

President Petro Poroshenko. Ukraine is a friend of the United States and it has looked to the West to meet naked Russian aggression.

As President Poroshenko's speech reminded us, there are objectives that bind our countries, such as the pursuit of freedom and representative government. Let's make it clear. We stand with Ukraine. We stand with the Ukrainian people in their struggle against external aggression and we stand with them in their struggle to secure the same kinds of rights and liberties each of us enjoy in America.

#### THE CONTINUING RESOLUTION

Mr. McCONNELL. On a different matter, today the Senate will consider House legislation to fund the government and address the threats of Ebola and ISIL.

These are important issues. Many Members on both sides plan to support this legislation. I know others have some concerns too. I understand those concerns. I share some of them, but while no bill is perfect, I believe this legislation is worth supporting.

I would like to thank my fellow Kentuckian, Representative HAL ROGERS, for his leadership and work on this bill because it does a lot of important things and all without raising discretionary spending. It would reauthorize important counternarcotics operations that help keep our children and communities safe and it would extend the Internet Tax Freedom Act until December, giving us a chance to secure a permanent extension.

It would block some of the administration's discretionary policies against Kentucky coal and help address the administration's veterans crisis by providing more resources to address the backlog and investigations into potential wrongdoing that is a positive step toward the more comprehensive reforms Republicans would like to see.

Critically, the legislation would provide authorization to train and equip a moderate Syrian opposition ground force, a key component of the President's efforts to disrupt, dismantle, and defeat ISIL.

While I am concerned about the ability of the coalition to generate sufficient combat power to defeat ISIL within Syria, I do support the President's proposal to begin the program. The authorization is of limited duration and it now contains important reporting requirements that will allow Congress to assess and oversee this program to measure whether the mission is actually being accomplished.

The Ebola crisis is another area where the President deserves congressional support. As you know, he recently announced several messages to contain the spread of the disease in Africa and prevent it from reaching our shores.

Accordingly, the bill contains additional resources to support research and bolster our Nation's effort in as-

sisting Africa to manage this growing crisis.

In summary, this isn't perfect legislation, but it begins to address many of our constituents' top concerns without raising discretionary spending. It positions us for better solutions in the months to come.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 35 minutes for the purposes of engaging in a colloquy with my colleagues on the issue of the Keystone XL Pipeline.

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

#### KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, tomorrow is the sixth anniversary of the application for approval of the Keystone XL Pipeline. Six years. Six years ago, September 19, 2008, the TransCanada company applied for a permit for approval to cross the Canadian border to build the Keystone XL Pipeline from Hardisty, Canada, down to Cushing and ultimately the gulf coast, to provide not only oil from Canada but to move oil from States such as my State of North Dakota, of light, sweet Bakken crude, oil from Montana, to our refineries here in the United States. Six years ago, that application was filed, effective tomorrow. So we are here today to talk about the need not only for a decision on the Keystone XL Pipeline but for approval of this vitally important project.

The reality is we can make this country energy secure, energy independent, working with our closest friend and ally, Canada. But to do it we not only need to develop all of our resources, our energy resources in this country, and work with Canada as they develop their energy resources, but we need the infrastructure to safely, effectively, efficiently, dependably move that energy to where it is needed, to our consumers.

That is what the Keystone XL Pipeline project is all about. This is truly about building the roads, the rails, the pipelines, the transmission, the energy infrastructure we need as a vital part of our energy plan for this country. We have bipartisan support. We have 57 Senators who support this legislation—57. The reality is I think by next year we will have 60.

So while we sit here and wait—now for 6 years, effective tomorrow 6 years, waiting for a decision from the President on the Keystone XL Pipeline—ultimately I believe this decision will be made by the American people, as it always is and as it always should be. Because I believe that after these elections in November as we go into next year we will not only have 57 Senators who support this project, we will have over 60.

