

major drug cartels and criminal networks. He is seeking coordinated strategies and action, increased aid and assistance, stronger laws and policies, and more effective social investment.

El Salvador has experienced several tragic episodes of violence carried out by drug members, and public revulsion at gang crimes is at an all-time high. President Funes is seeking to respond decisively to this terrible situation, while not repeating the mistaken policies that sounded tough but failed to reduce crime or keep young people out of gangs. He has also established an advisory commission on gangs and gang-related violence. One program that might be a model is the Center for Formation and Orientation at St. Francis of Assisi Parish in Mejicanos. It has had success working with young people on rejecting gang life and providing those who want to leave the gangs with advice, education, and training. Its pastor, Father Antonio Rodriguez, has made important contributions to the discussions about how to address the youth violence.

Mr. Speaker, it is in the best interest of the U.S. to support the Funes administration as it seeks to strengthen the rule of law, clean up institutional corruption and crime, and help lead the region in breaking impunity and confronting criminal threats.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Sept. 11, 2010]

SALVADORAN LEADER SPEAKS OF CRIMINAL GANGS' LINKS TO DRUG CARTELS

El Salvador's president, Mauricio Funes, the country's first leftist leader since the end of its civil war in 1992, finds himself preoccupied with a deepening struggle against criminal gangs and international drug cartels.

Since winning office in 2009, Funes has deployed the army to back up police, who are trying to curb a drug-fueled homicide rate that claims about 12 victims a day.

On Thursday, he signed a controversial law criminalizing gang membership. The gangs responded by shutting down nationwide public transportation with the threat of violence.

During a visit to Los Angeles this week to meet with community leaders on immigration issues, Funes spoke with Times editors about the growing links between Salvadoran gangs and international drug cartels, and he argued that boosting U.S.-led economic investment holds the most hope for defeating drug violence and illegal immigration.

WHO CONTROLS THE NARCOTICS TRAFFIC IN EL SALVADOR?

Everybody. There are Salvadoran cartels in connection with Colombian cartels. Guatemalan cartels are there. And recently we have found evidence of the presence of [the Mexican-based drug cartel] Los Zetas.

Just a few days after I came to office, I received an intelligence report saying that Los Zetas were exploring the territory and that they had started to make contacts with Salvadoran narcotraffickers and Salvadoran gangs, particularly the MS [Mara Salvatrucha, a transnational gang born in L.A.'s Salvadoran immigrant community]. It is the one that has shown, up to now, to have the most firepower.

The change that has occurred lately is that the [criminal] gangs have become involved in the business. At the beginning, the gangs were just a group of rebel youngsters. As

time moved on, the gangs became killers for hire. Now the situation is that the gangs have become part of the whole thing. They control territory and they are disputing territory with the drug traffickers. Why? Because they need to finance their way of life: basically, getting arms.

HAVE STATE INSTITUTIONS BEEN INFILTRATED?

I am convinced that the army is not infiltrated by the cartels. The grenades and the arms that these people have, they have not gotten them through the army. That does not mean that there are not other institutions that are infiltrated. Since my government started, we have dismissed more than 150 police officers, out of a total of slightly more than 20,000, because of suspicions they were involved with organized crime. I have my suspicions that the judicial system is also infiltrated by organized crime.

Yes, organized crime has penetrated certain institutions, but these institutions have not collapsed. We are talking about rotten apples, and we still have the opportunity and the time to get rid of them.

HOW DO YOU EXPLAIN THAT CIVILIAN INSTITUTIONS REMAIN STRONGER IN EL SALVADOR THAN IN GUATEMALA OR MEXICO?

The 1992 peace accords [which ended the civil war] allowed for a sort of re-foundation of the Salvadoran state. Through that process, it was possible to cleanse the army and security forces that were linked to gross violations of human rights. And now we have a professional armed force. If that cleansing of the armed forces had not taken place, we would probably be in the same situation as Guatemala.

ARE CURRENT U.S. POLICIES ON DRUGS AND IMMIGRATION ON THE RIGHT TRACK?

There will be [cartels] as long as there are consumers of drugs.

