

# REQUIRE THE PRESIDENT TO WITHDRAW FROM AFGHANISTAN AND PAKISTAN

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, this morning I stood before this House and pointed out that *The Nation* magazine did an investigation that showed that U.S. tax dollars were going to U.S. contractors who then gave the Taliban money so that the Taliban wouldn't attack a shipment of U.S. goods to U.S. troops. And of course U.S. troops would use those resources to attack the Taliban.

The war in Afghanistan is a racket. We have a strategy to pay off insurgents, warlords, the Taliban, in pretending that somehow this practice is going to help make an already corrupt central government more stable. I have been in this House now for seven terms, and I have seen the slow and steady erosion of the Constitution of the United States and, in particular, congressional authority with respect to article 1, section 8 of the Constitution, which very explicitly puts the power to create war in the hands of the United States Congress, not in the hands of the executive.

When the Founders crafted the Constitution, they were very clear that they did not want a monarchy. They wanted to what was called "restrain the dogs of war" by placing the power to commit men and women into combat in the hands of an elected Congress, in this case in the hands of the House of Representatives. Unfortunately, over a few generations, we have seen that power of Congress erode.

Today, according to ABC News, Hamid Karzai, the President of Afghanistan, in a joint press conference with Secretary of Defense Robert Gates, said that his country's security forces will need financial and training assistance from the United States for the next 15 to 20 years.

Now, since we're already spending at least \$100 billion to \$150 billion a year in Afghanistan, we are now committed, through Mr. Karzai, we're embarked on a strategy that could lead us to spend \$2 trillion, maybe more.

We've had speakers precede me today speak about the need for jobs in the United States. It goes without saying we should start taking care of things here instead of endeavoring to pour our resources into a corrupt administration, and furthermore, engage in a kind of corruption through trying to pay off warlords and even the Taliban to create shipments to our troops.

As President Obama prepares to escalate military operations in Afghanistan and Pakistan, we must reinstate our prerogative as it relates to war. The United States has been involved in military action—both in Afghanistan and Pakistan—since the inception of this administration despite the fact that the President has never submitted

a report to Congress pursuant to section 4(a)(1) of the War Powers Resolution.

Madam Speaker, when Congress returns in 2010, I intend to bring to the floor of the House privileged resolutions reasserting this congressional prerogative. My bills will trigger a timeline for timely withdrawal of U.S. troops from Afghanistan and Pakistan, invoke the War Powers Resolution of 1973, and secure the constitutional role of Congress as directly elected representatives of the people under article 1, section 8 of the Constitution for Congress to decide whether or not America enters into a war or continues a war or otherwise introduces Armed Forces or materials into combat zones.

Despite the President's assertion that previous congressional action gives him the authority to respond to the attacks of September 11, 2001, a careful reading of the authorization of military force makes clear that this authorization did not supersede any requirement of the War Powers Resolution and therefore did not undermine Congress' ability to revisit the constitutional question of war powers at a later date.

We will have an opportunity in this House in January to vote on this issue of Afghanistan and Pakistan, and I urge my colleagues to join the resolution, which I'll begin to circulate the notice of starting tomorrow.

Thank you.

## RESOLUTION ON THE IMPORTANCE OF SCIENTIFIC INTEGRITY

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

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in the last few weeks there has been some very disturbing correspondence that's surfaced and presents a real dilemma for the scientific community and an even greater dilemma for this Congress as the United Nations Climate Change Conference begins in Copenhagen.

As ranking member of the Science Committee, I'm concerned about these revelations dubbed by the press as "Climate-gate" and their implication for the scientific community, Congress, and the American people. Allegations of manipulation of scientific data would be troublesome under any circumstance. The fact that the scientific data in question here is to be used as the basis for global agreement to limit greenhouse gas emissions or changes to the regulatory regime of the United States makes these allegations that much more disturbing.