Then Congress will pass legislation, a bill that we have submitted, a bipartisan bill we have pending before this

body right now. We will pass it. We will attach it to something the President will not veto. The House has already passed this legislation. Because over 70 percent, I think in the most recent poll, of the American people want this project. They want this project approved.

So here after 6 years—we are going to talk about some of the history of this and all of the work we have done. But before I do that, I want to turn to my colleague from Wyoming, somebody who is incredibly knowledgeable when it comes to energy, somebody who has worked on energy in all different aspects, somebody who truly understands that, look, for the benefit of the American people to build our energy future we not only need to produce that energy, we need the infrastructure to transport it safely, effectively, and well.

I wish to call on the Senator from Wyoming for his remarks on this sixth anniversary of the application, waiting for approval, waiting for a decision from the administration on the Keystone XL Pipeline, for his thoughts and for his comments. I turn to the good Senator from Wyoming.

Can the Senator give us his thoughts as to why this project is still awaiting a decision from the administration, after the President told us, told our caucus last year, at a caucus we had here in an adjacent room, that we would have a decision by the end of 2013, why we are here still awaiting a decision on behalf of the American people?

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I appreciate and want to salute the significant leadership we have seen on this issue from the Senator from North Dakota. He has been a stalwart fighter, very focused on this issue, and focused on putting together a bipartisan coalition of supporters. Americans want the jobs, they want the energy, they want action. We have an opportunity, but we have been waiting 6 long years.

The Senator from North Dakota is absolutely right. It was at a meeting in the Republican conference where the President of the United States came in. I asked the specific question: When will we expect an answer so we can get moving with the jobs and the energy that the American people are asking for?

President Obama said: Well, by the end of the year. He said that almost a year and a half ago. It was the end of the year 2013 that the promise was going to be fulfilled. Now here we are halfway—beyond halfway—through 2014. Nothing yet. Not a thing from the White House, a White House held hostage by environmental extremists who are trying to block important jobs and important energy and this important project.

We are here in the Senate today and the majority leader is ready to close this place down until after the elections. He closed it down—if you count the number of days from the beginning

of August, all through August, a few days in session in September, but most of September not in session, and then all of October up through the election, you are talking 3 months, with the Senate in session for just 2 weeks. It is embarrassing. Where is the accountability? We are sure not getting it from the majority leader. The majority leader ought to bring this for a vote today. But he is not going to. He is going to shut down the Senate today, making sure these jobs are not there, that the energy is not there for the American people. The Keystone XL Pipeline bipartisan support is an excellent example of a project that could help us from the standpoint of energy security, from the standpoint of economic growth, the standpoint of helping our economy getting people back to work.

But yet the majority leader is not going to allow a vote today, 6 years in the waiting on this specific important project. I would say to my friend and colleague from North Dakota, I know our friends and colleagues from Oklahoma and Georgia are here on the floor. I want to hear their comments as well. I salute the Senator from North Dakota for his continued leadership, for his focus, and for continuing to work to make America better, in terms of jobs, in terms of the economy, and in terms of energy. I know the Senator will not stop until we finally get this project approved, completed, and constructed.

Mr. HOEVEN. I wish to thank the Senator from Wyoming for his diligence and for his work. This is a bipartisan issue. We have legislation now with 57 supporters that is pending before this body. In fact, we have passed this legislation. We actually had passed very similar legislation, different only in the respect that it called on the President to make a decision—this was back in 2012. I think we had 73 votes on this issue. The difference is, the pending bill we have provides congressional approval because the President once again delayed the decision when we passed legislation calling on him to make the decision earlier. So now we have come back with binding legislation, after doing congressional research. This bill makes the decision congressionally under the commerce clause that gives Congress the ability to oversee commerce with foreign nations.

Simply what this does is we say to our closest friend and ally, Canada—TransCanada is a Canadian company—that: Yes, you can cross the border with this pipeline, which is the latest, greatest technology we have for pipeline transport.

