

kids to school. That is why we are trying to get our hospitals staffed. That is why we are doing things.

That is the only thing the President said, is that those people should get a vaccine. He has not said, if you want to get on an airplane, you have to get vaccinated—maybe if you are flying overseas and have to work with another country.

My colleague from Florida knows all too well because he and I are working together to try to get temperature checks in a very broad way established at airports through the U.S. We have agreed that is a smart thing to do. It has been done on an international basis for a long time and it prevents people from getting on a plane who are sick. The President has not said this.

To now put a bill through that might have prohibited the cruise ship industry reestablishing service up to Alaska because now, all of a sudden, you are going to have all of these things is not the way I want to go.

I like what we have been able to achieve. It has taken hard work and working together. It does not take us passing this bill by Senator SCOTT.

I object, and I hope my colleagues understand that we are willing to work on anything related to the transportation sector so it can keep our U.S. economy moving.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. First off, I am disappointed my colleague objected. I think No. 1 is this is unconstitutional. First off, President Biden promised he wouldn't be doing this. This is unconstitutional.

Here is what it is going to do. If you talk to businesses around this country, they are already struggling to get people back to work because of excess funding that has been provided. And now we are going to tell a bunch of people that you can't come back to work because you haven't been vaccinated. We are going to tell people, you can't get on an airplane because you haven't been vaccinated.

This is wrong. This is not what the Federal Government ought to be doing. They ought to do what I did when I was Governor. You give people the information and feel comfortable that the American public will make a good decision.

I think this is a mistake. I hope my colleague will change her mind. And I hope this President will not continue down the path of requiring Americans to get vaccinations, because I don't think it is fair to Americans and I think it is unconstitutional.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

TRIBUTE TO SUSAN MEUSCHKE

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, today, I want to recognize a friend of mine, Susan Meuschke, who is the Executive Director of the Nevada Coalition to End Domestic and Sexual Violence.

She is retiring after three decades working on behalf of women and children in my home State of Nevada.

Sue has been a champion for victims of domestic violence and their families since she worked as a volunteer for the Committee to Aid Abused Women in Reno, NV. It was there—listening to the stories of women dealing with family violence—that she began to understand both their struggles and their courage.

Sue went on to work with the coalition for 32 years, helping develop it into a powerful organization statewide for those affected by domestic and sexual violence.

I have had the pleasure of working with Sue since I was Nevada's attorney general, and together we passed legislation to create dedicated funding for domestic violence programs. She has continued to be a resource for me during my time in the U.S. Senate, as I have worked to prevent sex trafficking, to stem the tide of violence against Native women, and push for the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act.

During the height of the COVID-19 pandemic, I pushed to make sure that our next COVID package included more support for survivors of domestic violence. Sue worked to distribute those Federal funds fairly and effectively to Nevadans, and she worked especially hard to promote a microloan program that families could use to regain financial independence.

As Sue enters her retirement, I want to make sure everyone in Nevada appreciates her decades of advocacy. She has made a profound difference for families in the Silver State. I have no doubt that whoever succeeds Sue at the coalition will continue to work tirelessly to end domestic and sexual violence, because, honestly, we still have so much work to do.

That is why I am here on the Senate floor today. The reality is that women's rights are under attack around the country, and that includes reproductive rights. Anti-abortion extremists are going to great lengths to stop women from seeking reproductive care. As of June, they had proposed 500 new laws restricting reproductive rights and passed 70 of these laws.

Let's start with Texas, where a new law prohibits abortions before many people even know they are pregnant. The law lets anyone sue those who aid and abet abortions and get a \$10,000 reward. It has the potential to create a whole industry of vigilantes prying into their neighbors' lives, all to stop women from being able to access reproductive healthcare.

The American people—70 percent of us—oppose deputizing private citizens to collect these kinds of bounties.

But even though the Texas law is extreme, the Supreme Court has refused to stop it from going into effect. That means that, right now, 7 million women of reproductive age in Texas have been deprived of a key constitu-

tional right, a right that they have had for 50 years.

