

most important reason in the following words: "Indeed, the pattern since Mikhail Gorbachev's time is unmistakable: reform talk followed by loans to underwrite reforms, followed by a collapse of the reform plans, followed by debt restructuring, more talk of reforms, more loans and so on. When lack of reforms is remunerated with new loans and debt write-offs, when the worst abusers of the current system live nicely off the spoils of what is effectively thievery . . . one starts having doubts about the message we get from the democracies of the West."

Mr. Speaker, I strongly recommend this important article to those of our colleagues who are seeking to better understand just what has gone wrong in our policy toward Russia over the past decade. I submit the full text of Fedorov article be inserted at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Wall Street Journal Europe, June 8, 2000]

NO MORE "HELP" FOR RUSSIA, PLEASE

(By Boris Fedorov, former Finance Minister of Russia)

For the last 10 years, the debate about Western assistance to Russia has revolved, superficially, around the question "to give or not to give." Despite all evidence to the contrary, the answer is always "to give" because this is seen as helping Russia. Thus for a decade, Russia is regularly dispensed a drug which never cures but keeps the patient in a vegetative state. And the drug habit is growing.

Who are the quacks? The list of names is familiar. The Clinton Treasury, the G-7, Michel Camdessus' IMF. Just days ago in Moscow, President Clinton reiterated his support for new loans to Russia. And U.S. Vice President Al Gore claims that Russia is a foreign policy victory. Why? Apparently because the current Russian government has released the country's umpteenth economic plan, which is considered to be "good." Other people are naturally well-intended. Still others think that it is worth a billion per year to keep Russia quiet in military terms.

But the results are dismal. More Russians are anti-Western today than a decade ago. Russia is economically weaker than 10 years ago after all the IMF-sponsored reforms. We have more corruption and poverty than under communism, and too many citizens want to return to a time they see as having offered them a better life. The questions are, what have loans done for Russia and does the country really need new loans now?

The roughly \$20 billion pumped into the Russian budget over the last decade have, in fact, had no positive effect whatsoever. This is not surprising, given the black-hole nature of the Russian budget. Money, being fungible, was misspent and ended up in the hands of a few well-connected people and in Western banks. Russian citizens definitely did not benefit from this "assistance," judging by the pitiful state of healthcare, education, public security, roads and nearly every other public sector sphere.

TRADE SURPLUS

A country rich in natural resources with a trade surplus of \$4 to \$5 billion a month (not counting capital flight of similar proportions) does not really need IMF money. I've heard some argue that the loans to Russia were so small to have made much of a difference in any case. The IMF, they claim, may have acted cravenly in seeking to cover its own exposed positions by throwing good

money after bad, but the loans were at worst wasteful, not harmful. They are wrong.

This view misses the corrosive impact that an IMF imprimatur had on government officials, the formulation of their economic plan and on international credit markets, which figured the IMF would assume a lender-of-last-resort function—in other words, the moral hazard that was created. An economic system in which corporate assets are routinely stolen, investors ripped off and the creditors deceived has been built with the help of Mr. Clinton and the IMF. This is a system that no Western politician would dare to advocate for his own country. Why do you impose it on us by underwriting it with your taxpayers' money?

We hear often these days about the booming Russian economy, cited as evidence of the success of Western policies toward Russia. The Clinton administration and IMF speak glowingly about how a new, democratically elected president has adopted an economic program that is much more liberal than its predecessors, and thus deserves more support. The new Russian government, however, is operating under a false sense of security, which is very much encouraged by the favorable remarks of Mr. Clinton and other Western leaders.

On closer examination, however, the new optimism about the economy is no more firmly grounded than it has been in the past. Economic growth is still behind pre-reform levels, and in large measure is due to higher commodity prices rather than an increase of investment and value added in the economy. Higher tax revenues are also cited as a sign that wealth is expanding. But revenues are actually lower in dollar terms. The government also cites better budget discipline, but this too is illusory, since much of the drastically depreciated expenditure was not indexed. There are more U.S. dollars under the mattresses of our citizens than the overall ruble money supply of Russia.

Is the Russian economy really reformed? Is productivity higher and corruption lower? Are structural reforms in progress? Does anybody believe that a country with an annual federal budget of \$25 billion (less than America spends on its prisons) can really maintain a superpower-size army and bureaucracy?