Furthermore, the only way we can prevent more migrants from coming to the U.S. is by providing jobs, opportunities and development. The same thing applies to narcotics. If the United States is concerned about [illegal] immigration and drug traffic, the best solution is a strategic alliance that together will bring development and job opportunities and social benefits to El Salvador.

AFGHANISTAN-PAKISTAN STUDY GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share with my colleagues the text of a letter I sent today to President Obama, Secretary Gates, Admiral Mullen, and all other parties in the administration charged with executing the war effort. I will enclose in my correspondence to the administration a copy of a letter from a constituent who is a mother of six children, all of whom are currently serving or have served in the U.S. military.

I submit for the RECORD a copy of my original letter to the President as well as a copy of the letter from my constituent.

My letter today to the administration will read, in part, "I implore you to consider my constituent's views—the views of an 'American mother with children glad to serve our country,' and to move swiftly to establish an Afghanistan-Pakistan Study Group, modeled after the Iraq Study Group, to bring

'fresh eyes' to the war effort in Afghanistan."

"The group would be comprised of nationally known and respected individuals who love their country more than their political party and would serve to provide much-needed clarity to a policy that increasingly appears adrift."

"Candidly, after reading yesterday's Washington Post piece adapted from Bob Woodward's *Obama's Wars*, I have serious concerns that the needed clarity about our aim in Afghanistan ever existed within the administration. Woodward writes, 'Even at the end of the process, the President's team wrestled with the most basic questions about the war, then entering its ninth year: What is the mission? What are we trying to do? What will work?'"

"These are sobering questions—but they are questions that must be answered, and the Afghanistan-Pakistan Study Group is just the means to arrive at these answers in a way that honors our men and women in uniform."

"In the halls of Congress or the White House, at Foggy Bottom or the Pentagon, public discussions can at times be detached from the actual lives that are most directly impacted by the decisions being made. This couldn't be further from the case for this mother. She doesn't have that luxury when it comes to the war in Afghanistan. And we mustn't either."

"This is not a matter of politics—or at least it ought not be—for it is always in our national interest to openly assess the challenges before us and to chart a clear course to victory. Frankly, I've been deeply troubled by Woodward's reporting which indicates that discussions of the war strategy were infused with political calculations. An Afghanistan-Pakistan Study Group could help redeem what was clearly a deeply flawed process."

I close with a line from my constituent. She said, "The casualties suffered aren't just numbers to me. Each name, each face, represents a family who is paying the ultimate price—the loss of a son or a daughter, brother or sister, father or mother; a family that will never be the same. Therefore, I wholeheartedly support the formation of an Afghanistan-Pakistan Study Group in the hope that it will help to turn the tide of this war and lessen the number of casualties as well."

I hope the President and his advisers will heed the eloquent words of this military mother who has six children serving and another child is married to a marine. And many have served in both Afghanistan and Iraq.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

August 4, 2010.

Hon. BARACK H. OBAMA,
The President,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On September 14, 2001, following the catastrophic and deliberate terrorist attack on our country, I voted to go to war in Afghanistan. I stand by

that decision and have the utmost confidence in General Petraeus's proven leadership. I also remain unequivocally committed to the success of our mission there and to the more than 100,000 American troops sacrificing toward that end. In fact, it is this commitment which has led me to write to you. While I have been a consistent supporter of the war effort in both Afghanistan and Iraq, I believe that with this support comes a responsibility. This was true during a Republican administration in the midst of the wars, and it remains true today.

In 2005, I returned from my third trip to Iraq where I saw firsthand the deteriorating security situation. I was deeply concerned that Congress was failing to exercise the necessary oversight of the war effort. Against this backdrop I authored the legislation that created the Iraq Study Group (ISG). The ISG was a 10-member bipartisan group of well-respected, nationally known figures who were brought together with the help of four reputable organizations—the U.S. Institute for Peace, the Center for the Study of the Presidency, the Center for Strategic and International Studies, and the Baker Institute for Public Policy at Rice University—and charged with undertaking a comprehensive review of U.S. efforts there. This panel was intended to serve as “fresh eyes on the target”—the target being success in Iraq.