Let me show one other chart here, so people understand. When we are talking about pipelines, oil and gas pipelines in this country, this gives you a little sense of the pipelines we have—thousands of pipelines, millions of miles of pipelines that move oil and gas around the country, from where it is produced to the consumers who very

much need it. So that gives you a sense of all of the pipelines we have.

Now we are talking about one that has the latest and greatest technology that we are seeking to get approved. To put this into some context, the project we are seeking to have approved is the Keystone XL Pipeline. The reason XL is because the Keystone Pipeline is this pipeline here, which goes from Hardisty up in Alberta down to the Patoka, IL, area as well as Cushing. That is the Keystone Pipeline. So I want to make sure there is no confusion. That is the Keystone Pipeline. That was approved in 2 years and built in 2 years.

So in 2006 the TransCanada company—I was Governor of North Dakota at that time. You can see it runs right through North Dakota. Obviously these things are immensely important. We are now the second largest oil-producing State in the Nation. We produce over 1 million barrels of oil a day—light sweet crude, second only to Texas. We have to get that to our markets and to refineries.

I started working on these projects when I was Governor. In 2006, TransCanada applied for approval of the Keystone Pipeline. Originally that was supposed to carry 640,000 barrels a day. I think it now carries 750,000 barrels a day. That application was applied for in 2006. It was approved in 2008. The pipeline was built and came online 2 years later. So 2 years to permit, and 2 years to build—4 years total.

When TransCanada applied for a second permit in 2008 for a sister pipeline, Keystone XL, it seemed pretty logical that it was going to be approved, particularly when the initial project had been approved in 2 years, built in 2 years. This is the actual pipeline infrastructure we have. When they wanted to build the sister pipeline, 830,000 barrels a day, it seemed kind of pretty logical they would go through the process and get it approved.

On September 19, 2008, they applied for that approval to move oil from Hardisty, pick up additional oil in North Dakota, Montana, take it down to Cushing and down to the refineries in the gulf, and get oil over to the refineries in Louisiana. September, 19, 2008. Tomorrow is September 19, 2014. Six years later, no decision.

I wish to turn to my colleague, the senior Senator from the great State of Oklahoma. Cushing is a hub for oil from all over the country. It is vital that we are able to move oil in and out of there, because that is a huge transition point between where we produce oil, including our region, but from all over the country and Canada and move it to refineries where it is distributed throughout the country. So we need to be able to move product in and out of Cushing, which is truly a hub for the Nation. That is exactly what this pipeline does.

I would turn to the senior Senator from Oklahoma. I would ask him: Why in the world, given what I have described here—we have thousands of

pipelines, millions of miles of these pipelines. We have to get product from where it is produced to refineries and to our consumers. We cannot put it all on rail or you create incredible congestion that leads to accidents and backlogs in shipping of other products. This is the latest, greatest technology for pipelines, for the transport of oil.

Why in the world—what rationale would there be not to approve this pipeline?

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, let me say first of all to leave that chart up, because it shows very clearly that I might have the biggest dog in this fight. I do not know. But I will say that Cushing, OK, has more pipelines coming through, throughout the United States, than any other city in America. That is where they all come through.

A few minutes ago the Senator from Wyoming was talking about what the President said less than a year ago, that he was going to be cooperating, we are going to do this thing, it will be the best thing for America. He has not done it. But I will tell you what is worse than that. This right here: because of this pipeline, the hub we have in Cushing, OK—the President went to Cushing, OK; this was about a year ago—over 2 years ago he did—he went there to affirm to the American people that he is going to do all he can to make sure this pipeline becomes a reality. Read this, I ask my friend from North Dakota. It says:

I am directing my administration to make this project a priority, to go ahead and get it done.

He has made this—I am not going to use the L word because it sounds disrespectful, and I lose credibility when I do that. He is saying something that is not true. He moved from that, and he has done everything since that time to destroy the pipeline.

That was when they were talking about the southern leg. Well, obviously the southern leg is not a problem because the southern leg does not cross an international border, so the President couldn't stop that even if he wanted to. So he was taking credit for that, but he is certainly underestimating the people of Oklahoma. In fact, nobody showed up when he was there. So that portion between Canada and Cushing is where the problem began.

