

The legislation is aimed at preventing and prohibiting caller ID spoofing. Spoofing is made available with Internet services that will provide false numbers and even disguise your voice so you can easily fool the person on the other end of the phone. Criminals coax victims into giving up sensitive personal information by making it appear that a call is coming from a legitimate institution, such as a bank, doctor's office, government office, or even a family member.

Misleading caller ID information also allows the spoofer to cause a victim to accept a call they would otherwise avoid, leading to harassment. Even more serious potential dangers exist. A pedophile could stalk a child by stealing a school phone number or the phone number of a friend or child. A sexual predator could use a doctor's office phone number to call their victim.

The problems with caller ID spoofing are very real. Let me give you a few examples.

There are cases where criminals using stolen credit card numbers call a service such as Western Union. They program the caller ID to appear to originate from the cardholder's home and use the credit card number to order cash transfers.

Seniors have been misled into believing they missed jury duty. It appeared the local courthouse was calling and victims were asked for Social Security numbers to prevent prosecution. The calls seemed legitimate because the telephone number of the local courthouse showed up on caller ID.

In another example, a SWAT team surrounded a building after it appeared a call came from within stating that a woman was being held hostage when, in fact, the call was coming from another location. The SWAT team showed up expecting to face an armed perpetrator. Luckily, no one was hurt in this one instance, but one can easily imagine what could have happened if an unsuspecting bystander happened to be at that location; a series of misunderstandings could have ended up in tragedy. Unfortunately, this process called "swatting" has occurred dozens of times.

And just this month, there have been two serious cases of caller ID fraud in the news. In Columbia, Maryland, a teenager was arrested for making terrorist phone calls to his former school, calling in a bomb scare and telling school officials there was a student on campus with a gun. The teen used spoofing to make the phone number appear to be coming from Texas. Fortunately, the police were able to subpoena the phone records and arrest the teen.

In Brooklyn, New York, a woman used caller ID fraud to exact revenge on her husband and his pregnant girlfriend's newborn baby. She illegally obtained a prescription that would induce labor early and called the girlfriend, using spoofing, to make it appear that her obstetrician was call-

ing. The woman, thinking she was under doctor's orders, took the medication and the baby was delivered 2 months premature. Police were able to track down the woman when she tried to deliver a poisonous mixture to the hospital disguised as milk, allegedly intending to kill the baby. The police arrested the woman, avoiding a devastating, tragic, and potentially fatal outcome that originated by using caller ID fraud. This could have been avoided if the caller had not used a fraudulent caller ID or if the police could have tracked down the perpetrator sooner.

This bill will make the act of caller ID fraud a felony, and criminals could see fines of up to \$250,000 and jail time up to 5 years if convicted of using caller ID fraud in perpetrating another crime.

I urge all my colleagues to pass this PHONE Act, H.R. 1110, because criminals must know they cannot use this technology loophole to escape the law and cause further harm to our citizens.

AFGHANISTAN

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I rise today with a number of my colleagues to express our continuing concern about the President's decision to escalate our military effort in Afghanistan by an additional 30,000 troops. Thirty thousand additional Americans put into harm's way in Afghanistan is a big deal, Madam Speaker, and I am concerned that the House of Representatives will be adjourning for the year without a real, meaningful, substantive debate about this important issue.

I happen to believe that increasing our military presence by 30,000 troops will make it 30,000 times harder to extricate ourselves from this mess. But whatever my colleagues believe about this decision—support, oppose, or non-committal—we owe it to ourselves and to the people that we represent to have a thorough debate about our policy.

□ 1745

I would urge this administration to submit their supplemental request for this escalation sooner rather than later. Congress has a constitutional role to play. We have the power of the purse and the responsibility to declare war. We haven't played that role in any meaningful way since 2001. That was the last time that this Chamber had a debate on Afghanistan, 2001.

In those eight long years hundreds of American soldiers have lost their lives, thousands have been wounded, and we have spent hundreds of billions of dollars, and we still do not have a clear exit strategy. Everyone seems to agree that Afghanistan requires a political solution. The question I still have is this: When does our military commitment to that political solution come to

an end so that we could bring our troops home?

In no way do I believe that we should abandon Afghanistan or its people. They have been through far too much trauma over the last several decades. Nor do I believe that we should abandon our fight against the people who murdered thousands of Americans on September 11, 2001.

