

doing, why they make their decisions and how they make them. Because today they do it in secret, Mr. Speaker. They do it in secret. And, as a matter of fact, even when Members of Congress ask why the decisions were made that were made, we cannot see their minutes, we cannot see their reports, we cannot see the studies of the results of what they obtained. So we are requesting to be able to see into their procedures: transparency, we call that.

We also introduced in the same bill, which happens to be H.R. 3331, a provision that would require them to use American dollars, both in the case of the \$36 billion they already have and in the case of whatever we may appropriate in the future, and that they loan at market interest rates, adjusted for risk.

That is an important factor, because, Mr. Speaker, if you have the opportunity to go out and borrow some money, if you are a lender and you start loaning at 4.7 percent, believe me, you have lots of customers. So we would require that they loan at market rates, and we would also require that they establish an independent advisory board that would report to the public periodically about their activities.

The reason for me taking the floor to explain this tonight, because I have done this before, is that a very prestigious organization in Washington, the Heritage Foundation, will soon release a report, a draft of which I have here. They support the notions and the concepts contained in H.R. 3331.

They say, for example, that with regard to the issue of being able to see what the IMF does, they say, "Demands for greater transparency are a part of nearly every piece of legislation involving the IMF."

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD an article by Brett Schaefer on this subject.

The material referred to is as follows:

HOW CONGRESS SHOULD REFORM THE
INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND
(Brett D. Schaefer)

Recent weeks have seen vigorous debate in Congress over America's participation in and funding of the International Monetary Fund (IMF). Both the Senate and the House of Representatives have passed supplemental appropriations bills containing the \$17.9 billion requested by the Administration for the IMF. Both bills request specific reforms in IMF operations or policy. Unfortunately, either these reforms would have little impact on the current operations of the IMF, or they are completely unenforceable.

Congress should utilize the rare opportunity offered by this legislation to reform the economically harmful activities of the IMF.¹ Short of denying funding for or elimi-

nating the IMF, the best way for Congress to correct its failings would be by enacting legislation like The IMF Transparency and Efficiency Act of 1998 (H.R. 3331), sponsored by Representatives Jim Saxton (R-NJ), Richard K. Arney (R-TX), and Tom Campbell (R-CA). This bill attempts to shine a bright light on the internal workings of the IMF, which have been all too often closed to outside scrutiny. In addition, it would mitigate the market distortion caused by IMF loans. It requires the IMF to charge market interest rates on its loans, and establish an independent review board to examine its policies, practices, and results. Finally, H.R. 3331 contains the most stringent enforcement measures of any current reform proposal.

CURRENT LEGISLATION

The Senate passed a supplemental appropriations bill on March 26, 1998, to grant the Administration's request for \$17.9 billion for the IMF. Negotiations between the Administration and the leadership in the Senate resulted in changes that greatly weakened the reforms demanded by earlier versions of the bill. For example, instead of demanding that the IMF pass a resolution to change its loan policies, a provision approved in the earlier version by the Senate Appropriations Committee, the new agreement only requires the Secretary of the Treasury to certify that the world's seven largest economies—the so-called Group of 7 (G-7) nations—agree to use their influence to push two specific reforms in IMF policies.² These reforms would obligate recipients of IMF assistance to: (1) end government subsidies and directed lending and (2) comply with international trade agreements. This deal removed the provision in the original legislation that would punish the IMF for failing to enact congressionally mandated reforms. Instead of demanding concrete results on reform before granting money to the IMF, the legislation recently passed by the Senate merely requests a nebulous promise from the G-7 countries to pursue reform.

The Appropriations Committee in the House of Representatives passed two supplemental appropriations bills on March 24, 1998. One contains appropriations for both the IMF and the United States' arrears to the United Nations, and the other provides funding for U.S. participation in the Bosnia peacekeeping mission, military expenses in the Middle East, and disaster relief. The reform provisions for the IMF in the House bill are very similar to those originally present in the Senate bill. Specifically, before the funds appropriated in the bill could be dispersed, transferred, or made available to the IMF, the Secretary of the Treasury must certify that the IMF Board of Executive Directors had passed a resolution requiring every user of IMF resources to: (1) comply with all international trade agreements and obligations to which the borrower is a party; (2) eliminate government directed lending or subsidies; and (3) guarantee that countries would not discriminate between domestic and foreign creditors or debtors when resolving debt problems.

