

Following that, we were in the House this morning to hear the President of Ukraine. It was very touching and very moving. President Poroshenko laid out in the most beautiful language, I thought, because of its simplicity, the beauty of freedom and what they are fighting for. What I loved so much about it was the fact that his speech united everybody in the room. There wasn't one group that sat down or didn't stand up to express their appreciation for what his countrymen are going through.

I hope we can get behind this President in this fight against the terror group that is probably the best-funded terror group ever in existence, the most barbaric I have ever seen. I hope there will be a good vote today. I think that would send a very important message that we are sincere and will bring more people to our coalition.

KEYSTONE PIPELINE

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I said I was going to talk about an issue I know the Presiding Officer and I don't agree on. I have total respect for her view. The people of her State are so lucky to have her fighting their fight on energy. The people of my State have a disagreement. We are very fearful about climate change. So we are also worried about the health impact of the tar sands.

I am going to make a few comments about why I think we should disrupt the process that is happening now with Keystone. It is a well-established process for considering projects such as this. The purpose of the review process isn't just to waste time. It is to determine whether the construction of the Keystone tar sands pipeline is in fact in the national interest. This is important. It is a major project.

In the past, Republicans have attempted to circumvent the review process for Keystone by creating shortcuts that in my opinion put our families' health at risk.

I want to show you a chart. It shows you that tar sands oil is one of the filthiest kinds of oil on the planet.

Let's look at a place in Texas where we see the tar sands oil being refined. This is Port Arthur. We have had visits from the Port Arthur community, and they said, please, we want to bear witness to the fact that this is what it looks like when these tar sands are burned. It hurts the health of our people. Residents along the gulf coast are suffering from asthma, respiratory illness, skin irritation, and cancer, and to get to the gulf coast the tar sands will be transported by pipeline through communities in environmentally sensitive areas in six States. It will pass through key sources of drinking water.

Look what happened in West Virginia when they couldn't drink the water there. It was a nightmare.

We have had experience with tar sands. People talk about how the pipeline is one thing, but it is what goes

through it that is critical, and what is going to go through it if it gets built is the dirtiest, filthiest kind of water we know.

What happens in places such as Detroit and Chicago, where they store the byproduct known as petcoke—take a look at this. This is what it looks like. It looks like filthy, dirty pollution, and unfortunately for the people, that is what it is.

When the wind is blowing, we see black clouds containing concentrated heavy metals. Children playing baseball have been forced off the field to seek cover to avoid the black dust that pelts their homes and cars. Petcoke dust is a particulate matter, which is the most harmful of all air pollutants. Why? Its particles are so small, they lodge in your lungs and cause terribly severe asthma attacks, aggravate bronchitis and other lung diseases, and reduce the body's ability to fight infections. Asthma affects 12 out of every 26 people—and 7 million of those are children.

If I could, I would ask the people in the gallery how many of them have asthma or know someone who has asthma. I know a lot of them would raise their hands. It is ubiquitous. We don't need more asthma.

There are other ways to go, and my State and other countries are proving it. We can move to clean energy. We need to have a comprehensive human health impact on the tar sands that would go through that pipeline because human health is important. If you can't breathe, you can't work. It is as simple as that. If you can't breathe, you can't go to school and get an education. If you can't drink the water, it is a serious problem.

While my Republican friends come down and say: Let's bypass all of this evidence and move forward, that is a dangerous idea. It is a dangerous idea.

I went to China about a year ago. You cannot see one foot in front of the other in China. That is how bad the air is because they don't care about the environment. They say: Oh, we don't need rules; we don't need regulations. Build, build, build. Do it, do it, do it, do it. Go and get it out of the ground.

There are moments we need to look at what we are doing. We are doing great right now on energy. Under this President we have become more energy efficient. Yes, there are places to drill, there are places to get energy, but it has to be clean and it has to be good.

We have just come out of the hottest August ever known to humankind since we began keeping the records in the 1800s. Climate change is so real, the only place they don't know it is here in the United States Senate. They don't know. Hear no evil, see no evil, speak no evil. Everything is great. Everything is good.

My colleague from Vermont is brilliant on this point, and we know the Keystone tar sands pipeline will create 17 percent more carbon than domestic oil. This is a dirty, filthy oil that is the

equivalent of adding 5.8 million new cars to the road, or eight new coal powerplants.