While reticent at first, to their credit President Bush, State Secretary Rice and Defense Secretary Rumsfeld came to support the ISG, ably led by bipartisan co-chairs, former Secretary of State James Baker and former Congressman Lee Hamilton. Two members of your national security team, Secretary of Defense Robert Gates and CIA Director Leon Panetta, saw the merit of the ISG and, in fact, served on the panel. Vice President Biden, too, then serving in the Senate, was supportive and saw it as a means to unite the Congress at a critical time. A number of the ISG's recommendations and ideas were adopted. Retired General Jack Keane, senior military adviser to the ISG, was a lead proponent of “the surge,” and the ISG referenced the possibility on page 73. Aside from the specific policy recommendations of the panel, the ISG helped force a moment of truth in our national conversation about the war effort.

I believe our nation is again facing such a moment in the Afghanistan war effort, and that a similar model is needed. In recent days I have spoken with a number of knowledgeable individuals including former senior diplomats, public policy experts and retired and active military. Many believe our Afghanistan policy is adrift, and all agreed that there is an urgent need for what I call an Afghanistan-Pakistan Study Group (APSG). We must examine our efforts in the region holistically, given Pakistan's strategic significance to our efforts in Afghanistan and the Taliban's presence in that country as well, especially in the border areas.

This likely will not come as a surprise to you as commander in chief. You are well acquainted with the sobering statistics of the past several weeks—notably that July surpassed June as the deadliest month for U.S. troops. There is a palpable shift in the nation's mood and in the halls of Congress. A July 2010 CBS news poll found that 62 percent of Americans say the war is going badly in Afghanistan, up from 49 percent in May. Further, last week, 102 Democrats voted against the war spending bill, which is 70 more than last year; and they were joined by 12 members of my own party. Senator Lindsey Graham, speaking last Sunday on CNN's “State of the Union,” candidly expressed concern about an “unholy alliance” emerging of anti-war Democrats and Republicans.

I have heard it said that Vietnam was not lost in Saigon; rather, it was lost in Wash-

ington. While the Vietnam and Afghanistan parallels are imperfect at best, the shadow of history looms large. Eroding political will has consequences—and in the case of Afghanistan, the stakes could not be higher. A year ago, speaking before the Veterans of Foreign War National Convention, you rightly said, “Those who attacked America on 9/11 are plotting to do so again. If left unchecked, the Taliban insurgency will mean an even larger safe haven from which al Qaeda would plot to kill more Americans. So this is not only a war worth fighting . . . this is fundamental to the defense of our people.” Indeed it is fundamental. We must soberly consider the implications of failure in Afghanistan. Those that we know for certain are chilling—namely an emboldened al-Qaeda, a reconstituted Taliban with an open staging ground for future worldwide attacks, and a destabilized, nuclear-armed Pakistan.

Given these realities and wavering public and political support, I urge you to act immediately, through executive order, to convene an Afghanistan-Pakistan Study Group modeled after the Iraq Study Group. The participation of nationally known and respected individuals is of paramount importance. Among the names that surfaced in my discussions with others, all of whom more than meet the criteria described above, are ISG co-chairs Baker and Hamilton; former Senators Chuck Robb, Bob Kerrey and Sam Nunn; former Congressman Duncan Hunter; former U.S. ambassador Ryan. Crocker; former Secretary of Defense James Schlesinger, and General Keane. These names are simply suggestions among a cadre of capable men and women, as evidenced by the makeup of the ISG, who would be more than up to the task.

I firmly believe that an Afghanistan-Pakistan Study Group could reinvigorate national confidence in how America can be successful and move toward a shared mission in Afghanistan. This is a crucial task. On the Sunday morning news shows this past weekend, it was unsettling to hear conflicting statements from within the leadership of the administration that revealed a lack of clarity about the end game in Afghanistan. How much more so is this true for the rest of the country? An APSG is necessary for precisely that reason. We are nine years into our nation's longest running war and the American people and their elected representatives do not have a clear sense of what we are aiming to achieve, why it is necessary and how far we are from attaining that goal. Further, an APSG could strengthen many of our NATO allies in Afghanistan who are also facing dwindling public support, as evidenced by the recent Dutch troop withdrawal, and would give them a tangible vision to which to commit.

