

leading Navy football as its quarterback. And what a quarterback he has become.

In the 2008 Navy football season, Ricky Dobbs rushed for 498 yards and eight touchdowns, and Navy was honored at the White House in April 2009 for winning a sixth straight Commander in Chief's Trophy by President Barack Obama. In his role as quarterback for the Navy Midshipmen in 2009, Ricky Dobbs broke the single season college record for the most rushing touchdowns by a quarterback. Yes, indeed, Ricky Dobbs finished with the NCAA record of 27 single-season rushing touchdowns and was named the game's most valuable player in the 2009 Texas Bowl.

Mr. Speaker and Members of Congress, Ricky has thrown just four interceptions in his entire career as quarterback for the Navy, or 0.033 percent, the lowest interception percentage in Naval football history. Ricky Dobbs has scored four or more rushing touchdowns on four different occasions. In other words, four touchdowns in four different games, including three times in three games this past year. No other Navy player has more than one career four rushing touchdown day, and that includes the legendary Roger Staubach.

Ricky Dobbs comes from a humble beginning. He has a family, a loving family, and when you give credit and you recognize the achievements of a young man or a young lady, you certainly have to recognize the achievements of those parents. Barbara Cobb and Clarence Dobbs have done a remarkable job of rearing this young man. But we can't stop there, for when you recognize the achievement of Ricky Dobbs of Douglasville and Douglas County, you have got to recognize that entire community that has put its arms around and reared and nurtured this outstanding young man to soar in academics as well as perform excellently in record-shattering circumstances on the football field for the prestigious Navy Academy.

Mr. Speaker, when you look at this, one word comes to mind, and that word is "excellence." When that word was put to the great Greek philosopher Aristotle, when Aristotle was asked, What does it take to be an excellent person, Aristotle said, In order to be an excellent person, you must first of all know thyself. Well, Ricky Dobbs knows who he is, and that is, he is a child of God.

The question was later put to the great emperor and general, Marcus Aurelius of Rome: Marcus Aurelius, what does it take to be an excellent person? Marcus Aurelius replied, In order to be an excellent person, you must first of all discipline yourself.

What discipline it took to achieve academically at Douglas County High School and then to move up to the prestigious Navy Academy and set these astounding, record-shattering records on the football field.

And then, finally, the question was put to the Messiah, Jesus Christ, when he was asked, What does it take to be a great person, an excellent person? Jesus said, Sacrifice yourself.

As a military person, he is doing that for his country. Let's give this tribute to this outstanding young man and make this day, ladies and gentlemen, Ricky Dobbs Day in this United States of America.

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO INCLUDE EXTRANEEOUS MATERIAL

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask for unanimous consent to introduce an article into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

STAYING HOOKED ON A DIRTY FUEL: WHY CANADIAN TAR SANDS PIPELINES ARE A BAD BET FOR THE UNITED STATES

(From the National Wildlife Federation Report)

CONFRONTING GLOBAL WARMING—INTRODUCTION

"America is addicted to oil."

When President George W. Bush uttered these words in his 2006 State of the Union address, the former Texas oilman acknowledged an imperative as important as any we can imagine for the nation's future: breaking that crude addiction.

Our addiction to oil has come with an untenable cost: to our national security, to our air and water, and to the ability of our warming planet to support billions of human lives. The recent Gulf Coast crisis, stemming from an exploding offshore drilling rig, is just one more reason to kick our prodigious habit. The United States consumes about one quarter of the world's oil—around 20 million barrels a day, and imports nearly two-thirds of that—about 13 million barrels per day. For economic, political, military and ecological reasons, the United States needs to address this addiction—and beat it.

The burgeoning Canadian tar sands industry epitomizes the depths of our addiction. Tar sands are a combination of clay, sand, and bitumen found in great quantities under the boreal forest of Alberta. By employing massive mining operations or energy-intensive underground heating and production techniques, energy companies produce a sludge-like heavy oil that can be further refined into transportation fuels like gasoline or diesel. As this report explains, expanding the mining, processing and refining of these tar sands represents a tragic choice for Canada, the United States, and the world.

British Petroleum's Deepwater Horizon tragedy off the Louisiana coast, which killed 11 men and is an unfolding ecological disaster, is not an argument to expand Canadian tar sands development, as some have argued. The Gulf Coast catastrophe should instead propel us away from a future of diminishing returns and higher costs from "unconventional" fossil fuel extraction, which includes tar sands, oil shale and coal-to-liquids. Moving deeper into tar sands would be taking the country down the wrong path—one that leads to an inevitable dead-end.