The State Department has concluded that the annual carbon pollution from just the daily operation of the pipeline will be the equivalent to adding 300,000 new cars on the road. If we do this, we will go backward on climate change. We cannot afford to do it.

I know people get impatient with decisionmaking—whether it is deciding how to take the fight to ISIL—and I am glad I have a deliberative President who didn't just say: Do this and this. He thought about it and came up with an idea for a coalition to do it right. When you are looking at something such as the Keystone XL Pipeline, which is going to vastly increase the importation of this filthy, dirty oil, we ought to take our time.

My very last point. I am so proud to chair the Environment and Public Works Committee. Four former Republican EPA Administrators who served under Presidents Nixon, Reagan, George H.W. Bush, and George W. Bush spoke out on the need to address the danger of climate change.

Really, this is not about bipartisanship. Ninety-seven percent of scientists tell us climate change is real and caused by human activity. Please, let's take our time. When we are faced with a project that will set us back—the dirtiest, dirtiest oil—a picture is worth a thousand words, and this is not what I want to leave to our children.

I thank the Presiding Officer and yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. I thank Senator BOXER not only for her remarks today but for her years and years of commitment to the environmental committee and pointing out the danger of climate change and the toxicity in our air.

ISIS

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, I rise today to discuss the dangerous and brutal extremist organization called ISIS, the terrorist army, which in recent months has overrun vast swaths of Iraq and Syria and is a serious threat to the stability of the region, and, in fact, to the international community.

But before I do that, I also want to say that ISIS is not the only major problem facing our country. It would be a real tragedy if, in our legitimate concerns about the dangers of ISIS, we continue to ignore the very serious problems that are taking place right here in the United States of America and impacting tens of millions of working families.

There are crises here at home we have ignored for too long. Real unemployment today is 12 percent, youth unemployment is 20 percent. We can't ignore it. The minimum wage nationally is at a starvation wage of \$7.25 an hour. We cannot ignore that reality. We have to raise the minimum wage.

Women earn 77 cents to the dollar that men earn. That is unfair. We cannot ignore the issue of pay equity. We have to address that issue.

Senator BOXER was just on the floor talking about the planetary crisis of global warming and the fact that virtually the entire scientific community is united in telling us that global warming is real. It is significantly caused by human activity. It is also causing devastating problems in our country and around the world. We cannot continue to ignore the crisis of global warming.

Last week many of us voted to overturn the disastrous Citizens United Supreme Court decision that allows billionaires the ability to spend unlimited sums of money to buy elections which will benefit candidates who support the rich and the powerful. My point is that while we address the very serious problems in the Middle East—and these are very serious problems—we cannot take our eye off the very serious problems facing tens of millions of Americans.

The issue involving ISIS, in my view, is enormously complex. Just one example is Syria. The Assad government is a dictatorship which has killed many thousands of its own people and has even used, we believe, chemical weapons against its own citizens—and these are the good guys. The decisions we make now in Syria, in Iraq, and in the Middle East must be made with great thoughtfulness.

As you know, President Obama has been attacked time and time again because he publicly stated a while ago that “we don’t have a strategy yet” for dealing with ISIS. Frankly, I applaud the President for trying to think through this incredibly complicated issue and not making rash decisions which would make a very bad and dangerous situation even worse and more dangerous.

I remember back in 2002—I was in the House of Representatives then—when George W. Bush and Dick Cheney said they did have a strategy. They were tough, they were forceful, they acted boldly, they acted swiftly, but, unfortunately, what they did was dead wrong. In fact, it was the worst foreign policy blunder in the recent history of America and opened up a can of worms we are trying to deal with today.

Frankly, I must say I am not impressed with all of the tough talk. I want smart policy that will work and that will, in fact, lead to the destruction of ISIS, not sound bites that may be effective in a political campaign.

I will take a few moments to lay out some of my concerns. First, President Obama is absolutely right when he said this struggle will not be successful unless there is a strong international coalition. Let’s be clear: ISIS is a terrorist threat not only to the United States but to Britain, France, Germany, countries throughout Europe, and, in fact, to nations throughout the world.

More importantly, ISIS, which wants to establish a new caliphate, which in-

cludes many countries across a large geographical area, is a major threat in the region to countries such as Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Turkey, Qatar, Iran, Jordan, and other countries.

I very much appreciate the hard work that President Obama and Secretary of State Kerry have undertaken in trying to put together an international coalition that will effectively fight ISIS. We all know how difficult that effort is, but at this point it appears to me the kind of coalition we need has yet to come together.

