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
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.

In addition to the Senate and long-standing U.S. government policy opposing government investment of the trust funds in the stock market, Federal Reserve Board Chairman Alan Greenspan opposes the idea as well. Chairman Greenspan says that investing Social Security funds in the market is bad for Social Security and bad for our economy.

When Alan Greenspan talks, the Clinton-Gore administration ought to listen. Chairman Greenspan has said this plan ''will create a lower rate of return for Social Security recipients,'' and he ''does not believe that it is politically feasible to insulate such huge funds from a governmental direction.''

In addition to these other concerns, I am also listening to the concerns of Missourians. Last year I received a letter from Todd Lawrence of Greenwood, Missouri, who wrote: ''It has been suggested that the government would invest in the stock market with my Social Security money. No offense, but there is not much that the Government touches that works well. Why would making MY investment decisions for me be any different. Looking at it from a business perspective, would the owner of a corporation feel comfortable if the government were the primary shareholder?''

Todd Lawrence understands what the Clinton-Gore administration does not. No corporation would want the government as a shareholder, and no investor should want the government handling their investment.

Even if the government were able to invest without adding new levels of inefficiency to the process, the government's putting Social Security taxes in the stock market adds an unacceptable level of risk to retirement. This risk is a gamble I am unwilling to make for the one million Missourians who get Social Security.

It is hard to overestimate how dangerous this scheme really is. While individuals properly manage their financial portfolios to control risk, the government has no business taking these gambles with the people's money.

Just recently, the Microsoft case gave us a chilling illustration of the potential conflicts of interest caused by the President's proposal. If the government had invested Social Security funds in the stock market, the antitrust suit against Microsoft would have put those funds at risk. Whatever one may think of the wisdom of the case, we do not want the federal government making law enforcement decisions based on government's stock portfolio.

While Americans should invest as much as they can afford in private equities to plan for their own retirements, the government should stay out of the stock market. I am glad that the Vice President has finally recognized that having the government invest the trust fund in the stock market, but I wish that he would remember that his administration has been the most vocal proponent of this bad idea. If the federal government tried to pick market winners and losers, all of us would end up as losers.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Monday, May 8, 2000, the federal debt stood at $5,662,693,356,964.51 (Five trillion, six hundred sixty-two billion, six hundred ninety-three million, three hundred fifty-six thousand, nine hundred sixty-four dollars and fifty-one cents).

Five years ago, May 8, 1995, the federal debt stood at $4,856,503,000,000 (Four trillion, eight hundred fifty-six billion, five hundred three million).

Ten years ago, May 8, 1990, the federal debt stood at $3,080,170,000,000 (Three trillion, eighty billion, one hundred seventy million).

Fifteen years ago, May 8, 1985, the federal debt stood at $1,744,562,000,000 (One trillion, seven hundred forty-four billion, five hundred sixty-two million).

Twenty-five years ago, May 8, 1975, the federal debt stood at $512,942,000,000 (Five hundred twelve billion, nine hundred forty-two million) which reflects a debt increase of more than $5 trillion—$5,149,751,356,964.51 (Five trillion, one hundred forty-nine billion, seven hundred fifty-one million, three hundred fifty-six thousand, nine hundred sixty-four dollars and fifty-one cents) during the past 25 years.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO MARVIN FIFIELD

• Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, next month, friends, associates and colleagues will gather at Utah State University to honor Mr. Marvin G. Fifield, a remarkable man whose entire professional career has been devoted to improving the lives of those with learning or developmental disabilities. While I stand in tribute to my friend of many years, it is his body of work over the span of forty-four years that does him honor.

At his retirement on July 1, Dr. Fifield will have served as the founder and Director of the Center for Persons with Disabilities for thirty-three years. He wrote the grant application, saw it funded, and directed the creation of the center. But it is not the Center alone that owes its existence to Dr. Fifield. Over a thirty year period, he succeeded in writing, achieving the approval and funding for over fifty projects, with combined grants exceeding $60 million. Without his skilled direction, numerous regional mental health centers, rehabilitation and vocational services, studies and workshops would not now be available. The Navajo Initiative in the Developmental Disabilities program, the Indian Children's Program, and the Native American Initiative program all owe their start to this man.

Dr. Fifield's chairmanship and membership in professional and community service organizations bridges more than three decades and forty organizations. To this day he chairs or serves on eight boards, including serving as Chairman of the Hatch Utah Advisory Committee on Disability Policy. He also serves on the innovative Assistive Technology Work Group. Marv was the first to champion assistive technologies for people with disabilities—or at least I think he was the first because he was the first to tell me about this exciting field. Assistive technology comprises all devices that improve the functional capabilities of those individuals with disabilities.

Marv Fifield is so accomplished that his curriculum vitae is not so much measured in pages as in pounds.

In academe, an individual's worth is often measured by how widely they have been published. Dr. Fifield has published seventeen books, chapters in books, or monographs; he has published twelve refereed journal articles and seven non-referenced journal articles; he has published seven technical papers; he has submitted ten testimonies and reports to congressional and Senate subcommittees; published twenty-three final reports and research reports; authored eleven instructional products, and has authored ninety-one selected unpublished conference papers.

Dr. Fifield has been a consultant to both national and international organizations including the World Health Organization. Among the richly deserved honors bestowed upon him, he is the recipient of the Leone Leadership Award, the highest honor an administrator can receive. He was presented the Maurice Warshaw Outstanding Service Award by the Governor of the State of Utah and was twice called to serve as a staff member on the Labor and Human Resources Committee.

Since 1981, Marv Fifield has provided leadership for my Utah Advisory Committee on Disability Policy. The Disability Advisory Committee has become a model for encouraging constructive dialogue among diverse interests and points of view. The committee has often been able to develop consensus recommendations, which have helped me a great deal over the years. I am most grateful to Marv for all his efforts with the committee.

I want to wish him well as he enters the next chapter in his already full life. I hope he will find retirement rewarding. But, if he thinks he can escape consulting with me and those in Utah who rely on his quiet and good-natured leadership to achieve consensus on matters of importance in disability policy, he can forget it. I am here to announce that we are not letting him off the hook. We need the benefit of Marv's knowledge, his humor, and his diplomacy to help us continue moving forward.

So, Mr. President, I rise today to pay a well-deserved tribute to Dr. Marvin Fifield. But, I am not bidding him farewell. On the contrary, I will be calling