The tar sands industry aims to create an extensive web of pipelines to deliver increasing amounts of this Canadian tar sands sludge to refineries in the United States. The U.S. federal government has already approved two dedicated tar sands pipelines and is poised to approve a third. The Canadian

company Enbridge's Alberta Clipper pipeline, running from the U.S.-Canadian border in North Dakota, and across Minnesota to Wisconsin, has already been completed. TransCanada's Keystone I pipeline, which the State Department approved in 2009, runs from Alberta to Illinois and on to Oklahoma. TransCanada's proposed Keystone XL pipeline is the third pipeline whose permit application is currently being reviewed by the U.S. State Department. It would cut through America's heartland, running nearly 2,000 miles from Alberta down to Port Arthur, Texas, where the tar sands will be refined into transportation fuels. Other, shorter pipelines are envisioned to run to refineries around the country. This network of tar sands pipelines would deliver even more pollution to refineries where and the surrounding communities, which are already experiencing health effects.

The proposed Keystone XL pipeline will traverse rivers and carve across prairies, will flow on top of vital aquifers, and threaten farmers, ranchers and wildlife when it leaks or breaks, as it unquestionably will. Building this new pipeline would institutionalize a demand for a product that we do not need—especially if we seize the initiative to wean ourselves from this a fuel that is sullyng our coasts, tearing up our heartland, and destroying the health and livelihoods of communities. Current projections are that the new pipeline would not even run close to capacity, raising the question of why the U.S. is even considering this project.

Promoting the growth of the Canadian tar sands industry is a dangerous and foolhardy development. This pipeline system would virtually assure the destruction of swaths of one of the world's most important forest ecosystems, produce lake-sized reservoirs of toxic waste, import a thick, tarlike fuel that will release vast quantities of toxic chemicals into our air when it is refined in the U.S., and emit significantly more global warming pollutants into the atmosphere than fuels made from conventional oil. Communities that live near the tar sands are already experiencing health problems linked to the pollution, and dozens of wildlife species are at risk, including millions of migrating cranes, swans, and songbirds. If Keystone XL crosses our border, it will cut through thousands of miles of sensitive habitat in America's heartland. When the tar sands are refined in U.S. facilities, the resulting pollution will foul our air and water.

We believe that the U.S. needs clean and renewable energy solutions as we make the inevitable and necessary transition to a post-oil world. Tar sands, as well as other inferior fossil fuels like oil shale, simply should not be part of the equation. Tar sands are a starkly inefficient, polluting, ecologically disastrous and expensive way to power our cars and trucks. Each tar sands pipeline our government approves further increases our dependence on this dirty fuel. These pipelines will become, in effect, a long-term, government-approved pollution delivery system.

If we allow all these pipelines to be built, we are essentially saying that we are willing to feed our oil habit, even if we know it will harm our air, water, health, prosperity and planet. Agreeing to increase our imports of Canadian tar sands represents the worst kind of addictive behavior: "persistent compulsive use of a substance known by the user to be physically, psychologically, or socially harmful."

Why then, we ask in this report, is the U.S. poised to allow this expanded pipeline network that will lock our country into an ongoing reliance on the dirtiest of fossil fuels?

It is time to apply every ounce of American ingenuity to finding a technological

path to a future that relies far less on oil and other fossil fuels and far more on sources of fuel that are renewable, sustainable, and clean. By applying the talent and technology of America's best minds and businesses, this country can dramatically improve our environment and accelerate our move beyond a dirty energy economy.

We have arrived at a critical crossroads that will determine whether we can break free from this dependence—or lash ourselves tighter to it. Building new pipelines to import billions of barrels of dirty fuel from Canada is taking the wrong path into increasingly hazardous terrain. We should tell our elected leaders to reconsider.

BIG OIL PUSHES FOR PIPELINES: TRANSPORTING A DIRTY FUEL THAT RAVAGES ALBERTA'S FORESTS AND WATERS

TAR SANDS DEVELOPMENT

An aerial view of the area around Fort McMurray, Alberta, provides a stark portrait of an addiction. The Athabasca River, snaking through a region once marked by unending vistas of glowing green conifers and populated by woodland caribou, moose, bears and lynx, now demarcates ground zero for what is arguably the most destructive peacetime industrial activity in the history of mankind.

Tar sands development has transformed a landscape of boreal forest and peat lands into a vast oil sacrifice zone. On either side of the river, a series of giant open pit mines, belching processing facilities, and poisonous tailings ponds now line the floodplains and wetlands. The giant toxic tailings ponds have grown large enough to see from space.