I am going to throw out something very briefly. I also did this yesterday on the floor, but I think it is important.

There is a new surge of opposition to this that wasn't there before this happened. Tom Steyer is a very fine person. I am sure—I don't know him—but Tom Steyer has put up \$100 million—his words, not mine—\$50 million of his own money, to do two things. One is to resurrect global warming, which is dead. If we read the polls today, people have caught on. It is now No. 14 out of 15 of the environmental concerns, according to all the polling data. So he is trying to bring that up again. The second thing he is trying to do is stop the Keystone Pipeline.

I say to my friend from North Dakota, and I don't want to sound disrespectful, but \$50 million of that is his own money, and he has that out there right now. I am going to quote him:

It is true that we expect to be heavily involved in the midterm elections.

Fifty million of his own money.

We are looking at a bunch of . . . races. . . . My guess is that we'll end up being involved in 8 or even more races.

The Keystone Pipeline would create 42,000 jobs and tens of thousands more. If you look at my State of Oklahoma, about one-third of all those jobs are in the State of Oklahoma.

Keystone is just the tip of the iceberg. When we look at this chart, we can see all of the domestic energy resources that are being developed around the country right now. We are going through a shale revolution, and the only thing getting in its way is the Federal Government.

Look at this next chart. I can remember back when people considered the only oil States to be west of the Mississippi, the Western United States. But with the Marcellus coming through, you could argue—and I have seen the argument in the State of Pennsylvania, for example—it provides the second-most jobs in that State. Yet they need to be aware that this is what is happening in the United States.

If we look at this map, it shows what we could do if we also had the Federal lands included in that. In fact, one of the shocking things we hear when we talk about the Federal lands is that in the past 6 years—and that is since President Obama has been there, and he has done everything he could to retard the progress of oil and gas since he came to office. The production on State lands is up 61 percent—that is in 6 years, up 61 percent—and natural gas is up 33 percent. However, on Federal lands—land the President can affect—oil production is down 6 percent. How can production be up 61 percent on State lands and down 6 percent on Federal lands? I think that shows the commitment that is there.

ICF International is a well-respected consulting firm. It is not Republican or Democratic. They recently released a report that says U.S. companies will need to invest \$641 billion over the next 20 years in infrastructure to keep up with growing oil and gas production. What does that mean for jobs? According to the analysis, spending on these new pipelines alone will create 432,000 new jobs. It goes on and on talking about this.

I asked the same question: How could it be—6 years ago I thought that this was a piece of cake, that this was going to be done. What is the argument against it? There are people who fight against fossil fuels. That is alive and well. But they know they are going to be producing it anyway, and if it goes to China—and there are already discussions; that is public record—if it gets to China, they are going to have to go through the refining process, and they

don't have any restrictions on emissions in China. So the argument is that if they do it, there are going to be more emissions—if they find that to be so offensive—than if we do it here in the United States where we have the capability to produce and have the jobs here.

When I go back to Oklahoma, people say: What are the arguments against it? I try to explain the argument they are using, but they don't buy it. Of course, I am in Oklahoma talking to normal people.

Anyway, good luck. We are going to do all we can do to make this a reality. We are going to win this eventually, but I am afraid we have the opposition of this administration, and unless we get that turned around, we will have to wait for another President.

Mr. HOEVEN. I would like to thank the Senator from Oklahoma and pick up on a point he made very well. He made of number of points that are extremely compelling, but one of the points he made is that overall, since about 2008, 2009, that area, our oil production in America is up 40 percent. So people say: Well, we are producing 40 percent more oil than we did in 2008, the end of 2008, so that is good. That is reducing the amount of oil we have to import into this country. We were below 50 percent. Now we are closing in on 60 percent and more oil that we produce. Together with Canada and Mexico, we are up over 75 percent, in terms of the oil that we consume, we produce in this country or get, as I say, from our closest allies and working on getting to 80 percent.

