

to accept this delay because they knew that they would have to do their fair share to help us control the budget deficit. Many of them said to me, "Senator, I'm willing to tighten my belt another notch to help this country, as long as everyone else is asked to do the same."

Now we have a situation where retirees are being asked to tighten the belt again. Except this time they are being singled out for special treatment. We have proposals to delay Federal retiree COLA's for another 4 years. I don't think that's right—it's not fair and it's not equitable. I think all COLA's—Federal, military, and Social Security should be paid on time. They should be reliable and they should be accurate. We owe our seniors, our Government retirees, and our military retirees nothing less.

I am very disturbed by the recent trend of promises broken to Federal employees, and retirees. I believe that promises made should be promises kept. When Federal employees signed up for service, they agreed to defer some compensation until retirement. They knew that they would make less salary than in the private sector, but they also knew that they would have a stable benefits package of health insurance, life insurance, and retirement. If we delay their COLA's again we are telling them—sorry, we did not exactly tell you the truth when you signed up for service. We are telling them that they cannot rely on the benefits that they planned their retirements around.

I do not think this is the way we should run our Government, and it's not the way we should treat our Government retirees. I am working to make sure we honor our commitments, and I urge all my colleagues to do the same and support this resolution.●

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I rise today as a cosponsor of legislation expressing the sense of Congress that Federal retirement cost-of-living adjustments [COLA's] should not be delayed.

I join with my colleagues Senator SARBANES and Senator MIKULSKI of Maryland, and Senator AKAKA of Hawaii in opposing President Clinton's fiscal year 1998 budget proposal to delay Federal retiree cost-of-living adjustments [COLA's].

It was a matter of great satisfaction to me that the balanced budget proposal approved by the Congress in 1995 provided for full CPI-based COLA's for Federal retirees each January through the year 2002. That legislation was vetoed by President Bill Clinton on December 6, 1995.

The President has once again indicated his lack of support for COLA equity by submitting his fiscal year 1998 budget proposal including delayed Federal retiree COLA's. It is my intention to strenuously oppose the President's inequitable COLA policy whenever possible. I will be looking to the Federal retiree community for support in this effort as the fiscal year 1998 budget process continues.

Federal retirees must be treated equitably in terms of cost-of-living adjustments [COLA's] and income security. You may recall that in 1986, I was an original cosponsor of the COLA equity amendment, landmark legislation which guaranteed equal COLA treatment for all participants in Government retirement programs—Social Security, civil service, and military. From that point until President Clinton's Deficit Reduction Act of 1993, full CPI-based COLA's were provided for all retirees each January 1.

Regrettably, President Clinton's 1993 budget departed from the policy of COLA equity in that a series of COLA deferrals were put in place for civil service, and military retirees. As you know, Social Security recipients were not affected. What you may not know is that last year, I sponsored legislation which was enacted into law to at least retain COLA equity for the military and civil service. A damaging proposal had surfaced to further delay civil service COLA's to help fund military COLA's, an unworkable and unfair proposition. I vigorously opposed it and fought for its defeat.

It is time once again to stand and oppose this COLA inequity for Federal retirees. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution to restore equity for all retirees.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 8—RELATIVE TO COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENTS

Mr. ROBB submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Governmental Affairs:

S. CON. RES. 8

Whereas over the years Federal retirees have been asked to share in efforts to reduce the deficit by delaying their annual cost-of-living adjustment while retirees under other Federal programs who also receive cost-of-living adjustments were not delayed:

Whereas it would be inequitable to continue delaying cost-of-living adjustments for Federal retirees when like delays for similarly situated retirees under other systems are not under consideration: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the United States Senate (the House concurring). That it is the sense of the Congress that cost-of-living adjustments for Federal retirees should be paid at the same time as other retirees receiving federal cost-of-living adjustments.

Mr. ROBB. Madam President, I submit a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that all Federal annuitants should receive their cost-of-living adjustments at the same time.

This resolution is very similar to one submitted by my colleague from Maryland, and cosponsored by the other distinguished Senator from Maryland and my own esteemed colleague, the senior Senator from Virginia. And while I agree with them in spirit, I could not support the wording of their resolution so I am here to offer my own.

As we are all aware by now, the President's budget proposal would

delay Federal retiree cost-of-living adjustments from their statutory date of January 1 to April 1 until the year 2002. This same budget proposal, however, would leave the effective date for COLA's for other Federal COLA recipients at January 1, thus singling out Federal civilian retirees as the only Federal beneficiaries with their COLA's delayed. This seems blatantly unfair and violates the principle of COLA equity that so many of us have espoused over the years. If the budget justification is there to delay one group, then why isn't it there for the others? Conversely, if there is a policy justification for not delaying certain retirees, then why are Federal retirees any different?

I could not join my colleagues in cosponsoring their resolution because I can see a point where a policy decision to treat everyone equitably could result in delaying COLA's across all of these programs. That is not what I believe we need to do this year, and I'll continue to support efforts to equalize COLA's in January. I could not, however, in good conscience cosponsor a resolution which I might contradict at a later point in time.

As an alternative, I am offering a concurrent resolution which expresses the sense of the Congress that COLA's for all of these Federal annuitants and beneficiaries should be paid at the same time. The resolution deliberately does not state a date certain, simply that the principle of equity between them should prevail.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 9—RELATIVE TO COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES

Mrs. HUTCHISON (for herself, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. DODD, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. BIDEN, and Mr. LUGAR) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. CON. RES. 9

Whereas the international drug trade poses a direct threat to the United States and to international efforts to promote democracy, economic stability, human rights, and the rule of law;

Whereas approximately 12,800,000 Americans use illegal drugs, including 1,500,000 cocaine users, 600,000 heroin addicts, and 9,800,000 smokers of marijuana;

Whereas illegal drug use occurs among members of every ethnic and socioeconomic group in the United States;

Whereas 10.9 percent of all children between 12 years and 17 years of age use illegal drugs, and one child in four claims to have been offered illegal drugs in the last year;

Whereas drug-related illness, death, and crime cost the United States approximately \$66,900,000,000 in 1996, including costs for lost productivity, premature death, and incarceration;

Whereas effective treatment and prevention is required to break the cycle that links illegal drugs to violent crime in the United States and to reduce the social and economic costs to the United States of illegal drug use;

Whereas such treatment and prevention depend on our ability to prevent the flow of illegal drugs through our borders through effective cooperation with other nations;