

that makes the oil sands' carbon footprint comparable to conventional drilling. In fact, the oil sands industry has reduced greenhouse gas emissions per barrel of oil produced by an average of 26 percent since 1990, with some facilities achieving reductions as high as 50 percent. Today, heavy crude oil from the Middle East and even from California produces more carbon emissions over its life cycle than the Canadian oil sands. Let me repeat that. Today, heavy crude that we import from the Middle East and even some of the California heavy crude produce more carbon emissions over their life cycle than Canadian oil sands.

We also need to factor in that if the pipeline is not built from Alberta to the United States, a similar pipeline will be built to Canada's Pacific coast. That is what I show right here on this chart. From there, the oil will be shipped across the Pacific Ocean, a much larger, sensitive ecosystem than the Sandhills—which we are not even going through now—to be refined at facilities in China with weaker environmental standards and more emissions than facilities in the United States. The United States, moreover, will continue to import oil from the Middle East, again, on tankers. Factor in the cost of trucking and railing the product to market overland, and the result, contrary to the claims of opponents, will be more emissions and a less secure distribution system without the Keystone XL Pipeline project.

Think about it. So we say: OK, we are not going to have this pipeline, even though we have built other pipelines already. We are not going to get oil from Canada. What happens? That oil goes to China, with higher emissions. You are going to take it across the ocean, which is a greater risk than putting it in a pipeline. You are going to have it refined in refineries in China, which have much worse emissions standards than our own. And guess what we get to do. Let's see, we do not get the jobs. We do not get the tax revenues. Do you know what we do get to do? We get to continue to import our oil from the Middle East. How does that sound? Is that a good idea with what is going on in Iran and with what is going on in Egypt and with what is going on in Syria—the risk that the Strait of Hormuz could be blockaded or that you could have further conflict over there that could cut off oil supplies? Is that what the American people want? They want to continue to get oil from the Middle East rather than our closest friend and ally, Canada? The American people would rather that oil go to China? Of course not. And that is what we are talking about with this project.

Well, that raises another important point. The administration's own State Department completed its 3-year National Environmental Protection Act—NEPA—review of the Keystone XL project back in 2011 and determined that “there would be no significant im-

pacts” on the environment. That is what the administration determined in their own NEPA process.

And that raises another point. The White House says: Well, we do not want to get ahead of the process. But the President effectively abandoned the process more than a year ago when he halted the project by Executive action. Had he not, the State Department, in keeping with the usual process, would have issued a decision on the permit—after 4 years—by December 2011, according to a letter Secretary Clinton sent to me in August 2011.

I have worked toward approval of the Keystone XL Pipeline—first as the Governor of North Dakota and now as a Senator—because I believe it is just the kind of project that will grow our economy and create the jobs our country so desperately needs, and it will do so with good environmental stewardship. At the same time, it will reduce our dependence on the Middle East for oil, which is what the American people have desired for decades. The Keystone XL Pipeline project is long overdue. For the benefit of our economy, our environment, and our long-term energy security, President Obama needs to approve it now, without further delay.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for several minutes on another topic in regard to a recipient of the Medal of Honor from my State of North Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANCHIN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO ARMY STAFF SERGEANT CLINTON ROMESHA

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I rise today to honor one of our Nation's true heroes—Army SSG Clinton Romesha.

On Monday the President will present Sergeant Romesha with our country's highest military award—the Medal of Honor—for “acts of gallantry . . . above and beyond the call of duty.”

Clint comes from a long line of military heroes. His father is a veteran of the Vietnam war. His grandfather fought in the U.S. Army during World War II. Romesha often cites his grandfather as his greatest hero, so it was not surprising that Clint followed his example and joined the Army in 1999.

Staff Sergeant Romesha showed courage every day that he donned his Army uniform but especially on October 3, 2009, one of the deadliest days of the war in Afghanistan. On that day hundreds of Taliban fighters ambushed American Combat Outpost Keating from all sides with grenades, machine guns, mortars, and rifles. Heavily outnumbered, Clint Romesha and his fellow soldiers quickly fought back in what would turn out to be a deadly daylong battle.

Sergeant Romesha fought valiantly. He darted into danger to draw out the enemy many times. He himself took out a machine gun team. Staff Sergeant Romesha was working to take out a second when he was wounded by shrapnel from an exploding grenade.

