

All seniors under Governor Bush's proposal have a limit, a cap on how much is spent out of pocket, not only for prescription drugs but for all health care—visits to the physician, visits to the hospital, prescription drug coverage. Once your out-of-pocket expenditures get above \$6,000, it is covered by the Government.

Fourth, this proposal is based on the Federal Employees Health Benefits Plan. I think that is very important because seniors understand if that care is really good enough for President Clinton or Senator FRIST, health care will be good enough for me.

No. 5, Governor Bush has said yes, this is going to take more money. It is going to take about \$110 billion in more money. Why? Because that modernization in bringing things up to date, that better coordination of services, is going to require an investment. That is in real contrast to the Clinton-Gore proposal which, when we first heard about it, was going to cost \$167 billion; that is when it was introduced last year. Right now, the figure touted by the Gore campaign is \$250 billion. The Congressional Budget Office says no, it is not \$167, it is not \$250 billion, but in truth it is about a \$337 billion plan.

So, taxpayers, watch out. Seniors, watch out. This plan has already doubled in size, in how much it costs, in the last 12 months, the plan of the Clinton-Gore team. No. 6, and most important, I think, in the short term, is seniors deserve this coverage now, not 2 years from now, not under the Clinton-Gore plan which phases in over another 8 years—actually they don't fully implement it until the year 2010. Our seniors need health care now.

I would like to briefly turn at this point to S. 3016 and S. 3017, introduced by Senator ROTH. What this bill says—which complements, supplements, and parallels very much what Governor Bush has said, and Governor Bush did it through his helping hand—since we have a problem now, let's reach out right now and get the money to the neediest people, the low- and moderate-income people who need it right now; not to be phased in later.

What this Roth bill does is it makes grants immediately available to those people who need it the most. It will extend prescription drug coverage immediately, recognizing it is a transition program, until we modernize Medicare through the Breaux-Frist or Governor Bush approach. It immediately extends prescription drug coverage to about 85 percent of Medicare beneficiaries.

It serves as a bridge to overall Medicare modernization, overall reform.

This is not the answer. This is the short-term answer to plug that hole that everybody agrees is there, whether Democrat or Republican. That hole is created because true modernization is going to take 12 months or 24 months or 36 months. So let's start that modernization program now, but, in the meantime, let's get help to the people who need it, who are out there making

that choice between putting food on the table, buying those groceries, or buying prescription drugs. Let's help them in 6 months, not 10 years from now, not 5 years from now. That is where the Roth bill moves right in.

Let me point out that 22 States already have taken action. Remember, all 50 States right now are administering prescription drug programs. That mechanism is there right now. It is not in HCFA, it is not in the Federal Government now, and that is why, under Chairman ROTH's leadership, we can get that aid to the people who need it most.

I will talk more about the Clinton-Gore plan later, but let me just close by saying all I said sharply contrasts it.

No. 1, the Gore plan forces seniors to wait 10 years before it is fully implemented. It doesn't even start offering any drugs or drug coverage for at least 2 years.

No. 2, it doesn't give seniors any choice. They can choose one time, at 64½ years. They choose one time, and that is it. Contrast that with the Breaux-Frist plan or Governor Bush's plan, which allows choice at any point in time.

No. 3, the Clinton-Gore plan does nothing to strengthen Medicare. It is a 50-percent copayments for drugs. It does nothing to modernize or strengthen Medicare long term.

No. 4, it does nothing to benefit, to improve that underlying benefit package in terms of preventive drugs, preventive care, in terms of vision care, in terms of dental care. The flexibility is simply not there in the Gore plan.

I close by saying our debate about the various plans is an exciting one for me. Our goal must be health care security for seniors. Governor Bush and our plans, through Breaux-Frist and the Roth proposal, do just that.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

#### VICTIMS OF GUN VIOLENCE

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, it has been more than a year since the Columbine tragedy, but still this Republican Congress refuses to act on sensible gun legislation.

Since Columbine, thousands of Americans have been killed by gunfire. Until we act, Democrats in the Senate will read the names of some of those who have lost their lives to gun violence in the past year, and we will continue to do so every day that the Senate is in session.

In the name of those who died, we will continue this fight. Following are the names of some of the people who were killed by gunfire one year ago today.

