosen
Booker	Hoever	Rubio
Boozman	Hyde-Smith	Sanders
Braun	Inhofe	Sasse
Brown	Johnson	Schatz
Burr	Kaine	Schumer
Capito	Kelly	Scott (FL)
Cardin	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Carper	King	Shaheen
Casey	Klobuchar	Sinema
Cassidy	Lankford	Smith
Collins	Leahy	Stabenow
Coons	Lujan	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lummis	Tester
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Thune
Cotton	Markey	Tillis
Crapo	Marshall	Toomey
Daines	McConnell	Tuberville
Duckworth	Menendez	Van Hollen
Durbin	Merkley	Warner
Ernst	Moran	Warnock
Feinstein	Murkowski	Warren
Fischer	Murphy	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Murray	Wicker
Graham	Ossoff	Wyden
Grassley	Padilla	Young
Hagerty	Peters	

NAYS—2

Cruz	Lee
------	-----

NOT VOTING—6

Blunt	Cramer	Rounds
Cantwell	Paul	Shelby

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 92, the nays are 2.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

DRINKING WATER AND WASTE-WATER INFRASTRUCTURE ACT OF 2021—MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Cloture having been invoked, the Senate will resume legislative session and consideration of the motion to proceed, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to S. 914, a bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize programs under those Acts, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.