

time Executive Director of the Washington Office of the Polish American Congress.

For nearly 20 years Myra was a respected and tireless advocate of the ties that bind the United States and Poland. During the 1980s, when Poland's Solidarity movement struggled under martial law, Myra generated great support for the movement by soliciting humanitarian support to Poland.

She coordinated the "Solidarity Express"—a train of some 22 railroad cars loaded with relief goods. At her suggestion, on the first-year anniversary of Solidarity, a Solidarity Convoy produced thirty-two container trucks bearing relief cargo.

Myra's initiatives contributed literally millions of dollars of humanitarian support to the Polish people during that difficult decade, but more recently, Myra played a pivotal role in the effort to transform the Polish-American relationship from one of partnership to that of allies. One cannot overestimate the energy and momentum she and her husband, Casimir, brought to the effort to bring Poland into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. For her efforts, Myra and her husband were both honored by the Polish Government with the Commanders' Cross.

This year, Poland and the United States will, together, launch the Polish American Freedom Foundation. Myra's invaluable counsel and political judgment ensured that this initiative successfully navigated the difficult path of transforming a grand concept into a real foundation that will on a daily basis reaffirm the commitment of the United States and Poland to democracy and freedom.

So, we are deeply saddened by Myra's passing and we use this occasion to express to her husband, Casimir Leonard, and to the other members of her family, how much we will miss her. Our memory of Myra will be a lady of tireless energy and warmth who brought to Washington a genuine devotion to the ties binding Poland and America.

REUNITING AMERICAN CHILDREN AND THEIR PARENTS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, throughout the dispute over Elian Gonzalez, I have argued that he should be reunited with his father Juan Miguel. I have made this argument because I believe that children belong with their parents, barring evidence of unfitness. I also made this argument because I was concerned about how American parents are being treated internationally.

At the Judiciary Committee hearing held on the Elian Gonzalez case on March 1, I also urged that we consider the potential impact of that case on those of U.S. parents fighting to gain custody of their children in other countries. In fact, at that hearing I made sure to invite a U.S. parent who has struggled for years just for the right to

see his children in Japan, and who believes, as do other American parents in similar circumstances, that to preserve American credibility we must practice what we preach and reunite Elian Gonzalez and his father.

I worked for months on such a case of an American child who was taken abroad by an estranged parent. Had it not been for the active intervention of the Government of Egypt, the child would not have been reunited with his American mother. Reuniting Elian and his father was the best thing for Elian and also the best way to advance American interests—and the interests of American parents whose children have been taken abroad without their consent.

At the March 1 hearing, I quoted Mary Ryan, the Assistant Secretary of State for Consular Affairs, who had testified in the federal court case regarding Elian Gonzalez that a failure to enforce the INS' decision that Elian Gonzalez should be reunited with his father would "be inconsistent with the principles we advocate on behalf of the United States and could have potentially lasting negative implications for left-behind parents in the United States and for U.S. citizen children taken to foreign countries."

I believe that the American government should stand behind that principle and seek to bring children and their parents back together. I am proud that the government has reunited Elian and his father, and I think the pictures of the two of them together have proven beyond a doubt that this was the right result.

But I am deeply concerned that the energy and effectiveness that our government showed in reuniting Elian and his father does not always seem to apply to its attempts to reunite American children and their parents. Indeed, recent articles in the Washington Post indicate that our State Department should take a far more active role in helping American parents who—in violation of international law—are being deprived of custody of their children.

The Washington Post tells the story of Joseph Cooke, a New York man whose then-wife took their two young children to Germany and, without Mr. Cooke's consent, turned the children over to the state because she felt unable to care for them. For a year and a half, Mr. Cooke was unable to find out what had happened to his children, as his wife refused even to tell him where they were. When he finally was able to locate them, he sought custody of them in both American and German courts. Although he obtained a custody order from an American court, which under the Hague Convention is binding upon Germany since the children had resided in the United States for all of their young lives, the German courts have refused to grant him custody. Instead, they have ruled that the children should stay with their foster parents, in part because during the drawn-out German legal process, the children

learned German, went to German schools, and grew attached to their foster parents. The court felt that reuniting these children with their father would result in "severe psychological loss."