I've introduced a resolution which highlights concerns about moving forward with greenhouse gas emissions regulations or an agreement in Copenhagen on the basis of scientific data which email exchanges indicate has been manipulated, enhanced, or deleted in order to advance a political agenda. Forcing Americans to meet carbon

emission reductions may worsen our high unemployment rate and slow our economy while other nations advance their own growth at our expense.

Considering the loss of confidence in the scientific process, it's even more troubling that policymakers are pushing forward with a scheme that could irrevocably alter our economy and our prosperity.

In the past few weeks, through the disclosure of more than a thousand emails, there is extensive evidence that many researchers across the globe discussed the destruction, alteration, and suppression of data that did not support global warming claims. These exchanges include a leading climate scientist encouraging other scientists to alter data that is the basis of climate modeling across the globe by using the "trick of adding in the real temps to each series . . . to hide the decline [in temperature]."

The U.S. National Science and Technology Council defines research misconduct as fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism in proposing, performing, or reviewing research, or in reporting research results.

All of this would be troubling enough on the basis that much of this research is taxpayer funded. However, it is even more troubling when one considers that this data is held up as the reason to implement new regulations and laws and potentially enter into global agreements, all in the name of reducing emissions. Policymakers are asking citizens to agree to alter the economic structure of our country and possibly sacrifice jobs in the name of preserving this warming planet, even as these scientists fail to follow accepted scientific practices and seek to stifle contrary points of view.

Federal policy for addressing research misconduct requires a full inquiry and investigation of the misconduct, as well as a correction of the research record, and potential referral to the Department of Justice. I have sent a letter to the chairman of the Science Committee asking there be an investigation into these matters.

Even more troubling is that these exchanges describe attempts to silence academic journals that publish research skeptical of significant man-made global warming and refer to efforts to exclude contrary views from publication in the scientific journals. Some scientists even encouraged the deletion of data and emails to avoid disclosure in the event of a Freedom of Information request.

All of this presents a troubling pattern of attempts not only to misrepresent the data on global warming to meet expectations contained in the theories, but also to silence any dissenters and cover up inappropriate data manipulation.

□ 1730

The emails show that raw data not meeting the expectations of the scientists or showing a pattern of warm

were altered and the raw data in question was destroyed so as to ensure no further examination. When accepted scientific practices are not followed, there can be implications well beyond the scope of the narrowly focused project. I believe that this is the situation we have before us.

These documents reveal actions that may constitute a serious breach of scientific ethics and violation of the public trust. Certain actions appear to qualify under the definition of U.S. Federal policy on research misconduct.

While this investigation is an important step, the resolution states that the United States should not consider limitations on emissions until sufficient scientific protocols and a robust oversight mechanism have been established to preclude future infringements of public trust by scientific falsification and fraud.

In addition to the economic and regulatory concerns about international climate agreements, Congress should not allow any agreement with any other country nor agree to legislation or regulatory action that will irrevocably alter our economy until we can be assured that this data which forms the basis for these laws and agreements is based on sound science obtained and maintained using traditionally accepted scientific principles. Signing an internal protocol in Copenhagen, especially one based on questionable science, is un-American and will kill jobs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. DEAL of Georgia addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### BITTER FRUIT

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I wish everyone would listen to these words from a column in the current issue of the American Conservative magazine. This column says: "We ran Saddam out of Kuwait and put U.S. troops into Saudi Arabia, and we got Osama bin Laden's 9/11. We responded by taking down the Taliban and taking over Afghanistan, and we got an 8-year war with no victory and no end in sight. Now Pakistan is burning. We took down Saddam and got a 7-year war and an ungrateful Iraq.

"Meanwhile, the Turks who shared a border with Saddam, have done no

fighting. Iran has watched as we destroyed its two greatest enemies, the Taliban and Saddam. China, which has a border with both Pakistan and Afghanistan, has sat back. India, which has a border with Pakistan and fought three wars with the country, has stayed aloof. The United States, on the other side of the world, plunged in. And now we face an elongated military presence in Iraq, an escalating war in Afghanistan, and potential disaster in Pakistan, and being pushed from behind into a war with Iran."