The false sense of achievement and the new prosperity comes largely from the effects of the 1998 ruble devaluation combined with a high oil price. It has very little to do with economic reform. And still Mr. Clinton is in a hurry to say that America will support IMF loans to Russia because the economic plan of the current government merits that support.

I am not saying that the Putin government's pronouncements on economic policy are bad. In fact, I am encouraged by much of what I hear. But I remember too well how past economic programs also featured liberal and enlightened reform plans that were later shelved in favor of the status quo.

SWEPT UNDER THE CARPET

Indeed, the pattern since Mikhail Gorbachev's time is unmistakable; reform talk followed by loans to underwrite reforms, followed by a collapse of the reform plans, followed by debt restructuring, more talk of reforms, more loans and so on. When lack of reforms is remunerated with new loans and debt write-offs, when the worst abusers of the current system live nicely off the spoils of what is effectively thievery—if not in legal terms since Russian law is inadequate—one starts having doubts about the message we get from the democracies of the

West. Why reform anything in Russia if another IMF loan shipment is on the way and past scandals can be swept under the carpet?

I personally think that Mr. Putin should be given the benefit of the doubt. He cannot be blamed for past failures. Many of the ideas he has voiced have much in them. But only he can really change the course of events, and so far meaningful actions have been few. We do not know the full economic plan of the government. The jury is still out.

Rather than repeat the mistakes of the past, my recommendations for the West are simple. First, do not grant Russia concessions, but rather apply the rules as you would to any country. Western capital should flow to the private sector, not to the government. Only this will help to change the country, create jobs and increase efficiency. Second, money should be spent where it brings genuine return and where it will generate the kind of good-will that makes reform and democracy self-sustaining.

I imagine what might have been if that \$20 billion in IMF money been spent on providing full time education for 200,000 Russian students in the West. My guess is that we would be living in a different country today.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE  
JOSEPH H. RODRIGUEZ

HON. ROBERT E. ANDREWS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 2000

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following proclamation for the RECORD.

CONGRESSIONAL COMMENTATION

HON. ROBERT E. ANDREWS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, FIRST DISTRICT, NEW JERSEY

Whereas, The Rutgers University School of Law-Camden, New Jersey and the First Congressional District of New Jersey commend and honor the Honorable Joseph H. Rodriguez for 15 years of distinguished service on the federal bench; and Whereas, United States District Court Judge Joseph H. Rodriguez embarked on his distinguished legal career immediately after graduating from Rutgers University School of Law where he was admitted to practice law and became a member of the bar of the State of New Jersey; and Whereas, in 1985, the President of the United States of America, President Ronald Reagan, nominated Judge Rodriguez to the federal bench in Camden, New Jersey where he has continued to establish a standard of excellence in the legal profession; and Whereas, over his distinguished legal career, Judge Rodriguez has received numerous awards recognizing him for his accomplishments which include his induction into the Rutgers University Hall of Distinguished Alumni in 1996; and Whereas, this Member of the 106th Congress recognizes Judge Rodriguez for his outstanding contributions to the legal profession where everyday of his legal career he has continued to render legal decisions fairly and upheld the law always in the interest of justice; and Whereas, Judge Rodriguez's exceptional achievements and constant efforts to create a positive difference throughout our communities serves as an inspiration for the legal profession and for the citizens of the United States of America.

Now therefore, Be it Known that the undersigned Member of the United States Congress, the Honorable Robert E. Andrews of

the First Congressional District of New Jersey hereby commends and congratulates United States District Court Judge Joseph H. Rodriguez as he is recognized as the "Gentleman Judge" by Rutgers University School of Law for his outstanding accomplishments, and in honor of his legal achievements, hereby officially proclaims today, Wednesday, June 7, 2000 to be the Honorable Joseph H. Rodriguez Day throughout the First Congressional District of New Jersey.

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

SPEECH OF

**HON. MARGE ROUKEMA**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 10, 2000*

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4461) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes:

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would have eliminated funding for a proposed pilot program for non-needs based school breakfast pilot program.

Mr. Speaker, I am a strong supporter of child nutrition programs for needy families. There is undeniable proof that kids who start the day with a good breakfast learn the best. My record shows that I have supported school breakfast and school lunch, not to mention WIC. We must make sure that all appropriate and necessary funds are given to these important programs to help the nutritional needs of needy children and families.