Well, people would say that is very good, but the Senator from Oklahoma made a very important point. Understand that is because we are up 60 percent in oil production on private land—on private land. We are actually down in terms of our production on public land; we are down between 6 and 7 percent. So when you net the two, we are up about 40 percent, but that is because we are up about 60 percent on private land.

I will give an example of how that works on the ground. In North Dakota 90 percent of the land is privately owned, so our oil production is growing tremendously. As I said, we are at about 1.1 million barrels a day and on our way to 1.4 million barrels a day in a few more years.

In Alaska, on the other hand, production is going down because their land is 90 percent public land and a very small percentage is private land. They can't get the permits and they can't build the infrastructure, so the amount of oil they produce is declining. The Alaskan pipeline can carry 2 million barrels of oil a day. It is down to less than 600,000 and declining. This is at a time when we are still getting oil from the Middle East and we are dealing with entities like ISIL, with terrorism, and with instability. How can we continue to be dependent on getting oil from the Middle East when we can produce that oil

right here in our country and in Canada? I would ask the good Senator from Oklahoma to comment for a moment on the technology that is enabling us to do so.

Hydraulic fracturing—I think the first well hydraulically fractured in this country was in about the 1950s in Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. My friend is correct. It was 1948 in Duncan, OK.

Mr. HOEVEN. So I ask my friend from Oklahoma to talk for a minute about the technology and what that means for the future of this country and energy security.

Mr. INHOFE. Hydraulic fracturing and horizontal drilling are to be credited for this shale revolution we are going through now. We hear this administration—knowing the American people want to use this abundance of good, clean, natural gas and oil—sounding supportive of that, but he has done everything he can to retard our efforts to continue to use, as we have since 1948, hydraulic fracturing.

This is interesting because the first Director of the EPA who was chosen and confirmed during the Obama administration was Lisa Jackson. I asked her the question live on TV during one of our committee hearings—I said: Hydraulic fracturing—people are creating problems with this. Yet we have never had a problem, and it all started in my State of Oklahoma. Has there ever been a documented case of groundwater contamination with hydraulic fracturing?

Her answer, I say to my good friend from North Dakota, was no.

So we have the Obama administration saying there is no problem with it. Yet they are doing everything they can to federalize jurisdiction over hydraulic fracturing, with the idea that would make it much more difficult to take advantage of this revolution we are in the middle of.

Mr. HOEVEN. I again thank the Senator from Oklahoma.

Since 1948, with the first well hydraulically fractured—there have been no cases of contamination since 1948. We are now using this hydraulic fracturing with the latest new greatest technology where, on one pad, on one what we call eco-pad, we will now drill down as many as 18 wells. These wells will have—we go 2 miles underground, and then we drill laterals 3 miles long. Eighteen wells all on one site. Think of how much we have reduced the environmental footprint with that technology. Think of how much less ground disturbance there is. You are covering 1,280 acres. In the old days—and again maybe my friend from Oklahoma would like to think of how many wells they would have had to drill and how much infrastructure and well derricks and pumpers they would have to have all over the landscape, and now we do it on one pad covering 1,280 acres going out 3 miles in all directions from one eco-pad. So it is not just about energy,

I would say to my friend from Oklahoma, it is also better environmental stewardship.

Mr. INHOFE. It is also about technology. All of the environmentalists or extreme environmentalists who are trying to stop or fighting this war against fossil fuels, they ought to be rejoicing that we have this technology now.

When we talk about the number of wells, it is now past 1 million wells that have been drilled using hydraulic fracturing. By their own admission, there has never been one documented case of groundwater contamination. So the answer is that there is no reason not to do it.

This is our opportunity to be independent. We could be independent in a matter of weeks if we had the opportunity to export.

It is not just private land, it is private and State land. All of the increase we have had, the 63 percent we talk about, is all private and State land. How is it possible that increase could take place on State land while on Federal land it goes down 6 percent? That tells the whole story.