The State Department's reaction to this case hardly befits the importance of the issue involved. Despite Germany's obligations under the Hague Convention, a State Department spokeswoman told the Washington Post, "We're not the courts. It's up to the courts to make those kinds of decisions." The very point of the Hague Convention is to provide countries with a diplomatic opportunity to question the rulings of courts outside the country where the children habitually reside. The Convention is rendered meaningless if our State Department is not willing to act as a strong advocate for American parents. As the Post reported, only 80 out of the 369 children—22 percent—who were the subject of Hague applications from American parents from 1990 to 1998 have come back to the United States, and that number includes those children who were voluntarily returned. Meanwhile, U.S. courts have returned 90 percent of children who were the subject of Hague applications in other countries.

In other words, while America obeys its treaty obligations, it has failed to enforce our own treaty rights. This is not a minor problem, either. The State Department says that it has 1,148 open international custody cases, and there are surely far more cases that have not been reported to the government. The State Department should be doing everything within its power to help American parents. I implore our government to pay more attention to this issue, and I ask our allies to abide by their own duties under the Hague Convention.

I ask unanimous consent to enter an editorial on this matter from today's Washington Post into the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 9, 2000]

STOLEN CHILDREN

When Congress was considering legislation that would have kept Elian Gonzalez in this country, State Department officials argued that such a precedent could disrupt their efforts to intervene in cases where American parents have had children abducted abroad. A sound argument, with one big problem: It turns out that in many of the 1,100 open cases in which American parents are fighting to get their children back from recalcitrant court systems in other countries, the State Department isn't making much effort on the parents' behalf. The heartwrenching story of Joseph Cooke and his children, told Sunday in this newspaper by Post reporters Cindy Loose and William Drozdiak, highlights an unusually egregious problem with German-American custody battles in particular: In at least 30 cases, advocates say, German judges have flouted basic tenets of the 1980 Hague treaty on international abductions, to which their country is a signatory, and kept children from parents who had overwhelming claims to them. But the Cooke story also reveals an almost incomprehensibly lackadaisical U.S. Government response to the

human tragedies that arise when a parent cannot get his or her rights enforced.

The Hague Convention calls for quick resolution of custody disputes in the country where a child "habitually resides." The law lacks teeth: An official at the U.S. Embassy in Germany told a Post reporter that he viewed the Hague Convention as "a voluntary compliance sort of thing." Up the ladder, it's the same: U.S. ambassadors fail to raise individual cases or to make diplomatic noise over these cases. German officials say they cannot intervene in the court system. German Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer, meeting with Secretary of State Madeleine Albright this week, echoed that view when the secretary raised the Cooke case—though Mr. Fischer said he was touched by the Cookes' "personal tragedy."

American reluctance to apply diplomatic pressure makes no more sense than German excuses about "interfering" in the judiciary. Public and private pressure through diplomatic channels on behalf of Sundered families can indeed have an effect; so could legislation to require judges to be trained in the applicable laws. When an ally such as Germany flouts good conduct in this regard, the issue should rise to the top of the diplomatic agenda, not be shunted aside.

SENATE QUARTERLY MAIL COSTS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, in accordance with section 318 of Public Law 101-520 as amended by Public Law 103-283, I am submitting the frank mail allocations made to each Senator from the appropriation for official mail expenses and a summary tabulation of Senate mass mail costs for the second quarter of FY2000 to be printed in the RECORD. The second quarter of FY2000 covers the period of January 1, 2000 through March 31, 2000. The official mail allocations are available for franked mail costs, as stipulated in Public Law 106-57, the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act of 2000. I ask unanimous consent that material I referenced be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE QUARTERLY MASS MAIL VOLUMES AND COSTS FOR THE QUARTER ENDING 03/31/00

