

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;

Whereas according to the Department of State, Mexico is the source of between 20 and 30 percent of the heroin and 70 percent of the marijuana shipped into the United States and is a transit point for between 50 and 70 percent of the cocaine shipped into the United States;

Whereas drug traffickers along the United States border with Mexico smuggle approximately \$10,000,000,000 worth of narcotics into the United States annually, and the drug trade generates approximately \$30,000,000,000 annually for the Mexican economy;

Whereas there has been a failure to take effective action against drug cartels and other significant narcotics traffickers in Mexico, including the Juarez and Tijuana drug cartels;

Whereas Mexico has failed to honor requests by the United States for extradition of Mexican nationals indicted in our courts on drug-related charges;

Whereas the number of drug seizures in Mexico in 1996 was only half the number of seizures in 1993, and the number of drug-related arrests in Mexico in 1996 was only half the number of such arrests in 1992;

Whereas there is evidence of official corruption in the counter-drug forces of Mexico, including the recent arrest of General Jesus Gutierrez Rebollo, the highest-ranking counter-drug official of the Government of Mexico;

Whereas the Government of Mexico has refused to permit United States agents to carry their weapons on the Mexican side of the United States border with Mexico;

Whereas the banking and financial sectors in Mexico lack mechanisms to prevent money laundering; and

Whereas the Department of Treasury estimates the amount of drug-related money-laundering in Mexico in 1996 at nearly \$10,000,000,000; Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),* That it is the sense of Congress—

(1) to express concern about ineffective and insufficient progress by Mexico in halting the production in and transit through Mexico of illegal drugs; and

(2) to urge the President of the United States and the President of Mexico to expand and strengthen their cooperative relationship in order to make additional progress in halting the production in and transit through Mexico of illegal drugs, including meaningful progress in—

(A) the dismantlement of major drug cartels in Mexico and the arrest of their leaders;

(B) the implementation by Mexico of effective money-laundering legislation;

(C) the compliance of Mexico with outstanding extradition requests by the United States, particularly those requested for extradition of Mexican nationals indicted in our courts on drug-related charges;

(D) the interdiction of the flow of narcotics and other controlled substances across the land and sea border between the United States and Mexico;

(E) the cooperation of Mexico with United States law enforcement officials engaged in counter-drug activities, including permission for United States agents to carry weapons on the Mexico side of the United States border; and

(F) the implementation by Mexico of a wide-ranging program to identify, eliminate, and prosecute officials in Mexico, including government, police, and military officials, who are engaged in or corrupted by drug-related activities.

#### SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 10—RELATIVE TO MEXICO

Mr. GRASSLEY submitted the following concurrent resolution; which

was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

#### S. CON. RES. 10

Whereas Mexico is one of the major source countries for narcotic and psychotropic drugs and other controlled substances entering the United States;

Whereas Mexico is a major transit country for cocaine;

Whereas 70 percent to 80 percent of all foreign-grown marijuana in the United States originates in Mexico;

Whereas criminal organizations in Mexico are involved in smuggling across the United States border;

Whereas criminal organizations in Mexico are engaged in the routine corruption of Mexican officials;

Whereas Mexico has not taken adequate steps to prevent or punish bribery and other forms of corruption;

Whereas Mexican President Ernesto Zedillo has stated his commitment to "create a nation of law," combat drug trafficking, investigate assassinations, and punish official corruption at all levels;

Whereas Mexico has not taken adequate steps to arrest or extradite major drug cartel leaders;

Whereas the continued, large-scale transportation of narcotic and psychotropic drugs and other controlled substances from Mexico to the United States is detrimental to the vital national interests of the United States;

Whereas the Government of Mexico has not taken sufficient steps to control its borders against airborne and seaborne smuggling or to implement a promise by President Ernesto Zedillo to develop a radar network along Mexico's border and to take adequate steps to arrest or extradite major drug cartel leaders; and

Whereas the President determined and reported to Congress pursuant to section 490(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2291j(b)) that Mexico had taken sufficient steps to combat international narcotics trafficking; Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),* That it is the sense of the Congress that the President should not certify Mexico pursuant to section 490(b)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act (22 U.S.C. 2291j(b)(1)) on March 1, 1998, unless the Government of Mexico demonstrates clear progress in the following matters:

(1) Taking steps to develop and deploy a southern tier of radars to monitor aircraft flying into Mexico and to deploy interception capability to close the air bridge into Mexico.

(2) Arresting or extraditing major drug trafficking kingpins and taking adequate steps to disrupt the operations of major criminal organizations operating in and through Mexico.

(3) Taking adequate steps to stop the corruption of Mexican officials at all levels of government and investigating accusations against State governors and public officials.

(4) Taking swift action to implement recent money-laundering and anti-crime legislation.

(5) Permitting United States law enforcement officials on the United States-Mexico border to cross the border with their weapons and reaching agreement to allow United States law enforcement personnel to continue into Mexico while in "hot pursuit" of suspects.

(7) Reaching an agreement to allow refueling for maritime and air interdiction assets.

(8) Reaching an agreement to permit adequate cooperation with United States law enforcement personnel for intercepting maritime smugglers.

(9) Developing and implementing measures to control and monitor maritime smuggling through major ports and container facilities.

(10) Deploying and using vetted units of specially selected and trained law enforcement personnel to disrupt drug trafficking organizations.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Senate shall transmit a copy of this concurrent resolution to the President.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, there is no dispute that a lot of drugs reach this country through Mexico. Not we, not the administration, not Mexico challenge this fact. Just as clearly, we must be concerned about this traffic in illegal drugs. We must be concerned for what this poisonous trade is doing to our country and to our kids. We must be concerned for what the drug money that results from this trade is doing to build criminal empires able to challenge and corrupt whole countries. For these reasons, the United States and Mexico have a shared interest in stopping an illegal trade that is so damaging to both our peoples and our institutions.

Mexico acknowledges its responsibility to help in combating the production and transit of illegal drugs. The production and transit of these drugs are illegal under Mexican law. Mexico is a party to a variety of international agreements to stop these practices. It also has bilateral agreements with the United States to the same effect. Thus, by solemn agreement, Mexico, along with most others countries, is committed in principle and practice to taking effective action to stop illegal drug production and transit.

The United States has a long and deeply intertwined relationship with Mexico, a relationship that is very important to both countries. Whether for good or ill, we are linked to Mexico and Mexico to us. Thus, we must be particularly thoughtful in how we treat that relationship.

The resolution I am offering today does not amend the certification process. It does not change the President's decision to certify Mexico—today. What it does do is send a clear, strong message from Congress that, while we have heard many promises, we have seen little action. And actions—appropriate actions—are paramount. While a change in the certification process may be necessary, doing so without taking the time to hold hearings or look at the possible solutions is hasty. We need to consider our next steps carefully.

There has been a lot of discussion in the last few days on what to do about Mexico. The discussion has tended to go from conditions that proposed to go too far, in my judgment, to approaches that do not go far enough. Clearly, striking the right balance on this important issue is not easy. In my view, however, we must lay down benchmarks with a clear time frame for deciding what Congress regards as the minimum we expect. After all that has been said and done in the last several days, to do less falls shy of doing anything.

My resolution affords the Congress the time to make a reasoned determination about what to do. It requires