His Medal of Honor citation reads:

Undeterred by his injuries, Staff Sergeant Romesha continued to fight and upon the arrival of another soldier to aid him and the assistant gunner, he again rushed through the exposed avenue to assemble additional soldiers.

With complete disregard for his own safety, he continually exposed himself to heavy enemy fire as he moved confidently about the battlefield engaging and destroying multiple enemy targets.

Staff Sergeant Romesha exemplified the valor that President Theodore Roosevelt—also a Medal of Honor recipient—spoke of when he said: “Courage is not having the strength to go on; it is going on when you don't have the strength.”

Despite his wounds, Sergeant Romesha never stopped fighting. He stayed in the battle—leading his team, directing air support, protecting wounded soldiers, and helping to recover the bodies of his fallen friends.

The battle lasted for 12 hours. Eight soldiers lost their lives, and 22 were wounded—a fact that Romesha humbly reminds us of whenever his bravery is touted.

In fact, Sergeant Romesha said:

What I got injured with was nothing. I have buddies who lost their eyesight, who lost limbs. For that, I would rather give them all the credit they deserve for the sacrifices they made. For me, it was nothing.

To Sergeant Romesha, it was just doing his job. To the rest of us, he is a true example of courage and selfless sacrifice. He went above and beyond the call of duty, repeatedly risking his life to defend his post and, more importantly, to help his fellow soldiers. We are grateful for his service and for his example to us all.

Today, Clint resides in Minot, ND, where he and his wife Tamara are raising their three children. I am certain he is every much the hero and inspiration to them that his own grandfather was to him.

My wife Mikey and I join our fellow North Dakotans and Americans in honoring Sergeant Romesha for his heroic and selfless service. We thank him for his exemplary actions on that dangerous day in Afghanistan and every day he served our great country.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we proceed to morning business, with the Senators allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COONS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

TIMBUKTU ANTIQUITIES

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, there was a lot of attention recently on the French military's operation to repel Islamic extremists and Tuareg nationalist rebels who had terrorized the local population of northern Mali, including in the ancient city of Timbuktu. That operation was widely welcomed by local Malian citizens and the international community. Many of the rebels are believed to be hiding out among the local population until the French soldiers leave, so whether they are ultimately vanquished remains to be seen. It will depend in large measure on the longer term capability of a multinational force of African troops supported by the United States and others.

Besides terrorizing, torturing, mutilating, and slaughtering innocent people, the rebels destroyed ancient tombs, shrines, and manuscripts dating to a period many centuries ago when Timbuktu was a crossroads for commerce and a center of intellectual pursuits in northern Africa. I mention this not only to inform those who may be unaware of Mali's ongoing cultural importance, but also to call attention to the fact that Irina Bokova, Director General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, commonly known as UNESCO, has already pledged to reconstruct the damaged mausoleums. As she was quoted in the *New York Times* on February 4, 2013, "This is the record of the golden ages of the Malian empire. If you let this disappear, it would be a crime against humanity."

There are also little known heroes in this otherwise humanitarian and cultural disaster. Malian residents, particularly Ali Iman Ben Essayouti, who knew the importance of priceless manuscripts preserved in a library funded by international donors, including the Library of Congress and Department of State, managed to carefully move some of them to another location where the rebels did not find them. As a result, although the rebels burned the library, only a small portion of the manuscripts were destroyed.

The other point of this is that, as many Senators are aware, the United States, once the largest contributor to UNESCO, including under President George W. Bush, was forced to sever its support last year due to a 1990s law that prohibits U.S. funding to any United Nations-affiliated agency in which the Palestinian Liberation Organization, PLO, obtains the same standing as a member state. After UNESCO's members voted, against the advice of Ms. Bokova, to grant the PLO that standing, the law was triggered and U.S. funding abruptly ended.

This is illogical and self-defeating. First, although the PLO was a terrorist organization in the 1990s, it is no longer. Second, by cutting off our contribution to UNESCO we not only empower its other members, including Russia, Iran, and Syria, we also make

it impossible to assist the organization in the kind of cultural preservation activities it is now undertaking in Mali, which are clearly in the national interest of the United States. There are many other examples, including World Heritage Sites like the Great Barrier Reef, which UNESCO designates and protects today without the support of the United States. Finally, if U.S. funding is not restored before the end of this fiscal year, we will lose our vote in the organization. Ironically, despite PLO membership in UNESCO, Israel has paid its dues through 2014. Presumably, Israeli officials recognize, as we should, that their interests are far better served by participating in a U.N. agency, not by watching from the sidelines.