Senators	FY2000 official mail allo- cation	Total pieces	Pieces per cap- ita	Total cost	Cost per capita
Abraham	\$114,766	0	0	0	0
Akaka	35,277	0	0	0	0
Allard	65,146	0	0	0	0
Ashcroft	79,102	0	0	0	0
Baucus	34,375	0	0	0	0
Bayh	80,377	0	0	0	0
Bennett	42,413	0	0	0	0
Biden	32,277	0	0	0	0
Bingaman	42,547	0	0	0	0
Bond	79,102	0	0	0	0
Boxer	305,476	0	0	0	0
Breaux	66,941	0	0	0	0
Brownback	50,118	0	0	0	0
Bryan	43,209	0	0	0	0
Bunning	63,969	0	0	0	0
Burns	34,375	0	0	0	0
Byrd	43,239	0	0	0	0
Campbell	65,146	0	0	0	0
Chafee, Lincoln ...	34,703	0	0	0	0
Cleland	97,682	0	0	0	0
Cochran	51,320	0	0	0	0
Collins	38,329	0	0	0	0
Conrad	31,320	24,399	0.03820	\$4,860.16	\$0.00761
Coverdell	97,682	0	0	0	0
Craig	36,491	5,291	0.00526	4,179.01	0.00415
Crapo	36,491	2,344	0.00233	2,135.37	0.00212
Daschle	32,185	0	0	0	0
DeWine	131,970	0	0	0	0
Dodd	56,424	0	0	0	0
Domenici	42,547	0	0	0	0

SENATE QUARTERLY MASS MAIL VOLUMES AND COSTS FOR THE QUARTER ENDING 03/31/00—Continued

Senators	FY2000 official mail allo- cation	Total pieces	Pieces per cap- ita	Total cost	Cost per capita
Dorgan	31,320	1,033	0.00162	824.74	0.00129
Durbin	130,125	0	0	0	0
Edwards	103,736	0	0	0	0
Enzi	30,044	0	0	0	0
Feingold	74,483	0	0	0	0
Feinstein	305,476	0	0	0	0
Fitzgerald	130,125	0	0	0	0
Frist	78,239	0	0	0	0
Gorton	81,115	0	0	0	0
Graham	185,464	0	0	0	0
Gramm	205,051	2,478	0.00015	1,953.07	0.00012
Grassley	69,241	73,933	0.01690	39,859.74	0.00911
Gregg	52,904	0	0	0	0
Hagel	36,828	0	0	0	0
Harkin	40,964	147,000	0.09313	25,935.25	0.01643
Hatch	52,904	0	0	0	0
Helms	42,413	0	0	0	0
Hollings	103,736	0	0	0	0
Hutchinson	62,273	0	0	0	0
Hutchinson	51,203	0	0	0	0
Inhofe	205,051	0	0	0	0
Inouye	58,884	0	0	0	0
Jeffords	35,277	0	0	0	0
Johnson	31,251	14,260	0.02534	3,874.66	0.00689
Kennedy	32,185	646	0.00093	606.59	0.00087
Kerry	82,915	0	0	0	0
Kerry	40,964	0	0	0	0
Kerry	82,915	1,109	0.00018	261.74	0.00004
Kohl	74,483	0	0	0	0
Kyl	71,855	0	0	0	0
Landrieu	66,941	0	0	0	0
Lautenberg	97,508	0	0	0	0
Leahy	31,251	14,714	0.02615	5,939.97	0.01056
Levin	114,766	0	0	0	0
Lieberman	56,424	0	0	0	0
Lincoln	51,203	0	0	0	0
Lott	51,320	39,083	0.01518	6,428.68	0.00250
Lugar	80,377	0	0	0	0
Mack	185,464	0	0	0	0
McCain	71,855	0	0	0	0
McConnell	63,969	0	0	0	0
Mikulski	73,160	2,289	0.00048	496.12	0.00010
Moynihan	184,012	0	0	0	0
Murkowski	31,184	0	0	0	0
Murray	81,115	0	0	0	0
Nickles	58,884	0	0	0	0
Reed	34,703	16,164	0.01611	4,708.58	0.00469
Reid	43,209	0	0	0	0
Robb	89,627	0	0	0	0
Roberts	50,118	0	0	0	0
Rockefeller	43,239	39,900	0.02225	7,100.75	0.00396
Roth	32,277	0	0	0	0
Santorum	139,016	0	0	0	0
Sarbanes	73,160	0	0	0	0
Schumer	184,012	0	0	0	0
Sessions	68,176	0	0	0	0
Shelby	68,176	0	0	0	0
Smith, Gordon	58,557	0	0	0	0
Smith, Robert	36,828	0	0	0	0
Snowe	38,329	0	0	0	0
Specter	139,016	0	0	0	0
Stevens	31,184	0	0	0	0
Thomas	30,044	1,505	0.00332	1,218.04	0.00269
Thompson	78,239	0	0	0	0
Thurmond	62,273	0	0	0	0
Torricelli	97,508	1,304	0.00017	360.95	0.00005
Voinovich	131,970	800	0.00007	168.13	0.00002
Warner	89,627	0	0	0	0
Wellstone	69,241	707	0.00016	570.46	0.00013
Wyden	58,557	0	0	0	0
Totals	7,594,942	388,959	0.26790	111,482.01	0.07332