Just as was true at the time of the Iraq Study Group, I believe that Americans of all political viewpoints, liberals and conservatives alike, and varied opinions on the war will embrace this “fresh eyes” approach. Like the previous administration's support of the Iraq Study Group, which involved taking the group's members to Iraq and providing high-level access to policy and decision makers, I urge you to embrace an Afghanistan-Pakistan Study Group. It is always in our national interest to openly assess the challenges before us and to chart a clear course to success.

As you know, the full Congress comes back in session in mid-September—days after Americans around the country will once again pause and remember that horrific morning nine years ago when passenger airlines became weapons, when the skyline of one of America's greatest cities was forever changed, when a symbol of America's military might was left with a gaping hole. The

experts with whom I have spoken in recent days believe that time is of the essence in moving forward with a study panel, and waiting for Congress to reconvene is too long to wait. As such, I am hopeful you will use an executive order and the power of the bully pulpit to convene this group in short order, and explain to the American people why it is both necessary and timely. Should you choose not to take this path, respectfully, I intend to offer an amendment by whatever vehicle necessary to mandate the group's creation at the earliest possible opportunity.

The ISG's report opened with a letter from the co-chairs that read, “There is no magic formula to solve the problems of Iraq. However, there are actions that can be taken to improve the situation and protect American interests.” The same can be said of Afghanistan.

I understand that you are a great admirer of Abraham Lincoln. He, too, governed during a time of war, albeit a war that pitted brother against brother, and father against son. In the midst of that epic struggle, he relied on a cabinet with strong, often times opposing viewpoints. Historians assert this served to develop his thinking on complex matters. Similarly, while total agreement may not emerge from a study group for Afghanistan and Pakistan, I believe that vigorous, thoughtful and principled debate and discussion among some of our nation's greatest minds on these matters will only serve the national interest. The biblical admonition that iron sharpens iron rings true.

Best wishes.

P.S. We as a nation must be successful in Afghanistan. We owe this to our men and women in the military serving in harm's way and to the American people.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WOLF: I have read your proposal for the formation of an Afghanistan/Pakistan Study Group with deep personal interest and approbation. I applaud its respectful, well-reasoned, bipartisan approach to rethinking the war in Afghanistan. The following are my personal thoughts regarding this war. Please accept them as the insights of an average American mother.

It has been troubling to me how distant this war is for so many Americans. Many are only vaguely aware of the events taking place, other than perhaps the recent increase in the number of casualties. Even gathering information of what is daily happening in Afghanistan hasn't been easy. I comb the internet daily searching many different online news sources in an attempt to be informed. Our country is at war and yet so often the top news items contain nothing regarding it. Often it is the local papers in towns with soldiers, sailors and marines serving in Afghanistan that contain the most news. Other times it is the news stations with an embedded reporter who will have a flurry of articles while the reporter is there but then nothing once they return.

The War on Terror is not just impersonal news but it is a war that strikes very close to home. My father has a dear friend whose son-in-law died in the Twin Towers. I have a friend who lost a son in Iraq during the battle for Fallujah. A student of mine lost her fiancée in the war. My children and son-in-law have served in both Iraq and Afghanistan and have buddies injured or killed in action.

One of my daughters is currently serving in Afghanistan in a Combat Support Hospital. She arrived in time to experience first hand the peak number of casualties in June and July. In a recent news interview her Commanding Officer said they are seeing an almost constant stream of casualties; something that none of them were prepared for, but will remember the horrors of the rest of their lives.

It has sometimes appeared that the efforts in Afghanistan have trudged along, with success measured in part by the areas in which we have gained some measure of control versus the price paid in human lives both civilian and military. The casualties suffered aren't just numbers to me; each name, each face, represents a family who is paying the ultimate price, the loss of a son or daughter, brother or sister, father or mother; a family that will never be the same. Therefore, I wholeheartedly support the formation of an Afghanistan/Pakistan Study Group in the hope that it will help to turn the tide of this war and lessen the number of casualties as well.

I, too, have a deep respect and confidence in Gen. Petraeus and would not want my comments to be construed as being critical of the leadership of our military. I have no formal training in political science or history so please accept these comments as simply the perspective of an American mother with children glad to serve our country.