And then in the December 3 issue of The Washington Post, it says: "President Obama's new strategy for combating Islamist insurgents in Afghanistan fell on skeptical ears Wednesday in next-door Pakistan, a much larger, nuclear-armed state that Obama said was 'at the core' of the plan and had even more at stake than Afghanistan. Analysts and residents on both sides of the 1,699-mile border expressed concerns about Obama's plan to send 30,000 more troops into Afghanistan."

And on that same day, The Washington Post had a headline that said: "A deadline written in quicksand not stone."

Now, I think most Americans feel that 8 years in Afghanistan is not only enough; it's far too long. After all, we finished World War II in just 4 years. Now under the President's most optimistic scenario, we are going to be there another year and a half, that's 9½ years, and we're going to be there, we have 68,000 troops there now. They want to add 34,000 more at a cost of \$1 billion per thousand per year, which means over \$100 billion a year.

The Center for War Information says we've already spent almost a half trillion dollars in war and war-related costs in Afghanistan at this point.

And then I would like to ask, Who is in charge? Because this weekend on the interview program, Secretary of State Clinton and Secretary of Defense Gates said, Well, the year and a half withdrawal plan presented by the President at West Point really doesn't mean anything, that we're going to be there probably another 3 or 5 more years. That would bring our time there to 11 or 13 years. That is ridiculous in a country like Afghanistan, a very small country where we are fighting a very small force that has almost no money.

And then I understand from one of the previous speakers that President Karzai said that he needs American troops to be there another 15 or 20 more years. Well, he wants our money, that's for sure, like any gigantic bureaucracy. And what does any gigantic bureaucracy want? They want more money and more employees. So the Defense Department, being the most gigantic bureaucracy in the world, is going to continue to want more money and more personnel.

But when we have a \$12 trillion national debt and almost \$60 trillion in unfunded future pension liabilities, Madam Speaker, we simply can't afford

it. We have to start putting our own people first at some point. It's not going to be long before we're not going to be able to pay our Social Security and veterans' pensions and things we have promised our own people with money that will buy anything, if we keep spending hundreds of billions for very unnecessary wars.

Now, I would like to mention just a couple of things about Pakistan. In the Los Angeles Times on November 1 in a story about Secretary Clinton's visit to Pakistan, it said: "At a televised town hall meeting in Islamabad, the capital, on Friday, a woman in a mostly female audience characterized U.S. drone missile strikes on suspected terrorist targets in northwestern Pakistan as de facto acts of terrorism. A day earlier, in Lahore, a college student asked Clinton why every student who visits the U.S. is viewed as a terrorist. The opinions Clinton heard weren't described in voices of radical clerics or politicians with anti-U.S. agendas. Some of the most biting criticisms came from well-mannered university students and respected, seasoned journalists, a reflection of the breadth of dissatisfaction Pakistanis have with U.S. policies toward their country."

This is a country, Madam Speaker, that the Congress in a voice vote at a time when almost no one was on the floor, most Members didn't even know it was coming up, voted to send another \$7.5 billion in foreign aid to Pakistan on top of \$15.5 billion that we've spent since 2003 there already.

This is getting ridiculous. A country that we are sending billions and billions and billions in foreign aid to, and it's becoming so anti-American, and they don't appreciate this aid at all. We simply can't afford to keep doing these ridiculous and very wasteful expenditures. And I will say again, we need to start putting our own people first once again.

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

(Mr. AKIN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### CLIMATEGATE

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

Mr. OLSON. Madam Speaker, yesterday the U.N. climate change summit in Copenhagen, Denmark, began. The work of the summit is supported in large part by the research developed by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, or the IPCC. This panel is responsible for assessing the state of scientific knowledge related to climate change and reporting its findings to the convention.

And it is not a stretch to say that policymakers in the United States and