Mr. HOEVEN. I have one more question for my friend from Oklahoma before I turn to my good friend from the State of Georgia.

Answer, please, if you would. As we produce this energy domestically—so we are producing energy here, we are creating jobs, we are creating economic activity, we are creating revenue without raising taxes from a growing economy. We are helping national security because we are not getting oil from the Middle East or Venezuela or places that are hostile to our interests. Now we are talking about environmental stewardship. We are talking about minimizing the footprint with these new technologies. Why would we not want to move that product as safely as possible, with the latest, greatest type of pipeline, with the best technology and the most safeguards? Why isn't that an environmentally sound decision as well?

Mr. INHOFE. I have often said and many of the people who are very conscious about the environment—as I am and others—have said this is the answer. I remember years ago when I was very young, I worked in the oilfields. I can remember there were small wells all over and, of course, at that time there wasn't an effort. Now they have cleaned things up, and nothing is greater in terms of the technology that has come along for the environment than what we have experienced.

When we think about what is happening all over the world—I am glad the Senator mentioned this—with ISIS and all of these problems we have right now, I believe we are facing a greater threat right now militarily than we have before. And that is where a lot of our energy is coming from, and it doesn't have to.

A good friend of the Senator and a good friend of mine named Harold

Hamm—he is from Oklahoma, but he does a lot of work up there—I asked him a question in relation to the President repeatedly saying: Well, if we were to go ahead and develop this on Federal lands, it would take 10 years before that would reach the economy.

I was going to be on an unfriendly TV show, and I called up Harold Hamm and I said: Harold, I am going to ask you a question, and be careful in the way you answer it because I am going to use your name and your answer on nationwide TV. If you were set up someplace like New Mexico on Federal land that had not been touched before, how long would it take that first barrel of oil to reach the economy?

Without hesitating, he said: Seventy days.

I said: Seventy days? Well, that is 10 weeks, not 10 years.

Then he went on to say what would happen each week for those 10 weeks. I have never been refuted since we used that.

In addition to all the arguments we are using, just think about what our oil independence, our energy independence could be in this country. It is all there for the taking. This is the key element to make that a reality.

Mr. HOEVEN. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma, who has been a leader in energy for so many years.

This morning we were addressed by the President of Ukraine. Look at their situation. Because they haven't developed their own energy resources and because they don't have their own infrastructure, they are now dependent—Ukraine is dependent, along with most of the European Union, on Russia for their energy.

They get more than one-third of their energy from Russia. So at the same time that Russia is invading Ukraine, the European Union is reluctant to stand with the United States and our other allies on strong sanctions to prevent that type of aggression. Why? Because they get their energy from Russia.

So when we talk about building the infrastructure we need in this country to work with our closest friend and ally, Canada, to make sure we are energy secure and that we do not need to get energy from places such as the Middle East or Venezuela or other places that may have interests that are antithetical to ours, think about how important it is for the security of our country with what is going on in the Middle East with ISIL, and see what is going on in Ukraine and Eastern Europe, and Russian aggression.

So I turn to our colleague from Georgia, who has also been a staunch supporter of this project, and ask him what is going on in terms of national security, the situation we face today, and why in the world would we not be building—not only producing our energy resources in this country but deploying these new technologies we are talking about that produce energy with better environmental stewardship and

building the infrastructure to move it to our refineries and move it to our consumers.

Why are we waiting 6 years for a decision that would enable us to do that very thing on behalf of the American people?

Mr. ISAKSON. I am pleased to join with the distinguished Senator from the State of North Dakota, and I am pleased to join with the Senator of Oklahoma.

I am pleased to speak as an American from a State that is a net consumer, not producer, of energy. The Senator's State is a great producer of energy. Senator INHOFE's State is a great producer of energy. Georgia is a great consumer. We don't have a lot of oil or natural gas or coal, but I am here because I have a lot of experience in my lifetime—a lot of it with national security issues and with economic issues. Our ability or our failure to approve the Keystone Pipeline and fracking is, very simply, professional malpractice.