In addition, the House bill includes three directives that (1) the Treasury report on advances in financial transparency, application of internationally accepted accounting practices, elimination of subsidies, and improv-

ing the effect of IMF assistance on worker's rights; (2) the President ensure that no U.S. resources are "made available, directly or indirectly, to promote unfair competition against the American semi-conductor industry"; and (3) the IMF member countries establish an advisory commission on the international financial system.

Although the House bill is stricter than the Senate legislation, it remains far from ideal. Both would give the IMF \$17.9 billion—the entire Administration request—with ineffective or unenforceable conditions, and would result in little change in how the IMF does business, which is the root of the problem.

THE IMF TRANSPARENCY AND EFFICIENCY ACT OF 1998

As a lender of last resort, the IMF disrupts the global market. Worse, the secretive nature of the IMF prevents any accurate evaluation of the extent of this disruption. The problem, therefore, is not that the IMF lacks sufficient funds, but that its distribution of subsidized loans and its secretive nature reward poor governance, encourage excessive risk-taking by investors, and conceal information necessary to counter these effects. The best way to avoid these outcomes would be to shun these kinds of subsidized loans altogether. Short of eliminating the IMF, which would be the ideal solution, Congress can focus on mitigating the more harmful consequences of IMF lending.

The best vehicle for achieving this goal is The IMF Transparency and Efficiency Act of 1998 (H.R. 3331), sponsored by Representative Jim Saxton (R-NJ), Richard K. Arney (R-TX), and Tom Campbell (R-CA). H.R. 3331 demands that the Executive Directors of the IMF initiate specific reforms:

Increase transparency. Demands for greater transparency are a part of nearly every piece of legislation involving IMF reform. Despite Congress's appropriation of \$17.9 billion in American taxpayer dollars to the IMF, the organization refuses to grant Congress or the American public timely access to the minutes of its board meetings, its loan agreements, and its performance evaluations.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I was on official travel with the President of the United States last week, and I missed a number of votes.

Had I been present, I would have voted no on rollcall numbers 80, 78, 76, 75, 74, 73, and 69. I would have voted yes on rollcall numbers 79, 77, 72, 71, 70, and 68.

A HISTORICAL HEALER: MARY JANE LAWSON BROWN

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

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a historical healer, Mary Jane Lawson Brown, who has been considered to be one of the most important figures in the history of health care in Palatka, Florida.

Born in 1882, Mary Jane Lawson was an incredible person by any measure, let alone an historic and extraordinary woman. In 1915, Mary Jane Lawson enrolled in training school for embalming, one of the only two women at the

¹For detailed criticism of the IMF and the detrimental effects of its policies on developing countries and the global economy see: Bryan T. Johnson and Brett D. Schaefer, "Congress Should Give No More Funds to the IMF," Heritage Foundation Backgrounder No. 1157, February 12, 1998; "No New Funding for the IMF," Heritage Foundation Backgrounder Update No. 287, September 23, 1997; and "The International Monetary Fund: Outdated, Ineffective, and Unnecessary," Heritage Foundation Backgrounder No. 1113, May 6, 1997; Bryan T. Johnson, and John Sweeney, "Down the Drain: Why the

IMF Bailout in Asia is Wasteful and Won't Work," Heritage Foundation Backgrounder No. 1150, December 5, 1997.

²The G-7 includes Canada, France, German, Italy, Japan, the United Kingdom, and the United States. It meets periodically to coordinate economic policies, discuss treaties or agreements, and issue policy statements. The G-7 are the seven largest contributors to the IMF and control 44.82 percent of its votes, according to the 1997 IMF Annual Report.

school. Completing her courses of study in the same year, she became the first African American licensed to perform funerals in the State of Florida.

In 1918, she opened the Mary Lawson Sanatorium. At first, the sanatorium cared for the African American residents of the Palatka area. However, by 1922, the sanatorium was caring for people of all races in a community desperately short of health care facilities.

The 35-bed Mary Lawson Sanatorium, later to be renamed the Mary Lawson Hospital during the 1930s, housed x-ray equipment, a laboratory, and surgical facilities. For a long period in Putnam County history, the Mary Lawson Hospital was the only location in the county equipped for physicians to perform surgery.

As the owner and administrator of the primary health care center in Putnam County throughout the Roaring Twenties, the Great Depression, World War II, and the 1950s, Mary Jane Lawson has been regarded as a blessing to Palatka.

In 1925, Mary Jane Lawson and her close friend, Mary McLeod Bethune, started the first chapter of the Advancement of Colored Women, which continues to be a large national organization today. Mary McLeod Bethune founded the Bethune Cookman College in Daytona Beach, Florida, and lived in Palatka during the 1920s.