SEPTEMBER 14, 1999

Charles Caldwell, 18, Minneapolis, MN; Penny Calhoun, 32, Salt Lake City, UT; Henry J. Calhoun, 32, Salt Lake City, UT; Jovan Coleman, 19, Chicago, IL; Orlando Cortezq, 24, Dallas, TX; Israel Cuervas, 26, Dallas, TX;

Charlie D. Duff, 18, Chicago, IL; Alfredo Fernandez, 50, Houston, TX; Toi Goodnight, 41, Pittsburgh, PA; Stevie Gray, 33, Washington, DC; Jessie Harper, 39, Houston, TX; Michael L. Harris, 41, Chicago, IL; Lee Sun Heung, 43, Baltimore, MD; John Homilton, 82, Oakland, CA; Stephen Hornbaker, 35, Pittsburgh, PA; Kerne Lerouge, 43, Boston, MA; Nigel D. Reese, 17, Chicago, IL; Herman Ridley, 24, Baltimore, MD; Frank Rizzo, Houston, TX; Charles Waldon, 62, Houston, TX.

One of the victims of gun violence I mentioned, 41-year-old Toi Goodnight of Pittsburgh, was shot and killed one year ago today in a carjacking incident. The man who killed Toi shot her in the mouth and left her on the highway as he drove away in her car.

We cannot sit back and allow such senseless gun violence to continue. The deaths of Toi Goodnight and the others I named are a reminder to all of us that we need to enact sensible gun legislation now.

#### OLYMPIC AMBUSH MARKETING

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, at the end of this week the men and women of the United States Olympic Team will march into the Olympic Stadium in Sydney, Australia for the XXVII Olympic games. These athletes who inspire all of us to set high goals and reach those goals deserve our congratulations and support. The American people also deserve praise and thanks for their individual contributions to our athletes and to the United States Olympic Committee. Without those contributions, most of our athletes would never have the chance to compete.

American companies have also financially supported the United States Olympic Committee and the Olympic games through official sponsorships. Unfortunately, Mr. President, that Olympic sponsorship is being eroded by an insidious practice known as "ambush marketing"—advertising that falsely implies an official association with a particular event or organization. In no context is ambush marketing more prevalent or more damaging than with the Olympic games which, because of the reliance on private and corporate funding, are increasingly threatened by a decline in sponsorship interest.

Internationally, it is fair to say that corporate sponsorship saved the Olympic movement. In 1976, Montreal was left with a debt of nearly one billion dollars following the summer Olympic games in that city. Los Angeles, however, managed to capitalize on corporate sponsorship, turning a profit and revitalizing international interest in the games.

American companies have long been proud to be official sponsors of the Olympic games because of the humanitarian and inspirational values the games present. These companies also recognize the valuable marketing potential of the Olympics, enhancing

their presence and business reputation in an increasingly global marketplace. By encouraging corporate involvement, Olympic organizers have ensured that such companies continue to devote tremendous financial and human resources to be identified as official Olympic sponsors. This sponsorship is particularly important in the United States, because there is no direct government support of our athletes.

Congress has recognized the value of corporate sponsorship by adopting the Olympic and Amateur Sports Act, which I authored, to authorize the International Olympic Committee to grant worldwide sponsors of the Olympic games exclusive rights to use certain emblems, trademarks, and designations in the advertising, promotion and sale of products in designated product categories. The act also provides enhanced trademark protections to prevent deceptive practices specifically involving the use of Olympic trademarks or trade names. As a consequence, numerous major corporations have become Olympic sponsors and have contributed millions of dollars to the games and to U.S. athletes.

As the popularity of the Olympics has grown, so have the incentives to be associated with the games. Unfortunately, it is too easy for companies to imply an affiliation with the olympics, without becoming official sponsors. Such ambush or parasite marketing is often subtle—frequently depicting olympic sports, athletes, medals, the host city, a burning torch, or other olympic games indicia—but its effect is proven. Studies have concluded that ambush marketers have been quite successful in their efforts to mislead the American public.

As companies begin to perceive only negligible goodwill or favorable publicity resulting from their Olympic sponsor status, their willingness to support the Olympic games and our athletes may wane. That is why I am considering legislation to further clarify the types of unauthorized use of Olympic games imagery and indicia that are actionable under the Amateur Sports Act. Australia, which will host the Olympic games in the next few weeks, has in place an “Olympic Insignia Protection Act” to protect against ambush marketing, and we may need additional protection in the U.S. Unfortunately, that legislation cannot be addressed this year.

There is a vast difference between freedom of speech and deceptive advertising. I will ask the congress to authorize private suits, similar to private antitrust legislation, to allow those injured by “ambush marketing” to recover their losses and financially punish those who try to mislead our people.