Part of being a fiscal conservative is setting priority for important programs. School breakfast programs for needy children must remain a high priority.

CONGRATULATING MAJOR LEAGUE BASEBALL YEAR 2000 ALL-STAR GAME

**HON. CARLOS A. ROMERO-BARCELÓ**

OF PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, July 11, 2000*

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to congratulate the participants in tonight's Major League Baseball All-Star game. Each summer, the fans of our nation's pastime look forward to this game, which brings together the brightest stars of the sport. True to the American spirit, the starting line-ups for the game are selected by the millions of fans who follow the sport and take the time to choose the most deserving players to start at each position.

I want to note with special pride that seven of the players participating in tonight's game are Puerto Ricans. These players are Roberto

Alomar of the Cleveland Indians, Carlos Delgado of the Toronto Blue Jays, Edgar Martinez of the Seattle Mariners, Jorge Posada and Bernie Williams of the New York Yankees, Jose Vidro of the Montreal Expos, and Ivan Rodriguez of the Texas Rangers, who was the leading vote recipient in the All Star balloting. I know I speak for all the U.S. citizens of Puerto Rico in expressing our great pride in the accomplishments of these players. That our island of 3.8 million people could produce such a large proportion of the players on the All-Star teams shows how strongly Puerto Ricans have embraced our national pastime.

In the spirit of the All Star game, I would be remiss if I did not take a moment to mention Roberto Clemente, the greatest of all the Puerto Rican All-Stars. Mr. Clemente is one of 20 legendary baseball players being honored in a new series of commemorative postage stamps, which were officially dedicated last week in conjunction with All Star Week.

Mr. Clemente is known in baseball circles as the first Hispanic-American selected to the Hall of Fame. But he will be remembered as much for his great humanitarian spirit as he is for his considerable baseball skills. Many of us will never forget that tragic day 28 years ago when Mr. Clemente lost his life in a plane accident while he was participating in a mission to aid victims of a devastating earthquake in Nicaragua.

Mr. Clemente's legacy has influenced an entire generation of baseball players in Puerto Rico, just as future generations of players will be inspired by the All-Stars participating in tonight's game.

Congratulations to all the players in the 2000 All-Star Game.

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

SPEECH OF

**HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 10, 2000*

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4461) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes:

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise today against this amendment which will prohibit the FDA from testing, developing, or approving any drug that could cause an abortion.

I often come to the House floor to note that this would be the 147th vote on choice since the beginning of the 104th Congress. But this vote is about so much more than abortion. It is truly a chilling attack on biomedical research.

We are legislators, we are not scientists. Political mandates have no place in interfering

with the FDA's sound and rigorous scientific drug approval process.

Approval of this amendment would be the beginning of a slippery slope where some Members of Congress hold the health of all Americans hostage. Allowing Congress to dictate which drugs the FDA can and cannot test could halt the process of testing drugs that have nothing to do with abortion.

The target of this amendment, mifepristone or RU-486, has potential uses for the treatment of breast cancer, endometriosis, and even glaucoma. In fact, this kind of drug—an antiprogesterin—was originally being developed for its cancer treatment potential.

I tell you, if RU-486 was only a cancer treatment, this researcher would have won a Nobel prize, and I bet the drug would already have been approved. Instead, because of its pregnancy disruption use, the drug has been held hostage by the right wing.

If this amendment passes, it would prevent further testing of drugs such as mifepristone that have the potential to treat millions of Americans for other medical conditions.

Delaying this drug is not an option. Think of what this will do to women with fibroid tumors. Think of what this will do to seniors with glaucoma. Think of what this will do to people with brain tumors.

And even worse, there is a very dangerous precedent being set today. Even those who disagree about whether RU-486 should or should not be approved, should be highly concerned by the precedent being set by this outrageous amendment.

Congress established the Food and Drug Administration to be an independent agency to test and approve drugs and devices. We should allow them to do their work without interference from the Congress. Science, not abortion politics, should dictate the type of drugs the FDA tests.

I strongly urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

SPEECH OF

**HON. DAN MILLER**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 29, 1999*

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4461) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes:

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I was prepared to offer four amendments to this agriculture appropriations bill to highlight the absurdity of the US sugar program.

On Thursday, this Congress debated an amendment that would have limited the fleecing of taxpayers by the sugar program to \$54 million. However, a point of order technically prevented a vote on that matter.