

the government decides who lives, who dies.

The government does not have the moral right to make those decisions. Not one of the politicians who want to force America into a government-run health care boondoggle is going to be denied treatment or medicine. Not one of them. Like the book "Animal Farm", which had the philosophy all are equal, but some are just more equal than others. That's not what America is all about. It's the age-old struggle of freedom over tyranny.

When government bureaucrat gatekeepers have control over who lives and who dies in America, freedom is the first casualty. Just ask the elderly and the babies of Canada and England.

And that's just the way it is.

#### WE MUST DO MORE TO HELP THE IRAQI REFUGEES

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, after more than 6 years of foreign occupation, occupation that never should have happened in the first place, American combat troops have been withdrawn from Iraqi cities. This has led some people to believe that the conflict is over. But our troops remain in danger so long as they continue to stay in Iraq. And the suffering of the Iraqi people, especially the refugees, hasn't ended either.

A report issued last month by the International Rescue Committee described the bleak lives of the Iraqi refugees who have come to the United States to escape the violence in their home country. We admitted over 13,800 Iraqi refugees in the year 2008. Many of them had to come here because they worked for the United States military or the United States Government in Iraq and they became targets for retaliation as a result.

A large number of the refugees are war widows with young children. They are grieving over the loss of their loved ones, and many are suffering war-related emotional distress or injuries. While the refugees are grateful to be in America, most are frustrated and even in despair. The International Rescue Committee says, A flawed U.S. refugee admissions program is resettling Iraqi refugees into poverty rather than helping them rebuild their lives.

□ 1930

The committee says that the Federal program designed to help the refugees doesn't meet their basic needs. The resettlement program is badly underfunded and newly arriving refugees get a mere pittance. The United States State Department provides \$900 to each refugee. The refugees are also eligible for State assistance, which varies from State to State, but which averages about \$575 a month.

In addition, the refugees are eligible for Medicaid or a Federal medical as-

sistance program, but the program runs out after 8 months. With this tiny amount of assistance, the refugees are supposed to pay rent, utilities, food, clothes, transportation and all the other expenses of daily life.

Put yourself in their shoes. If you were a refugee, already suffering from trauma and injury, could you and your family make it in a country that is as high cost as the United States of America with so little help?

The refugees are searching for jobs to help pay the bills, but we know how hard that is. And in Atlanta, for example, only 25 percent of the Iraqi refugees have been able to find jobs when they were here for over 6 months. Resettlement agencies, which received State Department funding, are struggling to do as much as they can, and they are providing a number of very important services, but their resources are dwindling because of the recession.

As a result of all these problems, Madam Speaker, many of the refugees are destitute and facing eviction from their homes. Some are wondering if they should have stayed in Iraq, even though their lives would have been in danger.

Madam Speaker, the Iraqi refugee in our country deserves better. The International Rescue Committee has called for an increase in Federal assistance to help alleviate the situation. We must support them by doing more.

We had a hand in their upheaval. Now we must give them a hand in their new country. We have a moral obligation to act.

#### MADOFF VICTIMS ARE VICTIMIZED AGAIN, THIS TIME BY OUR OWN GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, my remarks are entitled "Madoff Victims Are Victimized Again, this Time by Our Own Government." Americans rely on the Security and Exchange Commission, the SEC, to safeguard their stock transactions through registered broker dealers.

The SEC, however, did not do that in the case of Bernard Madoff. Irrespective of his receiving 150 years in prison for life-damaging financial crimes, many Americans who lost their life savings, who were first victimized as a result of the SEC failures, are being today victimized a second time by our own judicial system and its court-appointed trustee.

The victims' plight is compelling. Think about this, Madam Speaker, irrespective of numerous warnings the SEC received dating back 17 years, all of our Federal agencies stood by and did nothing while thousands of investors deposited their money, usually their life savings, with Bernard L. Madoff Investment Securities.

In fact, after a supposed investigation in 1992, the SEC issued a clear-cut

and definitive Statement of Innocence about Madoff's business. This was an unusual occurrence. Indeed, it may be the only time in history that the SEC went as far as issuing a Statement of Innocence to clear a business that it was investigating.

Then, starting in 2002, the SEC continued to ignore seven individual and specific fraud warnings by a credible, financial whistleblower. Again, in 2004, in another government failure, the IRS approved Madoff to be one of only 260 nonbank IRA custodians, the very place that people put their retirement money for safekeeping. Why would the IRS have approved Madoff when it had the legal right and, indeed, the fiduciary obligation to inspect the books and the records of all nonbank IRA custodians?

The approval process, which the IRS shirked, was specifically designed to prevent this exact type of fraud. As Madoff's downfall exposed, both the IRS and the SEC failed to inspect Madoff in even the most basic fundamental fashion. Unfortunately, two different U.S. Government agencies both seemed to have given their approval for Americans to invest with Madoff. They indicated that he had a financial clean bill of health.

Now that Madoff's scheme has imploded, the government seeks to convey the appearance of serving justice on behalf of those who were duped.

Through the Federal Bankruptcy Court, the government has hired a private sector attorney to act as a Madoff bankruptcy trustee and will pay the trustee a fee based on his hours extended to claw back money. Well, this is not what it appears to be. Justice is not being served.

While it is true that the trustee cannot ask for a specific percentage of the total clawed back, he can ask for any specific amount he desires, and it can be based on his own internal computation using a percentage.

Since the trustee won't have enough manpower to sue thousands of people at the same time, he will also hire associate firms to assist in this litigation. All the fees charged by the law firms who are handling this case will first be paid, and then the trustee will receive his fee.