Mr. President, regardless of what one may think about Palestinian President Abbas' effort to obtain U.N. membership for the PLO, and I am among those who regard it as an unhelpful distraction, cutting off U.S. funding to UNESCO and thereby weakening our influence and empowering our adversaries makes no sense. It is time we recognize that a law that might have seemed sensible to some people years ago has had unintended consequences that run directly counter to our interests, and should be amended or repealed.

TRIBUTE TO MARK SULLIVAN

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Mark Sullivan, who is retiring from his position as Director of the United States Secret Service on February 22, 2013.

Serving as Director for nearly 7 years, and working for five Presidents, Mark Sullivan leaves his mark on the agency by achieving such benchmarks as the Secret Service Uniformed Division Modernization Act, and the Former Presidents Protection Act. He also oversaw the complete overhaul of the Secret Service IT Modernization and Operation Mission Support, which enhanced White House security. He led the effort to create the National Computer Forensic Institute in Hoover, AL, and established numerous overseas field offices to build partnerships between all levels of law enforcement.

Mark Sullivan began his distinguished 30-year career with the Secret Service as a special agent assigned to the Detroit Field Office in 1983. In 1990, Mr. Sullivan was transferred to the Fraud Division in Washington, DC, where he coordinated and monitored multi-jurisdictional criminal investigations involving credit card fraud, bank fraud, and other criminal activity. In 1991, Mr. Sullivan received his first assignment to the Presidential Protective Division, where he served 4 years.

In 1996, Mr. Sullivan was selected as Assistant Special Agent in Charge of the Office of Protective Operations. He returned to the field in 1997 as the Resident Agent in Charge of the Co-

lumbus Resident Office, which oversaw all Secret Service activities in Central Ohio. Twenty months later, Mr. Sullivan was promoted back to Washington, DC as Deputy Special Agent in Charge of the Counterfeit Division, where he managed the agency's investigative activities related to the criminal production and distribution of counterfeit currency and other financial instruments. In July of 1999, he returned to the Presidential Protective Division as an Assistant Special Agent in Charge.

Mr. Sullivan was promoted into the Federal Senior Executive Service in July, 2000, when he was selected as a Deputy Assistant Director in the Office of Protective Operations. In 2002, he was reassigned to the position of Deputy Special Agent in Charge of the Vice Presidential Protective Division. A year later, he was reassigned to the position of Deputy Assistant Director of the Office of Human Resources and Training. He next served as Assistant Director for the Office of Protective Operations, where he oversaw all protective activities for the agency, encompassing 12 divisions and 2,300 employees.

Mr. Sullivan was named Deputy Director in January, 2006 and on May 31, 2006, he was sworn in as the 22nd Director of the U.S. Secret Service.

Prior to joining the Secret Service, Mr. Sullivan spent 3 years as a special agent in the Office of the Inspector General for the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Mark Sullivan has received numerous awards for superior performance throughout his 34-year career in Federal law enforcement. In 2010 he was recognized by President Obama as the recipient of the Distinguished Presidential Rank Award, which he also received in 2005 from then President George W. Bush. Mr. Sullivan is to be honored for his dedication and commitment to public service, devoting his life to the safety of our first families, our Nation's leaders, and the general public. He has been a steadfast partner to the legislative branch, assisting with State of the Union addresses, Inaugurals and other joint partnerships. He will be greatly missed here in the Capitol and we wish him well in his future endeavors.

A native of Arlington, MA, Mr. Sullivan, who is from a large Irish Catholic family, received his bachelor's degree in Criminal Justice from Saint Anselm College in Manchester, NH. He and his wife of 26 years, Laurie have three daughters, one of which, Lauren, has followed in her father's footsteps by entering public service after graduating from college. She has worked for the Senate Sergeant Arms for over 3 years. A former boss once said of Sullivan, "If you were casting someone for the role of director of the Secret Service, he looks the part. He's a tall, handsome Irishman, with grey hair and the demeanor of a born leader." I join with my colleagues from both sides of the