Indeed, I am concerned that by committing over 100,000 American troops to nation building in Afghanistan, we will be less able to target those who attacked us, and that is al Qaeda, because al Qaeda no longer has a large presence in Afghanistan. Our top generals say that maybe there are 100 or less al Qaeda still in Afghanistan. They have moved to Pakistan.

I do not believe that the best, most effective way to fight al Qaeda is to increase our military footprint in Afghanistan. In Afghanistan we need a new strategy.

I would urge my colleagues to read a recent op ed in The New York Times by Nicholas Kristof. He points out that for the cost of one U.S. soldier deployed in Afghanistan, we could build 20 schools in Afghanistan. Let me repeat that. For the cost of one American soldier in Afghanistan for a year we could build 20 schools in Afghanistan.

Not only that, it seems that before the administration announced this new escalation, they failed to thoroughly consult with the elders and the local leaders and others in Afghanistan about the best way forward. Madam Speaker, without local support, without the support of the local leaders who have the respect of the Afghan people, nothing we do will work or be sustainable.

I also continue to be deeply troubled about the Karzai government. Today President Karzai is scheduled to convene a three-day conference on corruption. At a minimum, this conference is supposed to provide a forum where the Afghan government admits publicly that it runs on bribery, graft and cronyism which, in turn, fuels the Taliban insurgency.

President Karzai called this conference—not because he campaigned on cleaning up this government—but because of international pressure. He ran a fraudulent election that undermined international support for the war on Afghanistan, and this is an attempt to show the international community, and especially the United States, that he will somehow clean up his own house.

We will have to wait and see if it's more than just more talk, talk, talk. We will have to see if he is willing to kick out of office the very warlords, drug lords, family members, and cronies he appointed to high government positions, and if he does, whether he appoints reform-minded Afghans in their place.

Again, Madam Speaker, we are about to embark on another huge escalation in a very troubled part of the world.

Congress needs to debate this critical issue. Our men and women in uniform, and every other American we represent, deserve no less.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 3, 2009]
OP-ED COLUMNIST; JOHNSON, GORBACHEV,
OBAMA

(By Nicholas D. Kristof)

Imagine you're a villager living in southern Afghanistan.

You're barely educated, proud of your region's history of stopping invaders and suspicious of outsiders. Like most of your fellow Pashtuns, you generally dislike the Taliban because many are overzealous, truculent nutcases.

Yet you are even more suspicious of the infidel American troops. You know of some villages where the Americans have helped build roads and been respectful of local elders and customs. On the other hand, you know of other villages where the infidel troops have invaded homes, shamed families by ogling women, or bombed wedding parties.

You're angry that your people, the Pashtuns, traditionally the dominant tribe of Afghanistan, seem to have been pushed aside in recent years, with American help. Moreover, the Afghan government has never been more corrupt. The Taliban may be incompetent, but at least they are pious Muslim Pashtuns and reasonably honest.

You were always uncomfortable with foreign troops in your land, but it wasn't so bad the first few years when there were only about 10,000 American soldiers in the entire country. Now, after President Obama's speech on Tuesday, there soon will be 100,000. That's three times as many as when the president took office, and 10 times as many as in 2003.

Hmmm. You still distrust the Taliban, but maybe they're right to warn about infidels occupying your land. Perhaps you'll give a goat to support your clansman who joined the local Taliban.

That's why so many people working in Afghanistan at the grass roots are watching the Obama escalation with a sinking feeling. President Lyndon Johnson doubled down on the Vietnam bet soon after he inherited the presidency, and Mikhail Gorbachev escalated the Soviet deployment that he inherited in Afghanistan soon after he took over the leadership of his country. They both inherited a mess—and made it worse and costlier.

As with the Americans in Vietnam, and Soviets in Afghanistan, we understand the risk of a nationalist backlash; somehow Mr. Obama has emerged as more enthusiastic about additional troops than even the corrupt Afghan government we are buttressing.

Gen. Stanley McChrystal warned in his report on the situation in Afghanistan that "new resources are not the crux" of the problem. Rather, he said, the key is a new approach that emphasizes winning hearts and minds: "Our strategy cannot be focused on seizing terrain or destroying insurgent troops; our objective must be the population."

So why wasn't the Afghan population more directly consulted?

"To me, what was most concerning is that there was never any consultation with the Afghan shura, the tribal elders," said Greg Mortenson, whose extraordinary work building schools in Pakistan and Afghanistan was chronicled in "Three Cups of Tea" and his new book, "From Stones to Schools." "It was all decided on the basis of congressmen and generals speaking up, with nobody consulting Afghan elders. One of the elders' messages is we don't need firepower, we need brainpower. They want schools, health facilities, but not necessarily more physical troops."