The government should, instead, offer tax or financial relief to those who were victimized, not under an arcane net equity basis, but based on their statements as of November 30, 2008. The IRS should compute tax refunds so as to return 100 percent of each individual's first loss of \$2 million; then 90 percent of their loss between \$2 and \$4 million; 80 percent of their loss dollars between \$4 and \$6 million, and so forth, until a 20 percent return level has been reached, and at that point return should remain at 20 percent.

This would be most beneficial to smaller investors, who are most impacted by their losses.

If private citizens are required to reimburse other private citizens for harm

they caused, why should the government be able to drastically injure people and have no responsibility to restore those individuals' positions or pay restitution to them?

The SIPC, or the quasi-governmental body that offers insurance to those defrauded by the SEC, also stands to gain greatly by not paying the insurance. Even to the casual observer, this is a potential conflict of interest. A mistake has been made, and it must be corrected.

Their computation of net equity for purposes of insurance and clawback for Madoff victims is quite different than the formulas they have used each and every time in the past for other cases which were similar in nature. Since when did rules, regulations, and laws become changeable based on circumstances that would save the insurer the most money and allow the trustee to go after the largest clawbacks? To even the casual observer, there is a conflict of interest.

The President says that it's time to take responsibility and admit when a mistake has been made. "A mistake has been made."

---

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2997, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2010

Mr. MCGOVERN, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111-191) on the resolution (H. Res. 609) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2997) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

---

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2965, ENHANCING SMALL BUSINESS RESEARCH AND INNOVATION ACT OF 2009

Mr. MCGOVERN, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111-192) on the resolution (H. Res. 610) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2965) to amend the Small Business Act with respect to the Small Business Innovation Research Program and the Small Business Technology Transfer Program, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

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

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

REMEMBERING ROBERT McNAMARA

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Robert McNamara once said, "You can correct a wrong only if you understand how it occurred and you take steps to make sure it won't happen again."

Today, as we mark the passing of the late Secretary, I think it's time to apply the lessons he learned in Vietnam to our own times. He said, "We are not omniscient. If we cannot persuade other nations with similar interests and similar values of the merits of the proposed use of that power, we should not proceed unilaterally."

We had to learn that lesson again in Iraq.

He also said, "Our judgments of friend and foe, alike, reflected our profound ignorance of the history, culture, and politics of the people in the area, and the personalities and habits of their leaders."

That's another lesson we learned again in Iraq.

Secretary McNamara's Vietnam regrets also extended to the homefront. He confessed that "We failed to draw Congress and the American people into a full and frank discussion and debate of the pros and cons of a large-scale military involvement before we initiated the action."

Unfortunately, we did the same thing with Iraq.

Instead of being straight with the American people, we spent years reducing the debate to a false choice between "stay the course" and "cut and run." Today, as in McNamara's time, we face the consequences of our silence.

McNamara also recognized that we did not learn from his initial mistake. We stuck to the same tired plan of action, even if it had minimal relevance to the situation on the ground.

"After the action got underway," McNamara said, "and unanticipated events forced us off our planned course, we did not fully explain what was happening and why we were doing what we did."

We have learned that same lesson again in Iraq and too often find ourselves bogged down by unattainable goals and unable to explain why we are there and what we plan to do about it. Unfortunately, we have had to learn many of the same lessons twice.

In the early years of the Vietnam war, just as in the early years of the Afghanistan and Iraqi wars, you could state with confidence that our military was the most powerful in the world. But military strength does not always translate into victory on the ground.

Secretary McNamara had learned a terrible lesson, that fighting a war without committed allies, without planning, without public discussion and against an enemy force defending its home territory, is not a winning proposition.

In fact, in 1962, McNamara said, "Every quantitative measurement we have shows we're winning this war."

But Vietnam wasn't ultimately about quantitative measures. It wasn't enough to burn out its jungles with napalm or blockade its ports with gunships. The bigger issue was strategy, planning and foresight. We didn't know why we were fighting in the first place nor what we are fighting to achieve in the long run.

We had no perspective from which to evaluate our progress and reevaluate our goals. All we had were empty measures of troops, bombs and jets. The lesson of Vietnam has had to be learned and relearned too many times.

Secretary McNamara finally admitted in 1995, "We were in the wrong place with the wrong tactics."

At this time of his passing, we should take a moment to reflect on his legacy and take steps to ensure the wrongs of Vietnam don't happen again. The key lesson from Secretary McNamara is that we do that we do not live in a simple world with simple solutions. Military force is only one piece of the puzzle. Success depends on many variables.

McNamara saw this complexity in Vietnam. "We failed to recognize that in international affairs, as in other aspects of life, there may be problems for which there are no immediate solutions. At times we may have to live with an imperfect, untidy world."

That same complexity exists in the present conflicts in Afghanistan and Iraq. We need an open and frank discussion of our goals as well as how we plan to achieve them. The American people deserve to know if we are in the wrong place with the wrong tactics. Let's not sacrifice another generation to a war we think we are winning on paper.

---

HONORING JOHN W. FISHER

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

Mr. PENCE. Madam Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart to pay tribute to a friend and to the memory of a great man who will long be remembered across the State of Indiana as a civic leader and a philanthropist whose impact will be felt for generations.

For decades, John W. Fisher has been a leader in the business community of eastern Indiana. Remembered by many as a giant of industry, John will be greatly missed, not only by his family and friends, but all those whose lives he touched.

A native of Walland, Tennessee, John was known for his athleticism, an all-American. He graduated a Volunteer from the University of Tennessee in 1938, but it was his connection to the Ball family that brought him to Muncie, Indiana.

Married to his beloved Janice, John did not plan to live in Muncie; rather, he had always thought he would eventually settle in his native Tennessee.