

Republican aides said the law mandating sanctions had bipartisan support, fueled by concern the Trump administration would treat Moscow too favorably. Given that some Democratic lawmakers opposed the Biden administration's Nord Stream 2 decision, those aides said Congress could vote to keep the firm on Treasury's blacklists.

The risk of sanctions, the aides said, could dissuade companies from providing certification.

In November, Norwegian certification company DNV suspended its work on Nord Stream 2 after assessing that its activities could expose the company to sanctions under Protecting Europe's Energy Security Act, a 2019 U.S. law specific to the pipeline, a company spokesman said.

Last week, Germany's energy regulator Bundesnetzagentur received Nord Stream 2 AG's application for an operating license. The company has four months to engage an independent certification company to complete an assessment of the pipeline's operational integrity.

Once a certification is complete, the German regulator would send its decision to the European Commission, but this isn't the final hurdle to gas flows. Initial deliveries could face additional, unrelated delays. Last month, a German court rejected Nord Stream 2 AG's bid to bypass a European Union pro-competition regulation mandating that a gas producer and the company that transports the gas be separate entities.

One of the congressional aides said the Biden administration, besides worrying about creating diplomatic friction with allies, may also be concerned about setting precedent regarding sanctions, because Treasury officials also could have to sanction other companies.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I don't have objection to the article being included in the RECORD, but I would note that, once again, the Senator from Oregon is limited by the fact that he has not participated in the debate on this in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for the last 2 years, because what he stated in his first remarks was that there was no way to stop the pipeline initially and the Trump administration failed to do so. That was factually incorrect.

We stopped the pipeline the day President Trump signed the bipartisan Cruz-Shaheen sanctions into law. That was December of 2019, and the pipeline was stopped for over a year. As I mentioned, on January 24 of 2020, 4 days after Joe Biden was sworn into office, Putin began—returned to building the pipeline because Biden had already telegraphed his surrender to Russia.

Now, what my friend from Oregon just said is—he repeated news coverage that the pipeline is now, today, complete. That is, in fact, correct, that because Biden surrendered on this point, Putin went all in and finished the pipeline. But this is where being part of the Foreign Relations Committee discussion matters, because even though the pipeline is now physically complete, it does not mean it is operative. After the pipeline is physically complete, there are months of certifications required and multiple authorities.

The legislation that Congress passed as a bipartisan matter also imposes sanctions on any entity, any company that certifies the pipeline. Indeed, the position of the Biden State Department has been that even when the pipeline is complete, we can stop it from ever going online by stopping certification.

So the legislation that I just asked for consent would do exactly that—it would stop certification, and it would leave it as a hunk of metal rather than an operating pipeline enriching Putin at the expense of Europe and America. So we still have time to stop this.

One final observation. This morning, I spent a couple of hours in a classified briefing on this topic, on Nord Stream 2. A question that I posed to the Biden State Department—I said: What exactly did Joe Biden, did the administration get in exchange for surrendering to Russia in a way that will impact this country and Europe for decades to come?

The answer, I will say, was altogether unsatisfactory. The only thing the Biden White House got was good will from Angela Merkel, whose party was just defeated resoundingly this past weekend in the election. So Angela Merkel is on her way out. We got good will from someone who will very soon no longer be the leader of Germany.

Instead, the German people voted in—elevated the Greens, who were vocally opposed to the Nord Stream 2 Pipeline. So the new government in Germany is not going to appreciate Biden surrendering to Putin in a way that hurts the environment and hurts Germany. But we have alienated the Ukrainians; we have alienated the Poles; we have alienated Eastern Europe. The European Union voted 500 to 50, roughly, against Nord Stream 2. We got nothing, and we hurt U.S. jobs.

This is foolhardy, and I am hopeful that the Senate will exercise our historical role over foreign policy and prevent a President and an administration from making this mistake.

I would note, Secretary of State Blinken and the State Department argued vociferously in the interagency process to sanction Nord Stream 2 AG, and it was the political operatives at the Biden White House who overrode the State Department. They should not have done so, and today the Department of the Treasury should follow the law and impose sanctions under CAATSA or delist them and trigger a vote in this Congress.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

(The remarks of Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. JOHNSON, and Mr. LEE pertaining to the introduction of S. 2895 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 2895

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed

to the immediate consideration of S. 2895, introduced earlier today. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed, and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Ms. CANTWELL. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, Senator SCOTT's bill would prohibit the Department of Transportation, Amtrak, Transportation Security Administration, or other Agencies from requiring passengers in interstate transportation to show proof of COVID-19 in order to travel.

I appreciate my colleagues—all of whom I serve with on the Commerce Committee. I know that they know well—we have had a lot of discussions about the impacts of COVID-19 on our transportation sector. They know very well that we had to spend a lot of resources keeping our transportation sector moving.

Why?

Because we have to move goods and services and products. During COVID-19, we had to move essential workers, and we had to move product.

There is no doubt our transportation system needs to have keen oversight as it relates to moving in even a pandemic. That is what we did. I am proud of the work that we did. But it is not lost on anybody that COVID-19, the deadliest pandemic in U.S. history—as of September 28, there have already been 700,000 COVID-19-related deaths in the United States and over 43 million infections. In my State, 7,586 deaths and 652,000 cases.

So the point is here, we have been fighting this pandemic with all of these tools and no one has ever suggested the one—that Senator SCOTT nor my colleagues from the Commerce Committee are saying what the President might do. That is not what he has suggested.

In fact, I was very involved in an area of transportation where we wanted to get cruise ships back in service to Alaska at a critical moment—both for Alaska and a critical moment during the pandemic. Not everybody was ready to have that happen; not everybody was ready to move. And yet it meant so much to Alaska that we all worked together. And in some instances, those cruise ships said: We are going to require the vaccine.

So the point is here, we are not trying to mandate this. Now, if the President and the industry feel that it is important to have a workforce so that that workforce continues to serve us and conserve the growing response to the pandemic—which I mean responding to the aftermath of the pandemic—that is why we spent money. That is why we are trying to take off. That is why we are trying to return a workforce. That is why we are returning

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