have a drug benefit as part of their health insurance coverage, access to these new medicines is beyond reach.

Even more alarming, it is estimated that 38 percent of seniors pay $1,000 or more for prescription drugs annually, while 3 in 5 Medicare beneficiaries lack a dependable source of drug coverage. This lack of reliable drug coverage for today's seniors is reminiscent of the lack of hospital coverage for the elderly prior to the creation of Medicare. Back in 1963, an estimated 56 percent of seniors lacked hospital insurance coverage. Today, after all our investments in health care and prevention, 53 percent of seniors still lack a prescription drug benefit.

The need for a Medicare prescription drug benefit is a top concern for the elderly and disabled in my home state of Rhode Island. Many seniors continue to be squeezed by declines in retiree health insurance coverage, increasing Medigap premiums and the capitation of annual prescription drug benefits at $500 or $1000 under Medicare managed care plans. Mr. President, seniors in my state are frustrated and burdened both financially and emotionally by the lack of a reliable prescription drug benefit.

While the need for a prescription drug benefit is clear and the desire on the part of some members of Congress is there, action on Medicare prescription drug legislation has been slow. The Senate Finance Committee has held a series of hearings on the subject of Medicare prescription drugs, however, the committee to date has been unable to produce a bill.

In May, I joined Senator DASCHLE and several of my Democratic colleagues, in introducing S. 2541, the Medicare Expansion of Needed Drugs Act. This legislation seeks to provide millions of elderly and disabled Americans with an adequate, reliable and affordable source of prescription drug coverage.

The MEND Act embodies the principles that I believe are necessary for an adequate prescription drug benefit—it is voluntary, accessible to all seniors, affordable, provides a reliable benefit and is consistent with broader Medicare reform.

Last evening, the Senate had a real and possibly its only opportunity to enact a prescription drug benefit when Senator ROBB offered an amendment during the consideration of the fiscal year 2001 Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education appropriations bill that would have provided a universal Medicare prescription drug benefit to our nation's seniors. While the proposal differs slightly from the MEND Act, it embraced the principles that I view as necessary for a good benefit. Regrettably, this crucial amendment was defeated.

I sincerely hope that the stated desire of many of my colleagues to create an adequate and affordable Medicare prescription drug benefit will become a reality this year. During this time of strong economic prosperity, we should all feel compelled to seize this opportunity to strengthen and enhance Medicare for the new millennium.

## HATE CRIMES AMENDMENT

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, as hate-crimes legislation was recently debated and voted on by the United States Senate, I would like to briefly explain my vote on this issue. I believe that all victims of crime, and most certainly victims of violent crime, are deserving of special status. After due process has been afforded and guilt determined, perpetrators of crimes should be punished speedily for the peace of the community and to bring some measure of resolution for the victim. However, creating different classifications of victims, and rendering punishment based upon such classifications threatens the notion of ''Equal Justice Under Law,'' the principle that adorns the United States Supreme Court building and should suffuse our entire legal system.

Violence itself, whether motivated by hate, revenge, greed, lust, envy, or some other evil motivation, threatens the peace of our communities and our citizens' sense of security. The Kennedy amendment would include minor crimes against property within the definition of hate crimes, but would not have included such heinous acts as the Oklahoma City federal building bombing, or the school shooting at Columbine High School, both of which left lasting, painful memories for the local communities in Oklahoma and Colorado, and even the Nation as a whole.

Rather than focusing on the particular motivation of the criminal, Congress and the states should provide law enforcement officials the resources necessary to fully prosecute all crimes. The diligent enforcement of existing laws will serve as an effective deterrent against criminal acts motivated by bigotry and hate, or any other distasteful compulsion. A more comprehensive strategy than what is embodied in the Kennedy amendment is warranted in light of the fact that in 1998 there were 16,914 murders committed in the United States (an average of 46 every day), and of the 16,914, only thirteen were deemed to be hate crimes.

I supported the Hatch amendment, which studies how extensive the hate crimes problem is and whether these heinous crimes are being fairly and aggressively prosecuted in the same manner as other similar crimes. I also welcome the Justice Department technical and financial assistance to states which need help in pursuing and identifying hate crimes. This is a far better role for the federal government than moving to federalize all state actions against hate crimes.

The Kennedy amendment also raised concerns by experts about constitutionality. Ultimately, it threatened to create more problems in the criminal justice system than it purported to solve, and I consequently voted ''no'' on the amendment and yes on the more reasonable Hatch amendment. I pledge to my constituents that I will support aggressive state prosecution of hate crimes, and I will continue to work to maintain safe communities, including actively supporting legislation that furthers that end.

## INTERNET TAX MORATORIUM AND EQUITY ACT

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleague, Senator DORGAN, in introducing legislation designated to address the issue of Internet sales taxation.

As a consumer, I know first-hand how popular, simple and easy it is to buy items over the Internet. In fact, the Internet saved me at Christmas when I bought last-minute gifts for my wife, four children and our two little granddaughters.

But, as a member of both the Senate Finance and Commerce committees, I also know Congress has an obligation to examine how these same, tax-free Internet sales can financially harm businesses and state governments.

Senator DORGAN's bill balances the concerns of state and local governments with the importance of maintaining easy access to Internet services. It allows state and localities to enter into an interstate compact for the purpose of simplifying their sales tax systems for remote sales. Once 20 states have joined the compact, Congress can disapprove of their efforts. If Congress does not act, those states that have joined the compact and simplified their sales tax systems, will be authorized to collect sales tax on the purchases their citizens make over the Internet.

Our proposal, recognizing that collecting taxes must not be overly burdensome for online retailers, also provides a collection fee for all Internet retailers who collect these taxes. It ensures Internet purchases are not singled out for special tax treatment at the expense of neighborhood businesses, and state and local governments. This restores equality, a key aspect of any good tax system, without placing an unfair burden on anyone. I believe that this is a fair and equitable bill that takes reasonable steps to address the concerns of both online retailers and state and local governments.

We all agree Internet access should not be taxed, and that states and localities should not be allowed to impose discriminatory taxes on the Internet. In fact, Senator DORGAN's bill extends the moratorium on these types of sales for another four years.

But, I ask, is it fair to levy sales taxes on a person who buys a book from his local bookstore, but not his neighbor who buys that same book over the Internet?

I do not think it is fair. It isn't fair to residents who must pay the local