Even more troubling, the industrial activity is poised to spread across the landscape like blight. If all the current Canadian tar sands leases are exploited, development is slated to encompass an area the size of New York and New Jersey combined.

The Canadian tar sands industry is, by almost any measure, one of the most wasteful and polluting industries humanity has ever invented. Over the past ten years, commercial tar sands production became increasingly profitable because of rising oil prices and massive infrastructure construction that accelerated the development's expanding reach. In pursuit of profits that increased with the scaled-up production, energy companies have torn up a province, released countless gallons of toxic sludge into waterways, emitted hundreds of millions of tons of global warming pollutants into the atmosphere, and produced billions of barrels of viscous, heavy oil that requires vast amounts of energy to transport and refine into a transportation fuel.

EXTRACTING BITUMEN

Locked in underground pockets of sand, clay and water, tar sands contain bitumen, which is a heavy, black viscous oil that can be extracted, upgraded, refined, and turned into fuel. The Canadian Energy Research Institute estimates that these tar sands contain 1.7 trillion barrels of heavy crude, of which approximately 173 billion barrels are recoverable.

About 20 percent of Alberta's tar sands deposit is close enough to the surface to be dug up using conventional open pit mining techniques. Using this method, the forest is clear-cut and giant open pit mines carve the layers of tar sands from the earth. These tar sands are trucked to facilities where they are heated into a liquid, and the bitumen is separated from the sand and clay. This process requires substantial amounts of water and energy, and leaves behind a number of toxic byproducts.

Another technique, known as in situ production, will be used to target the other 80

percent of tar sands deposits, located deeper in the ground. In situ production requires companies to insert pipes into the ground, which are filled with steam to heat up the tar sands and liquify the bitumen. This liquid bitumen is then pumped to the surface much like conventional oil. Although this technique does not result in the same wholesale habitat destruction as strip mines, industry claims that in situ mining is a "solution" for tar sands environmental problems is overstated. This process requires substantially more energy than conventional mining, leaving a much larger carbon footprint. In situ mining also fragments the landscape with roads and pumping stations, requires large amounts of water, and still leaves toxic tailings ponds during the upgrading process.

Both open pit mining and in situ processes require systems of roads, pads, industrial facilities and tailings ponds that all contribute to the fragmentation and destruction of the boreal forest. The tailings ponds—which are more like giant toxic lakes filled with pollutants like benzene, cyanide, and mercury—stretch across the landscape, threatening human health and wildlife.

THREATENING DOWNRIVER COMMUNITIES

Scientists already have catalogued human health problems among the First Nations people who live downriver. Studies have raised alarms about increased cancer rates and autoimmune diseases. In the Fort Chipewyan First Nation, where subsistence hunting and fishing is still prevalent, hunters say they have noticed big changes in the game they harvest—including the fact that moose livers are enlarged and white-spotted. Water from the Athabasca River, their main water source, now leaves brown residue in the pot when they boil it. Fish they depend on are contaminated with high levels of mercury and toxic cancer-causing chemicals.

Because the communities in the vicinity of the mining sites are small, there has been relatively little monitoring of how much the industrial activity has affected human and wildlife health. What is clear is that the process of extracting, upgrading, and refining tar sands requires a suite of chemicals and produces toxic byproducts.

DELIVERY TO THE U.S.

Much the tar sands upgrading to date has taken place in Alberta, but the refining capacity is not high enough for the projected increase in production. That is why the tar sands industry is proposing pipelines to the U.S.: to bring the unrefined heavy crude to refineries in the U.S.

Today, approximately 60 percent of Canadian tar sands fuel is exported to the U.S. Our nation currently imports about 800,000 barrels of this fuel a day, and some project that this could increase fivefold if all the planned pipelines are constructed, world oil supply from conventional oil dwindles, and global demand intensifies.

In Canada, concern and opposition has been rising as the ecological fallout from tar sands production becomes more visible. If the U.S. continues its voracious oil habit and builds these pipelines to support it, we will be contributing to this Canadian calamity for many years to come.

POISONED HABITAT: WILDLIFE IN THE CROSSHAIRS

A DESTRUCTIVE BUSINESS

The video footage is heartbreaking: a mallard drake, flapping its wings in muck and beak dripping black gunk, barely keeping afloat in oil sludge. No, not Alaska after the infamous Exxon Valdez spill, or the Gulf Coast wetlands after the BP explosion. It is the result of "normal" tar sands development in Alberta.