The USOC has been aggressive in protecting its trademark interests. These additional tools may be needed, however, to ensure the value of Olympic sponsorships and encourage corporate participation in the Olympic movement.

#### VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN PROTECTION ACT

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I rise today to express my strong support for S. 2787, the Violence Against Women Protection Act of 2000. It is critically important that the Congress soon pass this legislation to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act, and to continue the progress made since the Act was first passed in 1994.

I am proud to have been a cosponsor of both the original Violence Against Women Act, VAWA as well as S. 2787 and other legislation introduced in the 106th Congress to reauthorize VAWA. Through a \$1.6 billion grants program, VAWA has provided hundreds of thousands of women with shelter to protect their families, established a national toll-free hotline which has responded to innumerable calls for help, and funded domestic violence prevention programs across the Nation. Most importantly, VAWA has provided a new emphasis on domestic violence as a critical problem that cannot be tolerated or ignored.

In my own State of Maryland, the funding provided by VAWA is essential to the continued operation of facilities like Heartly House in Frederick, Maryland, which provides shelter to battered women, accompanies rape victims on hospital visits, and assists women in crisis in numerous other ways. In Baltimore City, VAWA funds have helped create a dedicated docket in the District Court which has effectively increased the number of domestic violence cases prosecuted. In Montgomery County, Maryland, VAWA funds provide victims with legal representation in civil protective order hearings. Importantly, the staff for this program is located inside the Courthouse, making it easy and safe for victims to get the help that they need. VAWA funds are being used creatively in Garrett County, where the Sheriff's Department purchased a four wheel drive vehicle so that their domestic violence team can travel to remote areas of the county—overcoming the feelings of isolation many victims feel, particularly in the winter months.

Programs like these are working in Maryland and all across the country to reduce the incidence of domestic violence. And, according to the Bureau of Justice Statistics, VAWA is working. Intimate partners committed fewer murders in 1996, 1997, and 1998 than in any other year since 1976. Likewise, the number of female victims of intimate partner violence declined from 1993 to 1998; in 1998, women experienced an estimated 876,340 violent offenses at the hands of a partner, down from 1.1 million in 1993.

But despite these successes, clearly the incidence of violence against women and families remains too high. According to the National Coalition Against Domestic Violence (NCADV), over 50 percent of all women will experience physical violence in an intimate relationship, and for 24-30 percent of

those women the battering will be regular and on-going. Additionally, the NCADV reports that between 50 and 70 percent of men who abuse their female partners also abuse their children.

Even though strides have been made, we still have a long way to go before domestic violence is evicted from our homes and communities. It is critically important that we not allow VAWA to expire, and that we take this opportunity to reauthorize VAWA and build upon its success. The Violence Against Women Protection Act of 2000 will authorize more than \$3 billion over five years for VAWA grant program and make important improvements to the original statute. For example, S. 2787 will authorize a new temporary housing program to help move women out of shelters and into more stable living accommodations. S. 2787 will also make it easier for battered immigrant women to leave their abusers without fear of deportation, and target additional funds to combatting domestic violence on college campuses. Finally, the legislation will improve procedures to allow states to enforce protection orders across jurisdictional boundaries.

VAWA has made real strides against domestic violence, and the Violence Against Women Protection Act will continue the important work begun in 1994. I am proud to report of the valuable programs all across Maryland combatting domestic violence thanks to VAWA, and I urge Senate leaders to bring S. 2787 to the floor for consideration as soon as possible. We have an invaluable opportunity to make a statement that domestic violence will not be tolerated, and that all women and children should be able to live without fear in their own homes.

#### FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT PROBLEMS DUE TO THE McDADE LAW

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I came to the floor on May 25 to speak about the pressing criminal justice problems arising out of the so-called McDade law, which was enacted at the end of the last Congress as part of the omnibus appropriations law. At that time, I described some examples of how this law has impeded important criminal prosecutions, chilled the use of federally-authorized investigative techniques and posed multiple hurdles for federal prosecutors. In particular, I drew attention to the problems that this law has posed in cases related to public safety—among them, the investigation of the maintenance and safety practices of Alaska Airlines. The Legal Times and the Los Angeles Times recently reported on the situation regarding the Alaska Airlines investigation, and I ask unanimous consent to include these reports in the RECORD following my remarks.

Since I spoke in May, the McDade law has continued to stymie Federal law enforcement efforts in a number of States. I am especially troubled by