THE CLINTON-GORE ADMINISTRATION'S PROPOSALS TO INVEST SOCIAL SECURITY INTO PRIVATE MARKETS

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I note with interest Vice President GORE's recent attacks on Governor Bush's comments regarding Governor Bush's thoughts on Social Security reform. In dismissing the Governor's suggestions regarding Social Security reform, Vice President GORE denied that the Clinton-Gore Administration ever proposed the dangerous idea of having the government invest Social Security surpluses in the stock market. According to the May 2, 2000 Washington Post, the Vice President claimed that the administration never made any such proposal, saying "We didn't really propose it."

I find it surprising that the Vice President made this denial, especially since the Clinton-Gore administration has indeed made this proposal, and done so a number of times. First, on January 19, 1999, with the Vice President right behind him, President Clinton said in his State of the Union Address, and I quote, "Specifically, I propose that we commit 60 percent of the budget surplus for the next 15 years to Social Security, investing a small portion in the private sector, just as any private or state government pension would do."

Just a few weeks later, the Clinton-Gore FY 2000 budget said quite clearly, on page 41, that "The Administration proposes tapping the power of private financial markets to increase the resources to pay for future Social Security benefits. Roughly one-fifth of the unified budget surplus set aside for Social Security would be invested in corporate equities or other private financial instruments."

When I read this proposal, I was extremely concerned and proposed an amendment to the FY 2000 Budget Resolution that would express the Sense of the Senate that the government should not invest Social Security funds in the stock market. My amendment passed the Senate unanimously. After this resounding statement by the Senate, I hoped that we had laid the risky scheme to have the government invest Social Security funds in the stock market to rest.

Despite the fact that we had sent the clearest possible signal on this issue, the Clinton-Gore administration apparently did not get the message. On page 37 of the Clinton-Gore administration's FY 2001 budget, they resurrected this risky scheme to have the government invest the Social Security dollars in the stock market, saying, "The President proposes to invest half the transferred amounts in corporate equities." The only concession that the Clinton-Gore administration appeared to make was writing this unpopular proposal in smaller type than last year.

In response to this repeated proposal, I once again submitted an amendment to the Budget Resolution expressing the Sense of the Senate that the federal government should not invest the Social Security trust fund in the stock market. Once again this amendment passed with no votes in opposition.

The Senate has twice unanimously passed an amendment rejecting the idea of having the government invest the trust fund in the stock market. I am pleased that the Vice President now agrees with us, but I find it curious that he has failed to notice that it is his administration that has repeatedly suggested this risky scheme.

The Clinton-Gore administration's repeated attempts to implement this plan violates U.S. law. For more than 60 years Social Security law has forbidden the trust funds from being invested in the stock market. This new scheme is directly contrary to six decades of U.S. policy on Social Security.