I wish to refresh everybody's memory. This is the sixth anniversary of a letter to the President of the United States. Do we know what it is the 35th anniversary of? The Arab oil embargo.

I was a real estate salesman in 1970 when something called the misery index was developed. Does the Senator know what the misery index was? We had double-digit inflation, double-digit unemployment, and double-digit interest rates. Why? Because the Arab oil embargo in the middle 1970s brought America to its knees.

This real estate agent salesman used to have to wait for 2 hours in a line at an ExxonMobil station with a \$10 bill to get my ration of gasoline in the 1970s. Why? Because we depended on the Middle East and OPEC to supply us with energy.

We sit here on the cusp of being a net producer of energy. We can use it in our national defense, we can use it in our national security, and we can use it in our economy. If we produced the energy that we know we have available to us, and if we bring in the energy safely and environmentally soundly, as we know we have available to us, we can rule our foreign policy and our economy based on our own strength and not as dependents on anybody else.

Thirty-five years ago is not just a time of the misery index, but it was a time of failed U.S. foreign policy. Remember, it was the late 1970s when the Iranians took the American Embassy hostage in Iran and for 445 days held the strongest military power in the world hostage. Why? In large measure because they controlled petroleum to our country. So it is a national security threat.

When the President of the Ukraine spoke today, he didn't say this, but I will say it: If America was producing the oil and energy it could with the Keystone Pipeline and with fracking, if we were exporting to foreign countries, we could replace Russia in a heartbeat and be the net supplier of energy to the Ukraine and to Germany.

So it is important to the national security of our country and the employment of our people and the soundness of our economy that we do hydraulic fracking for our natural gas in Haynesville and Marcellus, and that we bring the pipeline oil from Canada-Keystone XL Pipeline in to Houston and refine that petroleum with gasoline and energy for our people.

The pipeline, to the Senator from North Dakota, is very interesting. I ran the State Board of Education in Georgia for years. By law we couldn't build a public school in Georgia if it was within 2,000 feet of an underground pipeline. It is hard in Atlanta, GA, to find a piece of land that isn't within 2,000 feet of an underground pipeline. Today America's energy and petroleum flows rapidly and safely and environmentally soundly in pipelines.

If we weren't using pipelines and we were bringing it on railcars or trucks, we would be producing carbon out the kazoo because those engines would burn petroleum to get the petroleum to Houston. By using the pipeline, it is safe, it is sound, and it is secure.

I think it is basically professional malpractice for this country to fail to approve the Keystone Pipeline or fracking because it hurts our national defense, it makes us dependent on people we shouldn't be dependent on, it hurts our economy, and one day the misery index could come back. If it comes back, it will be because we are held hostage by our own failed policy, not because somebody held us hostage because they were strong.

I want a strong America. I want an America that has strong leadership. I don't want to be a part of any professional malpractice. I want to be a part of seeking the best for our American people—bringing energy to our American people, and being the most competitive economy in the world today.

I appreciate the distinguished Senator from North Dakota for yielding me the time.

Mr. HOEVEN. I thank the distinguished Senator from Georgia for his strong support and his clear understanding of why we need this project and for putting the focus on national security.

In poll after poll two-thirds of Americans support this project. I think in the final analysis the American people will make a decision here. If the President after 6 years refuses to make a decision, clearly his strategy is to defeat this project with endless delays, just defeat by delay. So here we are in year 6 of the application process.

I would turn to my colleague from Georgia and ask his thoughts on this body's ability to step up and make the decision and approve this project on behalf of the American people. What does the Senator foresee? We have 57 who have signed on now. I believe we will get to 60. What is the Senator's sense of our ability to get this done for the American people?