In my view, ISIS will never be defeated unless the countries in the region—the people in the region, the Muslim world, including Sunni and Shiite nations—stand up to this threat.

I know how hard President Obama and Secretary of State Kerry are trying, but we are nowhere near where we need to be in terms of building this coalition at this moment.

It may surprise many people to know that Saudi Arabia—a country run by an autocratic royal family worth hundreds of billions of dollars and one of the wealthiest families in the world—is a country which was the world’s fourth largest defense spender in 2014. Most people don’t know that. According to a Reuters article from earlier this year—and I quote—“Saudi Arabia beat Britain to become the world’s fourth largest defense spender in 2013.” In other words, Saudi Arabia is now spending more money on arms and the military than is the United Kingdom.

The article goes on to cite a report by London’s International Institute for Strategic Studies which estimated Saudi Arabia was spending over \$59 billion, a figure researchers said was extremely conservative, pushing it above Britain at \$57 billion or France at \$52 billion. Once again, Saudi Arabia is spending more on their military than is Britain or France.

Another article from Bloomberg provides additional details on Saudi Arabia’s military strength. It cites that “in 2011, the U.S. Government signed an agreement with Saudi Arabia valued at \$29 billion.” That is the end of the quote from Bloomberg. But according to Military Balance, “The Royal Saudi Air Force has more than 300 combat capable aircraft, including 81 F-15 C and D fighter aircraft, 172 advanced F-15 S Typhoon and Tornado fighters capable of ground attack, dozens of C-130 transport aircrafts.” This is what the Saudi Arabian Air Force has.

Let me also quote from an article in Forbes which details the strength and numbers of many of the militaries in the Mideast. The article notes:

Countries in the region have more than enough power to destroy the Islamic State. Turkey has an army of 400,000. Iran has nearly as many in the army and paramilitaries. Iraq has a nominal army of nearly 200,000 and some 300,000 police. Saudi Arabia has nearly 200,000 army, national guard, and paramilitary personnel. Syria’s military, though degraded by war, numbers some 110,000, plus paramilitaries. Jordan has 74,000 in the army. The Kurdish Peshmerga numbers in

the tens of thousands. All of these but Iraq and Kurdistan have some air force ground attack capabilities.

Furthermore, not only are countries in the region not stepping up in the fight against ISIS but, believe it or not, several of these gulf states are empowering ISIS and Al Qaeda-related groups through their financial contributions. A recent article in the Washington Post noted:

Kuwait, a U.S. ally whose aid to besieged Syrian civilians has been surpassed only by the United States this year, is also the leading source of funding for al-Qaeda-linked terrorists fighting in Syria’s civil war.

Now, think back not so long ago when the United States of America went to war to push Saddam Hussein’s troops out of Kuwait and restore the royal ruling family. Today we find that “Kuwait is the leading source of funding for al Qaeda-linked terrorists fighting in Syria’s civil war.”

The article goes on to state:

... the amount of money that has flowed from Kuwaiti individuals and through organized charities to Syrian rebel groups such as Jabhat al-Nusra totals in the hundreds of millions of dollars.

Kuwait is hardly alone in this effort. As Treasury Department Under Secretary Cohen stated:

A number of fundraisers operating in more permissive jurisdictions—particularly in Kuwait and Qatar—are soliciting donations to fund extremist insurgents, not to meet legitimate humanitarian needs.

On and on it goes.

Why is all of this of enormous consequence? The answer is pretty obvious. The worst action we can take now is to allow ISIS to portray this struggle as East versus West and Muslim versus Christians, as the Middle East versus America. That is exactly what they want and that is exactly what we should not be giving them. In other words, this is not just a question of whether young men and women in Vermont or in North Dakota or in any other State of this country should be putting their lives on the line to defend the billionaire families of Saudi Arabia when Saudi Arabian troops are not in the struggle. This is not just whether the taxpayers of our country and not the billionaire ruling families of Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Qatar, and other countries should be paying for this war; more importantly, it is an understanding that at the end of the day, this war will never be won by the United States alone but it must be won by the people in the region.