Clinics in Oklahoma City, OK, and Little Rock, AR, have seen the number of Texas women seeking abortions jump tenfold in a matter of days.

But it is not just Texas where the right to medical care is threatened. Dangerous abortion bans have been signed into law in Mississippi, Arizona, and Georgia, among others. And all of this is happening because anti-abortion extremists have been working for decades to limit women's choices.

Let's be very clear: they are on the brink of success. On December 1, the Supreme Court is set to hear oral arguments in a case called *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health*, which deals with an abortion ban in Mississippi. This case was specifically chosen by anti-choice activists to help strike down *Roe v. Wade*.

Sadly, the Court has given every signal it is willing to do the activists' bidding by overturning *Roe v. Wade* and allowing these bans to take effect. That is why I and 47 of my Senate colleagues filed a friend of the court brief last week, calling on the Supreme Court to stick to the settled precedent of *Roe* and strike down the Mississippi law.

But if the Supreme Court doesn't abide by 50 years of its own rulings, well, there are 19 States where abortion would be illegal the day after a Supreme Court ruling overturning *Roe v. Wade*, and others where abortion bans would likely follow.

All in all, nearly half of women nationwide will see the nearest clinic close. The average distance to the nearest clinic for those seeking reproductive care will jump from 25 to 279 miles. Anyone who has ever worked a minimum-wage job knows that they don't have the luxury of traveling hundreds of miles for healthcare.

Women's healthcare isn't optional. Nevadans know this. That is why we worked so hard in Nevada to protect the right to choose.

In the nineties, we passed a ballot initiative to enshrine choice into law, and we have actually done away with the kind of restrictions on abortion that are popping up in State after State.

But what we are seeing in Texas and other States across the country threatens the future of *Roe v. Wade* everywhere. Let me be clear: It threatens the future of *Roe v. Wade* everywhere. And without *Roe*, there will be no Federal protections in place, paving the way for anti-choice lawmakers to pass legislation to restrict reproductive rights anywhere in the country.

And that is why it is so important for the Senate to pass the Women's Health Protection Act. This bill would outlaw bans in other medically unnecessary restrictions on abortion across the country. It would mean that States could not impose medically unnecessary ultrasounds, excessive waiting periods, and extreme burdens on

healthcare providers intended to limit abortion access.

In Nevada and across the country, the vast majority of voters believes that women should get to make their own decisions about their reproductive health, including when and whether to have a child. We cannot let a dedicated minority take that right away from the rest of us.

Let me just say, I am going to keep working on this issue because it is so important to Nevadans and to women all over this country. This is about making sure that women can control their own bodies and their futures, and I will always stand up for that.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON ANDERSON NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. SMITH). Under the previous order, all postcloture time has expired on the Anderson nomination.

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

Mr. PADILLA. 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 legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 393 Ex.]

YEAS—53

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

NAYS—44

Barrasso	Hagerty	Romney
Blackburn	Hawley	Rounds
Blunt	Hoeben	Rubio
Boozman	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Braun	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Burr	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Capito	Kennedy	Shelby
Cassidy	Lankford	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lee	Thune
Cramer	Lummis	Tillis
Cruz	Marshall	Toomey
Daines	McConnell	Tuberville
Ernst	Paul	Wicker
Fischer	Portman	Young
Grassley	Risch	

NOT VOTING—3

Cotton	Crapo	Moran
--------	-------	-------

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER). Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is con-

sidered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The Senator from Rhode Island.

REDUCE ACT

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I want to talk a moment about my REDUCE Act, which is the act to reduce plastic pollution, of which we have a lot.

Humans have created 8 billion tons of plastic, and it is all over the place. It is in our water. It is in our rivers. It is in our food. The Presiding Officer is from Colorado. As he knows, there was a study done that tested the rain falling in Colorado that showed that there were microplastics in the raindrops in Colorado.