Scientists are only beginning to understand the extent of the impacts of Alberta

tar sands production on the fish, waterfowl, and forest animals that live in the remote boreal forest that has become the hub of industrial tar sands production. Habitat destruction and fragmentation is expanding rapidly, and even energy companies acknowledge that they are effectively destroying habitat as they go. In a recent report by Cambridge Energy Research Associates, the authors quote the energy giant Shell describing the impacts in an application for a mine expansion: "Effectively, a complete loss of soil and terrain, terrestrial vegetation, wetlands and forest resources, wildlife and biodiversity happens for this area for the period of operations."

This kind of large-scale habitat destruction raises even larger concerns, because there is so much at stake in this fecund northern wilderness.

The surrounding forest is home to the full complement of wildlife any sportsman would imagine living in the Canadian wilderness: bears, wolves, lynx, and important herds of woodland caribou. The Athabasca River is part of a vital nesting and staging ground for migratory waterfowl, many of which winter in the continental U.S. The Canadian boreal forest provides breeding, nesting or migration stops for more than 300 species of birds—including several species of cranes, shorebirds, and more than a million inland birds.

FULL IMPACTS UNKNOWN

Scientists know very little about the cumulative impacts of tar sands development, says Canadian ecologist Kevin Timoney, because the Canadian government, provincial authorities, and energy companies have not conducted adequate monitoring and testing. Timoney however, has begun documenting a series of harmful effects to wildlife from habitat fragmentation, toxic exposures, and other threats to wildlife.

Some of these effects have gained public notice. In 2008, 1,600 ducks perished when they landed in a tar sands mine tailings pond operated by Syncrude. Originally, the company downplayed the numbers, and it took several years and a prosecution to bring the extent of the damage to light. A lawsuit is pending against Syncrude.

Timoney estimates that even 1,600 substantially underestimates bird mortality from this event—and many others that remain undocumented. In an article published in the *Open Conservation Biology Journal*, Timoney laid out a disturbing case that tar sands development has led to a permanent loss of at least 58,000 birds—and possibly as many as 400,000.

The Syncrude tailings pond deaths were the result of the birds becoming mired in oil, despite companies' efforts to shoo birds away from their toxic tailings ponds using noise cannons and scarecrows. The Cambridge Energy Research Report states that, "the surface layer of bitumen found on most tailings ponds is an acute threat to wildlife."

Timoney says there are other dangers as well. He and others have documented at least 43 other bird species—waterfowl and shore birds, birds of prey and gulls—that have died from tar sands-related development. Timoney also made a Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy request of the Alberta Sustainable Resources Development, which disclosed that 27 black bears, 67 deer, 31 red foxes, 21 coyotes and unspecified numbers of moose, muskrats, beavers, voles, martens, wolves and bats had also perished on tar sands operations between 2000 and 2008.

Even more disturbing, Timoney discovered that those reported numbers came from the energy companies themselves, suggesting an under-reporting of some significance. "The

numbers of dead animals reported to government," he wrote, "underestimated true mortality because they were derived from ad hoc reporting by companies rather than from a scientifically valid and statistically robust sampling design."

In another study, Timoney analyzed data from government and industry sources that revealed strong evidence of chemical contamination in the Athabasca River. Specifically, the levels of known cancer-causing chemicals were as high as in industrial zones in the United States. Elevated levels of mercury and other heavy metals were also present. A government report from the Regional Aquatics Monitoring Program determined that more than seven percent of river fish showed growth abnormalities, which Timoney says is "high."

AN EXPANDING THREAT

There is every reason to believe this problem will only worsen. According to Environmental Defense Canada, tar sands tailings ponds already have a surface area of 50 square miles, twice the size of Manhattan. These contaminated tailings ponds have already leaked into the nearby waterways, and projections are they will triple in size.

This spells more trouble for wildlife, especially migrating birds. According to Colleen Cassidy St. Clair and Robert Ronconi from the University of Alberta's Faculty of Science, "spring migration is a particular problem in northeastern Alberta, when the warm-water waste from oil sands mines are the only open water—the natural bodies are still frozen. When waterfowl land in these ponds, they may ingest oil and their plumage may become oiled with waste bitumen, potentially preventing birds from flying or leading to lost insulation and death from hypothermia."

Even though there has been very little study of the effects of tar sands development on wildlife, the indications are that this development is releasing a potentially devastating onslaught on Canadian and internationally-migrating animals. As ecologist Timoney put it: "The effects of these pollutants on ecosystem and public health deserve immediate and systematic study. Projected tripling of tar sands activities over the next decade may result in unacceptably large and unforeseen impacts on biodiversity, ecosystem function, and public health. The attention of the world's scientific community is urgently needed."