Mr. ISAKSON. If, before we left today and had a final vote on the CR,

the majority leader would let a vote come to the floor to get 60 votes to go ahead and move forward on the Keystone Pipeline, in my belief it would happen. For all the reasons I stated and what the American people want and all the reasons the Senator stated, I quite frankly do not understand why one single person in this administration would hold back the Keystone Pipeline.

Correct me if I am wrong, but the State Department has five times approved it; is that not correct?

Mr. HOEVEN. That is absolutely correct. We have the dates of the approval of five different environmental impact statements right here, all finding no significant environmental impact.

Mr. ISAKSON. So that is No. 1.

No. 2, there is no question that being independent in energy makes us a stronger country in terms of our national defense and our foreign policy; is that not correct?

Mr. HOEVEN. That is correct.

Mr. ISAKSON. No. 3, we will have more jobs, more employment, less inflation, and a more vibrant economy if we were developing this petroleum; is that not correct?

Mr. HOEVEN. That is correct.

Mr. ISAKSON. Then I think, knowing the quality and the intellect of the 100 Members of the Senate, there is no doubt that if the leader would bring that vote to the floor today, we would get more than 60 votes to move America forward and say: This Congress is ready to act. We are not in professional malpractice; we in fact are doing good for the American people. We want energy and we want it now.

Mr. HOEVEN. I thank the good Senator from Georgia.

I understand that our time has expired. I ask unanimous consent for 1 minute to wrap up this colloquy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOEVEN. On the facts and on the merits—which is how we have to make decisions for the American people—this is a project about energy, producing energy here at home so we don't have to get it from the Middle East. We know what is going on with the Middle East with ISIL and other organizations that are creating huge problems and that are a danger not only to this country but to the world.

It is about energy here at home and working with our closest friend and ally, Canada. It is about jobs. The State Department itself says more than 40,000 jobs are created with this project. It is about economic activity, a \$5.3 billion project and not one penny of Federal spending, just private investment. It is about national security, as we have talked about.

But it is also about congestion on our rails. It is about making sure we don't try to move all this oil on rail so we have so much congestion, we have accidents, and we have seen that happen. It is about harvest and moving ag prod-

ucts from the heartland throughout the country. It is about using the latest, greatest technology to make sure we produce more energy more dependably and with better environmental stewardship than without the project.

Six years. It is time for this body to step forward on behalf of the American people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

#### MATTERS OF WAR AND PEACE

Mr. NELSON. Madam President, I don't think we should adjourn and go home with matters of war and peace in front of us.

This Senator certainly intends to support the appropriations bill, the continuing resolution necessary to keep the government functioning. But one of the issues in this continuing resolution is the authorization in order to start training the Free Syrian Army in Saudi Arabia, and this Senator certainly supports that.

But the issues beyond just that training are very much in front of us, which involves the United States protecting our national security by going after ISIS—or ISIL or whatever you want to call them. It is the group that has already declared war on us. Day by day we see their efforts, and then we hear their statements that they want to fly the black flag of ISIS over the White House. What more do we need to know about the national security being threatened?

Today in a joint session we heard a very inspiring and emotional speech by the President of Ukraine. He so poignantly pointed out how Russia has invaded eastern Ukraine, and it is the Russian Army against the Ukrainian Army. We certainly should be helping them as well, as we are, but it needs to be more.

So, too, the national security of the United States is definitely threatened by ISIS. As I have said over and over, I believe the President has the constitutional authority to strike ISIS in Syria, as he already has in northern Iraq, and that is under his constitutional duty as Commander in Chief. But this is not going to be a strike for a few days; this is going to be a long effort to degrade and defeat—to use the President's words—this threat to America.

So here the Congress of the United States is going to adjourn in the middle of September; and, as I calculate, starting tomorrow it is 55 days until we would return. We need to be talking about war and peace. We need to be talking about the Congress exercising its constitutional authority to give the authority to the President for this long-term effort. The Senate has heard our colleague Senator TIM Kaine of Virginia speak very passionately about this. He believes it very firmly. I only disagree with Senator Kaine to the point that I believe the President has