For the cost of deploying one soldier for one year, it is possible to build about 20 schools.

Another program that is enjoying great success in undermining the Taliban is the National Solidarity Program, or N.S.P., which helps villages build projects that they choose—typically schools, clinics, irrigation projects, bridges. This is widely regarded as one of the most successful and least corrupt initiatives in Afghanistan.

"It's a terrific program," said George Rupp, the president of the International Rescue Committee. "But it's underfunded. And it takes very little: for the cost of one U.S. soldier for a year, you could have the N.S.P. in 20 more villages."

THE COOLING WORLD

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. Madam Speaker, we debate throughout the world the concept of global warming, but we don't call it that any more; we call it climate change. All the big leaders of the world are in Denmark talking about how they can figure out a way to control man, to make sure that man, the evildoer, the polluter of the world, does not continue to pollute our wonderful climate.

The consensus has been for some time that global warming, climate change, continues because man is the perpetrator. Now we are beginning to learn that may not be true, that there is not a consensus that there is global warming or climate change. We now have heard about Climategate, where the expert scientists hid emails in England that disagreed with the so-called consensus that there is global warming and global climate change. We have heard now new evidence that even NASA is involved in not revealing evidence that contradicts climate change.

I think a history lesson is in order, Madam Speaker, and I would like to read from a couple of well thought of, in the science community, a couple of magazine articles. One of them is under the Science section of Time magazine. It's dated June 24, but the year is 1974. The article begins with this comment, "Another Ice Age?" So much for global warming.

As they review the bizarre and unpredictable weather patterns of the past several years, a growing number of scientists are beginning to suspect that many seemingly contradictory events are occurring in global climate upheaval. The weather widely varies from place to place and time to time.

When meteorologists take an average of temperatures around the globe, they find that the atmosphere has been growing gradually cooler the last three decades and the trend shows no indication of reversing. Let me repeat that. According to scientists in 1974, the trend shows no indication of reversing the cooling trend.

Scientists are becoming increasingly apprehensive, for the weather aberrations

they are studying may be the harbinger of another Ice Age.

If we were to live in 1974, and, you know, I actually lived in 1974, I read this article then, I believed it. I believe we were all going to freeze in the dark. It goes on to say that a part of the problem is man polluting the atmosphere with farming. Because man farms and the dust gets up into the air, that blocks the sun rays from coming to Earth, and that actually cools the Earth. Maybe that's another new idea of carbon emission cooling that was in 1974.

The following year that notable news magazine, Newsweek, April 28, 1975, under its Science section in the back, talks about the cooling world. There are ominous signs that the Earth's weather patterns have begun to change dramatically and that these changes may be bringing a drastic decline in food production throughout the world.

To scientists these dramatic incidents represent the advanced signs of a fundamental change in the world's whether. The central fact, you got that word, fact, is that after three-quarters of a century of extraordinarily mild conditions, the Earth's climate seems to be cooling down. And that's from Newsweek.

Here is a chart they put in their expert scientific article, and it's entitled—I think it's nice they put it in the ice-blue color—Newsweek, "The Cooling World," and it shows that average temperatures are getting colder. Of course, it goes off the chart, colder and colder, April 28, 1978.

Like I said, Madam Speaker, I believed we were all going to freeze in the dark. The scientists told us that we were going to freeze in the dark because of the weather patterns. Climates do change, Madam Speaker. In the 1970s it was getting cooler. Now they say it's getting warmer. Now they just say it's climate change.

Climates do change. That's what seasons are. Most of the world up here in the north has seasons. Now, we don't have seasons in Houston. We have two seasons—we have summer, and we have August. Other than that, the seasons change. In most parts of the world they get warm, they get cold.

We are going to try to trust the world's climate predictions to a group of people from the 1970s and now, 2000, to a group of people who can't even predict correctly tomorrow's weather. You know, people in the weather industry are the only people I know who consistently can be wrong and keep their jobs. But yet, these same people who can't predict tomorrow's weather are trying to predict the weather from now on, that climate change is occurring because man is the culprit.

And that's just the way it is.

[From Newsweek, Apr. 28, 1975]

(By Peter Gwynne)

THE COOLING WORLD

There are ominous signs that the earth's weather patterns have begun to change dramatically and that these changes may have