Should we, as the most powerful military in the world, be of help to those people struggling against ISIS? The answer is obviously yes. Along with the international community, we should be strongly supportive of those countries in the region that are standing up to ISIS. And I personally believe President Obama is absolutely right in his efforts to judiciously use airstrikes which, at this point, have shown some success. But at the end of the day, in my view, the United States of America

cannot and should not lead this effort. We must be supportive of other countries in the region who are standing and fighting against the ISIS terrorist organization, but this fight will have to be fought by countries in the region that are, in fact, most threatened by ISIS. They cannot stand aside. They cannot say: Hey, go for it, United States. Thank you, American taxpayers. But we in Saudi Arabia—no, we don't want our young people involved in this war. We don't want our airplanes involved in the attacks. We don't want our billions to go into this war. Thank you, America. It is really nice of you to do that. By the way, while you do that, we may play both sides of the issue and some families may actually fund terrorist organizations. But we really do appreciate your stepping to the plate because we are not doing that.

So that is where we are today. It is a very complicated, difficult situation. Again, I applaud President Obama and Secretary Kerry for trying to work through this. But this is what I worry about: I worry very much that supporting questionable groups in Syria—so-called moderates who are outnumbered and outgunned by both ISIS and the Assad government—I worry very much that getting involved in that area could open the door to the United States, once again, being involved in a quagmire, being involved in perpetual warfare. And what happens when the first American plane gets shot down or the first American soldier is captured? What happens then? I am hearing from some of our Republican colleagues who are already talking about the need for U.S. military boots on the ground. That is what they are talking about today, and that concerns me very, very much.

So I am going to vote against this continuing resolution because I have very real concerns about the United States getting deeply involved in a war we should not be deeply involved in. At the end of the day, if this war against this horrendous organization called ISIS is going to be won, it will have to be Saudi Arabia, it will have to be Iraq, it will have to be the people of Syria, it will have to be the people of that region saying: No, we are not going to accept an organization of terrorists such as ISIS. And we should be there to help, as should the United Kingdom, as should Britain, as should France, as should Germany. This has to be an international coalition. But the last thing we need is the United States being the only major military power involved in this war.

So I thank the Chair, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. REID. Madam President, what is the order before the Senate?

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2015

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of H.J. Res. 124, which the clerk will report by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 124) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2015, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3851

Mr. REID. Madam President, I have an amendment to the joint resolution that has already been filed at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 3851.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 19, line 15, strike "30 days" and insert "29 days".

Mr. REID. I ask for the yeas and nays on that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3852 TO AMENDMENT NO. 3851

Mr. REID. There is now a second degree amendment which has also been filed at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 3852 to amendment No. 3851.

The amendment is as follows:

In the amendment, strike "29" and insert "28".

MOTION TO COMMIT WITH AMENDMENT NO. 3853

Mr. REID. I have a motion to commit H.J. Res. 124 with instructions which has been filed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] moves to commit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report back forthwith with the following amendment numbered 3853.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 19, line 15, strike "not later than 30 days after the enactment of this joint resolution" and insert "By October 31, 2014".

Mr. REID. I ask for the yeas and nays on that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3854

Mr. REID. I have an amendment to the instructions at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 3854 to the instructions of the motion to commit.

The amendment is as follows:

In the amendment, strike "October 31" and insert "October 30".

Mr. REID. I ask for the yeas and nays on that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3855 TO AMENDMENT NO. 3854

Mr. REID. I have a second degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 3855 to amendment No. 3854.

The amendment is as follows:

In the amendment, strike "30" and insert "29".

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. I have a cloture motion at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

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, hereby move to bring to a close debate on H.J. Res. 124, a joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2015, and for other purposes.

Harry Reid, Barbara A. Mikulski, Dianne Feinstein, Richard Blumenthal, Robert P. Casey, Jr., John E. Walsh, Mazie Hirono, Cory A. Booker, Heidi Heitkamp, Barbara Boxer, Bill Nelson, Richard J. Durbin, Sheldon Whitehouse, Amy Klobuchar, Jack Reed, Benjamin L. Cardin, Carl Levin.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under Rule XXII be waived.

Mr. REID. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the filing deadline under rule XXII for first-degree amendments to H.J. Res. 124 be at 2 p.m. this afternoon and that the filing deadline for second-degree amendments be at 3:30 p.m. today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HIRONO). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the motion to table an amendment to the joint resolution, as provided under the previous order, be in order during time for debate and, if made during the debate, the vote on the motion to table occur immediately after all debate time has been used and yielded back on H.J. Res. 124; further, that if a budget point of order is made, the motion to waive be considered made and the vote on the motion to waive occur following the vote on the motion to invoke cloture on H.J. Res. 124.