ADMINISTRATION MISSING IN ACTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government is missing in action on American border security. Our ineffective border security plan seems to be one of compassionate disinterest or catch them if you can.

Last week there was not another violent incident at the border near El Paso, Texas. This time a lone Border Patrol agent spotted a group of Mexican nationals crossing the border illegally. The agent was able to apprehend one of the illegals, but four illegals began assaulting the sole law enforcement officer with rocks. His life was in danger, and he defended himself. One of the assailants was killed, however; an assailant with a long criminal history of smuggling.

Our law enforcement agents have the moral and legal right to defend themselves, and they have the right to defend the American border.

□ 1945

The Mexican military showed up at the scene, however. They pointed their rifles at the American law enforcement agents. So what did they do? Did they stand their ground? Did they protect the sovereignty of the United States of America? No. Our Border Patrol agents retreated. They fled. And why? Because the Federal Government doesn't back up the Border Patrol.

The government hangs them out to dry. Just ask Border Patrol agents Ramos and Compean. Washington only gives lip service to securing the border. The government tells our Border Patrol to go down there on the border and kind of pretend to enforce the law. They don't receive the support they need to secure the border. They don't get the necessary manpower or the necessary equipment. They don't receive the necessary moral support from the government. The government doesn't back up their right to protect themselves when their lives are in danger. The Federal Government, Mr. Speaker, is missing in action.

But right on cue, Mexican President Calderon arrogantly demanded an apology for the shooting. But Calderon didn't apologize for the shooting of Robert Krentz, the Arizona rancher who was murdered in America on his own property by a Mexican criminal alien.

Calderon didn't apologize for the execution-style murder of Border Patrol agent Robert Rosas in Campo, California. Calderon didn't apologize when Senior Patrol Agent Luis Aguilar was murdered in America, run down and run over by a Mexican narcoterrorist drug smuggler in a Humvee.

Where's Calderon's outrage over the Americans being killed all the time in America by illegals from Mexico? Where's Calderon's apology for the criminal alien murderer of Houston Police Officer Rodney Johnson? Officer Johnson was a 12-year veteran of the Houston police force. He was married, had five kids, and Officer Johnson was shot four times execution-style by a Mexican illegal with a criminal record when he was stopped for speeding.

Where was Calderon when Houston Police Officer Gary Gryder was killed by an illegal in 2008? Or when Houston Police Officer Henry Canales was murdered by an illegal just last year? Americans are frequently killed in America by Mexican illegals. And why doesn't our government demand an apology about these homicides? Why doesn't our government demand compensation from Mexico for the homicides their illegals commit in the United States?

And where's the State Department? Where's the outrage, the concern when it's an American that loses their life, cost their lives by the actions of

illegals from Mexico? Where's that demand for an apology? And where's the administration? Missing in action, that's where.

Where's your outrage, Mr. President? The President should be on the American side of the border, doing what's best for America. And why don't we protect our own? How hard would it be for the President of the United States just to say, Don't cross the American border without permission? Why doesn't he say that? Doesn't he believe those words?

Mexican criminals think they can come over here and do as they please and nobody's going to really do anything about it. And they're right. Did we send our Attorney General out to demand answers when Border Patrol agent Rosas was shot execution-style last year? Where was the Attorney General? Missing in action.

And American citizens and peace officers are losing their lives because the government is missing in action. Seems like our government is more interested in what Mr. Calderon thinks than the American people. Mr. Calderon should take care of his own lawless country and Mr. Obama should take care of our borders. The administration, this administration, is not the first to be ineffective in border security, but it certainly should be the last.

And that's just the way it is.

THE LONGEST WAR IN AMERICAN HISTORY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, the war in Afghanistan is now 104 months old, passing Vietnam, to make it the longest war in United States history. And as it reaches this dubious milestone, it's hard to imagine things going much worse. The much-hyped military campaign in Kandahar is now way behind schedule, with the Secretary of Defense saying it's more important to get it done right than to get it done quickly.

That kind of plea might have worked 80 months ago, Mr. Speaker, but do they not see the irony or the disconnect in preaching patience about a war that is now the longest the Nation has ever fought? Do they not see that the American people, who have given a thousand or more of their best young people and a quarter of a trillion dollars to this war, are long past the point where they are willing to cut some slack and take a wait-and-see approach?

And if that's not bad enough, it turns out the campaign we thought we had just finished in Marja never really took in the first place. What seemed to be a quick and decisive military triumph turned out to be an illusion. The Taliban hadn't been crushed; they had gone into hiding, laying low for a while, taking part in the opium harvest, and regaining their bearings, so