

COATS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 74, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to limit the tax rate for certain small businesses, and for other purposes.

S. 75

At the request of Mr. KYL, the names of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLARD] and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI] were added as cosponsors of S. 75, a bill to repeal the Federal estate and gift taxes and the tax on generation-skipping transfers.

S. 76

At the request of Mr. KYL, the name of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. COATS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 76, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the expensing limitation to \$250,000.

S. 102

At the request of Mr. BREAU, the names of the Senator from Maine [Ms. COLLINS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. FORD], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BRYAN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] were added as cosponsors of S. 102, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve medicare treatment and education for beneficiaries with diabetes by providing coverage of diabetes outpatient self-management training services and uniform coverage of blood-testing strips for individuals with diabetes.

S. 181

At the request of Mr. DORGAN, the name of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 181, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that installment sales of certain farmers not be treated as a preference item for purposes of the alternative minimum tax.

S. 191

At the request of Mr. HELMS, the name of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HAGEL] was added as a cosponsor of S. 191, a bill to throttle criminal use of guns.

S. 252

At the request of Mr. GREGG, the names of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. FORD] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. GRAHAM] were added as cosponsors of S. 252, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a reduction in the capital gains tax for assets held more than 2 years, to impose a surcharge on short-term capital gains, and for other purposes.

S. 261

At the request of Mr. DOMENICI, the name of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. SMITH] was added as a cosponsor of S. 261, a bill to provide for a biennial budget process and a biennial appropriations process and to enhance oversight and the performance of the Federal Government.

S. 263

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the name of the Senator from New Jer-

sey [Mr. TORRICELLI] was added as a cosponsor of S. 263, a bill to prohibit the import, export, sale, purchase, possession, transportation, acquisition, and receipt of bear viscera or products that contain or claim to contain bear viscera, and for other purposes.

S. 278

At the request of Mr. GRAMM, the name of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. WARNER] was added as a cosponsor of S. 278, a bill to guarantee the right of all active duty military personnel, merchant mariners, and their dependents to vote in Federal, State, and local elections.

S. 357

At the request of Mr. BENNETT, the name of the Senator from Washington [Mr. GORTON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 357, a bill to authorize the Bureau of Land Management to manage the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument, and for other purposes.

S. 373

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Maryland [Ms. MIKULSKI] was added as a cosponsor of S. 373, a bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act and part 7 of subtitle B of title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to establish standards for protection of consumers in managed care plans and other health plans.

S. 389

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the names of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLARD], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK] were added as cosponsors of S. 389, a bill to improve congressional deliberation on proposed Federal/private sector mandates, and for other purposes.

S. 419

At the request of Mr. BOND, the names of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. LUGAR] were added as cosponsors of S. 419, a bill to provide surveillance, research, and services aimed at prevention of birth defects, and for other purposes.

## SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 18

At the request of Mr. HOLLINGS, the name of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. WYDEN] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 18, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections.

## SENATE RESOLUTION 57

At the request of Mr. DORGAN, the name of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. ASHCROFT] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 57, a resolution to support the commemoration of the bicentennial of the Lewis and Clark Expedition.

## SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 7—RELATIVE TO COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENTS

Mr. SARBANES (for himself, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. WARNER and Mr. AKAKA) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Governmental Affairs:

S. CON. RES. 7

Whereas over the years, Federal employees and retirees have regularly been forced to bear a disproportionate share in connection with deficit reduction: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring).* That it is the sense of Congress that cost-of-living adjustments for Federal retirees should be paid beginning in January of each year, as current law prescribes, and should not be delayed, whether as part of a budget agreement or otherwise.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I am pleased to submit along with Senators MIKULSKI, WARNER, and AKAKA, this sense-of-the-Congress resolution. It is a simple resolution which clearly states that it is the sense of the Congress that Federal retiree COLA's should not be delayed.

After 3 years of having their cost-of-living adjustments delayed, Federal retirees finally saw equity restored this year when their COLA adjustment became effective in January instead of April. Federal retirees should continue to receive their COLA on time, in line with all other Federal cost-of-living adjustments.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, the average Federal retiree would lose an estimated \$915 over the next 5 years if a three-month COLA delay is reinstated. To many of our Nation's more than 2 million Federal retirees, this can mean a significant difference in the calculation of their yearly living expenses.

Further delaying Federal retiree COLA's would, in my view, set a dangerous, unfounded precedent where cutting or altering Federal retiree and employee benefits to effect cost savings becomes an all too regular and accepted practice.

Mr. President, Federal retirees have served this Nation with the expectation that the benefits they have earned will be excluded from the pressures of achieving arbitrary budgetary targets. Disparate treatment of COLA recipients goes against longstanding congressional policy that for more than 25 years has ensured COLA equity for all retirees, and I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this important resolution.

● Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, today I am joining with my colleagues, Senator SARBANES, Senator WARNER, and Senator AKAKA to submit a very important resolution. Our resolution states a simple fact—federal retirees should not be singled out for delays in their cost of living adjustments.

As my colleagues know, 1997 was the first year since 1993 that Federal retirees received a timely COLA. Their COLA's were delayed until April for the last 3 years as part of the 1993 deficit reduction plan. They were willing

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;