God bless you and give you wisdom as you serve in the leadership of our country.

Sincerely,

P.S. It meant so much to see my sons receive a standing ovation when introduced during last week's luncheon. It is these very Lance Corporals, Corporals and Sergeants who are almost daily listed among the casualties. My son, ——— remarked that listening to your speech "restored his faith in the republic." Thank you again for recognizing their service.

□ 1040

FISCAL SOLUTIONS AND ECONOMIC RECOVERY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, the political parties are missing an opportunity to deal with both the discontent and the fundamental causes we see in the political process today. You don't have to identify with the tea party to be frustrated with the tax system. It is incomprehensible, expensive, unfair, and unsustainable. People of all parties and philosophies understand that the long-term debt of the United States and the fiscal practices that drive it are heading for a train wreck.

The answer is not to ignore real problems, change the subject, or make it worse. A tax discussion should, frankly, address why the system is incomprehensible, the lack of certainty, how it doesn't pay for what America needs, and how we spend through tax breaks about what we collect overall.

There are real problems that we should be zeroing in on, like the alternative minimum tax. It was a millionaire's tax some 40 years ago that now threatens 30 million American families, not the billionaires. They won't pay it at all. It will be the near rich and the middle class. It was a system that was actually made worse the way the Bush tax cuts were structured.

We should deal with the corporate tax. Yes, it is the second highest stated rate in the world, but few companies pay the full amount because of a Swiss

cheese of exemptions and special provisions. It actually penalizes people who manufacture here in the United States.

I would suggest that, if we can borrow trillions of dollars for tax changes, shouldn't the trillions be used to fix the broken system and not to push problems ahead a couple of years?

Instead, the debate is largely about extending \$3.5 trillion in expiring Bush tax cuts or maybe about only extending \$2.8 trillion, not to mention the cost of borrowing that money from the Chinese, the Europeans, or the Japanese. Missing in the debate is how much of that we can afford at all, not just the borrowed money and the deficit, but the lost opportunity to get the tax system right.

Yet it is not just about taxation. We must also look at the expending side of the equation, which is widely acknowledged. Our defense budget can be reduced and redirected. There are hints of this in the Obama administration, but we can do far more. We cannot continue to spend above the rate of inflation, not counting the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, while we spend billions of dollars to protect West Germany from the Soviet Union, neither of which exists anymore.

We lavish agricultural subsidies on the richest agribusiness, but it doesn't help most farmers or ranchers. We can help far more for far less.

There is the bottomless pit in the name of homeland security. Dana Priest's brilliant writing in The Washington Post pointed out: It is out-of-control spending, layer upon layer of activities, that doesn't make us any safer. Perhaps we may be less safe with all the expenditure.

There are some on the other side of the aisle who talk about eliminating health care reform. No. We should actually accelerate the reforms that are in the health care bill so that they won't just save money but will actually improve health care. We can invest in value over volume. We must not ignore why the long-term picture is such a problem and certainly we don't want to make it worse.

Many tea party sympathizers and Jon Stewart fans could agree on this path forward. It would be nice, instead of campaign documents that get people past an election but that don't solve a problem, to work on areas of agreement with the public which start us on a path to fiscal solutions and economic recovery.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 45 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until noon.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR) at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Roy Bennett, Calvary Assembly of God Church, Jefferson City, Missouri, offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, we come to You today, asking Your divine blessing upon this House of Representatives. As they are called upon to make many decisions, we ask for Your divine direction for not only this House, but for our President and all others that are called upon to lead this great Nation.

Lord, help them to remember we are not great because of our vast resources or our manufacturing abilities, but because our forefathers believed when Your word said, "Blessed is the Nation whose God is the Lord." And as they looked to You, Lord, You led them, and Your blessing was upon this great land.

But today, Lord, we need Your divine direction and blessing to be upon this Nation more than ever. And now, Lord, let Your blessings be upon each one of these men and women that are leaders today. This we pray in Jesus' name.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. SKELTON led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3847. An act to implement certain defense trade cooperation treaties, and for other purposes.

WELCOMING REVEREND ROY BENNETT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.