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 allocation	Total pieces	Pieces per capita	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 allocation	Total pieces	Pieces per capita	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
Grams	69,241	73,933	0.01690	39,859.74	0.00911
Grassley	52,904	0	0	0	0
Gregg	36,828	0	0	0	0
Hagel	40,964	147,000	0.09313	25,935.25	0.01643
Harkin	52,904	0	0	0	0
Hatch	42,413	0	0	0	0
Helms	103,736	0	0	0	0
Hollings	62,273	0	0	0	0
Hutchinson	51,203	0	0	0	0
Hutchison	205,051	0	0	0	0
Inhofe	58,884	0	0	0	0
Inouye	35,277	0	0	0	0
Jeffords	31,251	14,260	0.02534	3,874.66	0.00689
Johnson	32,185	646	0.00093	606.59	0.00087
Kennedy	82,915	0	0	0	0
Kerrey	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.