During this time period, Mary Jane Lawson provided assistance on several efforts to attain funding for the college that Cookman had started. This was yet another way Ms. Lawson gave back to the community.

Mary Jane Lawson lived to be 79 years of age. The efforts of Ms. Lawson extended to her granddaughter, Mary Lawson Brown. Ms. Brown and her son, Theodore Brown II, are both licensed funeral directors who live and own the Lawson & Son Funeral Home; and it has remained one of the largest and oldest businesses in the Palatka community.

As we celebrate Women's History Month, I ask that my colleagues join me as I applaud this historical healer who shares her talents among the residents of the great State of Florida.

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington, Mrs LINDA SMITH is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington 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 Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

PARENTS' TRUE PRIORITY: TIME WITH THEIR CHILDREN

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, as I was driving to the airport last Friday, I heard on the CBS News part of a statement by the national head of the YMCA. He said, because of all the broken homes and other factors, children are being deprived of time, love, and attention like never before in our history. He was speaking out because of the horrendous tragedy in Arkansas.

Then I switched stations and heard Dr. Laura Schlesinger, the radio psychologist, read something written by a third grader about his heroes, his parents. He emphasized, and Dr. Laura emphasized by reading it twice and stressing the word, "time."

Then in Sunday's Knoxville News Sentinel was an article by Mike Barnicle of the Boston Globe. The headline said, "How much time do we really spend with our children?"

Mr. Barnicle wrote, "It's not the guns. It's not TV. It's not movies featuring enormous amounts of gratuitous violence." He said,

"We can indulge ourselves in all of the semantic or psychological contortions available. We can assemble commissions, tie yellow ribbons around trees, shed tears, utter prayers, listen to speeches, read editorials, and we are still left with the apparent stone-cold fact that these multiple homicides were committed allegedly by two boys. One is 11, the other 13."

Mike Barnicle continued by pointing out that,

"Today we communicate by e-mail, cell phones, laptops, the Internet, websites, and home pages. Yet we don't know what a 13-year-old is doing in his spare time."

He ended his article in this way:

Accountability rarely makes its way to the conversation table because so many parents are busy, too preoccupied with the moment to realize that the true priority—the most difficult task, as well as their greatest achievement, potentially—is staring them in the face with a . . . look that says, "Talk to me, man."

For 7½ years before I came to Congress, I was a criminal court judge trying primarily the felony cases. The first day I was Judge, I was told that 98 percent of the defendants in felony cases came from broken homes.

I went through thousands of cases and read over and over again, "Defend-

ant's father left home when defendant was 2 and never returned. Defendant's father left home to get a pack of cigarettes and never came back."

Then 3 or 4 years ago, I read an article about two leading criminologists who had studied 11,000 felony cases from around the country; and they said, the biggest single factor in serious crime, nothing else was even close, was father-absent households. Then I read that the 13-year-old boy in Arkansas, probably the leader, was the son of parents who divorced when he was 9; and his father lives in Minnesota.

I know there are exceptions to every rule. I know that many wonderful people come from broken homes. I know there are hundreds of thousands of single mothers who are doing miraculous, even heroic, jobs raising their children. I also know that divorce hurts children; and many of them are hurt deeply, far worse than we realize, and scarred for life.

So many fathers are slowly going out of the lives of their children. This hurts both boys and girls, but girls, who so often stay with their mothers, seem to be able to handle it better. We have a very serious epidemic in this Nation of small boys growing up without a good male role model. I know sometimes divorce is inevitable. It is the only choice. But I also believe that one of the greatest blessings you can give any child is two loving parents.

Government cannot solve this problem alone. We need more men who will get active with the Boy Scouts and Sunday school and organizations that work with young boys, but government can help. We need school systems which will make a greater effort to hire male teachers at the elementary level. A very small percentage of elementary teachers are male right now.

But the biggest way government could help, Mr. Speaker, is by lowering its budget and increasing the family's budget. The biggest factor in most divorces is strong, even bitter disagreements over money.

In 1950, the Federal, State and local governments took about 3 or 4 percent each from the average family. Today, the government at all levels takes almost 40 percent in taxes and another 10 percent in government regulatory costs. One spouse has to work to support the government while the other works to support the family. If the government at all levels took less from the average family, there would be far fewer families that would split up due to the millions of arguments over family finances.

There is nothing we can do to end all divorce or end all crime, but if we could greatly downsize government and decrease its cost, we would greatly strengthen the family. If we could substantially decrease the government's budget, we could increase the family's budget. Many more families would stay together; and parents, whether single or married, could do far more for their children. It is no accident that when