So we have a plastics problem, and this is a bill whose intention is to solve that plastics problem.

I want to have you think about three numbers while I am making this speech: 2 percent, 10 percent, and 2050; 2 percent, 10 percent, and 2050.

What is 2 percent? Two percent is how much recycled plastic the plastics industry uses in single-use, disposable, throwaway plastic.

We had a hearing in the Environment and Public Works Committee, led by Chairman CARPER. We had witnesses in who were experts. They said it is actually less than 2 percent. So the plastics industry is comfortable with a business model in which they are only using recycled plastic for less than 2 percent of their production of single-use, disposable stuff.

They will then say: Well, yeah, but we don't need to worry about that because then it goes into the recycling bin.

Well, first of all, that is not much help if you are only going to use 2 percent recycled plastic in your plastic manufacturing and then 98 percent is all new fossil fuel-based plastic.

But here we get to the second number, 10 percent. When you put plastic in that blue bin and send it out to be recycled, less than 10 percent of that plastic actually gets recycled. Some people have said 6 percent. Some people have said 8 percent. Some people have said 9 percent. But pretty much everybody agrees that less than 10 percent of what you put in the recycling bin to recycle ever gets recycled. And the plastics industry is cool with that too.

The plastics industry is cool with 2 percent recycling content in their throughput, in their supply, and they are comfortable with 90 percent or more of your recycled plastics sent out in the blue bins never being recycled.

This brings me to the third number, 2050. Twenty-fifty is the year which, on present trends, will produce the following state of affairs: There will be more waste plastic floating in the Earth's oceans by mass than there will be living fish. That is the trajectory we are on with an industry that is totally content to use only 2 percent recycled plastic in its production and to have

the recycling system recycle less than 10 percent of the plastic that goes in. That is where we end up by 2050. And if we are content in this room to confer on our children and grandchildren a world in which there is more waste plastic floating around than there is living fish, then shame on us.

This is a trajectory we have to change, and my bill will change it. But, of course, the plastic industry doesn't love this. They are happy with using only 2 percent recycled plastic in their production. They are happy with less than 10 percent of recycled plastic in the blue bin ever getting recycled. They don't seem to give a red hot damn about the trajectory we are on with where we are going to be with waste plastic in the oceans. But they obviously care a lot about the bill because if you lived in Washington, DC, and you got the Washington Post on Wednesday, September 22, you got this little gem tucked in your newspaper on the front. It is a very glossy, multicolored handout, and it says:

Stop the plastic tax. Keep everyday goods affordable.

And then it shows a whole bunch of everyday goods: a bicycle helmet, reusable plastic containers that you use in your refrigerator to put stuff away when you are putting it back in the fridge, sneakers, a plastic child's toy, and a baby diaper.

Not one of those things is covered by our plastics tax—not one of them—not personal hygiene products like a diaper and not multiuse products like a child's toy or a sneaker or a bicycle helmet or the plastic containers that you store stuff in in your refrigerator.

If you flip it over, they go at it even further. There is a child's baby seat. There is solar paneling. There is a toothbrush. There is a cellphone. And there is a little package of tomatoes in Saran wrap in one of those foam Styrofoam containers.

The one thing on this whole page that this plastics pollution fee would touch is that disposable bit of foam. And if you would rather have that in the ocean instead of being recycled, fine; vote against this bill. But if you would like to see that kind of junk get properly disposed of, you need to support the act.

So why do you think the industry got this so wrong? Bicycle helmets, children's toys, car seats, toothbrushes? Do you think they actually didn't know what was in the bill or is it possible that they are just lying about the bill? And what conclusion do you draw when an industry is lying about a piece of legislation? The conclusion that I draw is that they know they would lose if they argued on the truth, and so they lie.

And they spent a lot of money on this. This is, you know, glossy. This is multicolor. We in politics, we send out mailers. This is not inexpensive. You put this onto every Washington Post—that is a big deal. They flooded the DC metropolitan area with this glossy pack of lies.