

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 McDADDE 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

what is happening in Oregon, where the interplay of the McDade law and a recent attorney ethics decision by the Oregon Supreme Court is severely hampering Federal efforts to combat child pornography and drug trafficking.

I refer to the case of *In re Gatti*, 330 Or. 517 (2000). In *Gatti*, the court held that a private attorney had acted unethically by intentionally misrepresenting his identity to the employees of a medical records review company called Comprehensive Medical Review ("CMR"). The attorney, who represented a client who had filed a claim with an insurance company, believed that the insurance company was using CMR to generate fraudulent medical reports that the insurer then used to deny or limit claims. The attorney called CMR and falsely represented himself to be a chiropractor seeking employment with the company. The attorney was hoping to obtain information from CMR that he could use in a subsequent lawsuit against CMR and the insurance company.

The Oregon Supreme Court upheld the State Bar's view that the attorney's conduct violated two Oregon State Bar disciplinary rules and an Oregon statute—specifically, a disciplinary rule prohibiting conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit or misrepresentation; a disciplinary rule prohibiting knowingly making a false statement of law or fact; and a statute prohibiting willful deceit or misconduct in the legal profession. In so doing, the court rejected the attorney's defense that his misrepresentations were justifiable because he was engaged in an investigation to seek evidence of fraud and other wrongful conduct. The court expressly ruled that there was no "prosecutorial exception" to either the State Bar disciplinary rules or the Oregon statute. As a result, it would appear that prosecutors in Oregon may not concur or participate in undercover and other deceptive law enforcement techniques, even if the law enforcement technique at issue is lawful under Federal law.

*Gatti* has had a swift and devastating effect on FBI operations in Oregon. Soon after the decision was announced, the U.S. Attorney's Office informed the FBI Field Office that it would not concur or participate in the use of long-used and highly productive techniques, such as undercover operations and consensual monitoring of telephone calls, that could be deemed deceptive by the State Bar. Several important investigations were immediately terminated or severely impeded.

Because of the *Gatti* decision, Oregon's U.S. Attorney refused to certify the six-month renewal of Portland's Innocent Images undercover operation, which targets child pornography and exploitation. Portland sought and obtained permission to establish an Innocent Images operation after the work of another task force over the past two years revealed that child pornography and exploitation is a significant prob-

lem in Oregon. With that finally accomplished, and with the investigative infrastructure in place, the U.S. Attorney refused to send the necessary concurring letter to the FBI for Portland's six-month franchise renewal. Since the U.S. Attorney's concurrence is necessary for renewal of the undercover operation, it now appears that Portland's Innocent Images operation will be shut down.

*Gatti* has also had an immediate and harmful impact on Oregon's war on drugs. Last winter, there was a multi-agency wiretap investigation into the activities of an Oregon-based drug organization. To date, the investigation has produced numerous federal and state indictments. Recently, the post-wiretap phase brought to the surface a cooperating witness. During the initial briefing, the cooperating witness indicated he had information about other drug organizations in Oregon and another State. In an effort to widen the investigation, the FBI sought the AUSA's concurrence in the cooperator's use of an electronic device to record conversations with other traffickers. Citing the *Gatti* decision, the assigned AUSA refused to provide concurrence. Since AUSA concurrence is required for such consensual monitoring, the FBI cannot make use of this basic investigative technique. Thus, a critical phase of the investigation languishes because of the interplay of *Gatti* and the McDade law.

These examples show how the McDade law is severely hampering federal law enforcement in Oregon. But as I made clear in my prior remarks, this ill-conceived law is having dangerous effects on federal law enforcement nationwide. Let me update my colleagues on the Talao case, which I discussed at some length in May.

In Talao, a company and its principals were under investigation for failing to pay the prevailing wage on federally funded contracts, falsifying payroll records, and demanding illegal kickbacks. The company's bookkeeper, who had been subpoenaed to testify before the grand jury, initiated a meeting with the AUSA in which she asserted that her employers were pressing her to lie before the grand jury, and that she did not want the company's lawyer to be present before or during her grand jury testimony. The grand jury later indicted the employers for conspiracy, false statements, and illegal kickbacks.

The district court held that the AUSA had acted unethically because the company had a right to have its attorney present during any interview of any employee, regardless of the employee's wishes, the status of the corporate managers, or the possibility that the attorney may have a conflict of interest in representing the bookkeeper. The court declared that if the case went to trial, it would inform the jury of the AUSA's misconduct and instruct them to take it into account in assessing the bookkeeper's credibility.

When I last spoke about the Talao case, the Ninth Circuit was reviewing the district court's decision. The Ninth Circuit has now spoken, and although it found no ethical violation, it did so on the narrow ground that the bookkeeper had initiated the meeting, and that the AUSA had advised the bookkeeper of her right to contact substitute counsel. Thus, the court sent a message that AUSAs and investigating agents may not approach employees in situations where there is a possible conflict of interest between the employee and the corporation for whom the employee works, and corporate counsel is purporting to represent all employees and demanding to be present during interviews. Let me put that another way. If a corporate whistleblower in California told an FBI agent that the agent should speak to a particular employee who had important information, and the AUSA assigned to the case knew that the corporation was represented by counsel in that matter, the AUSA arguably would have to nix the interview.

The need to modify the McDade law is real, and our time is running out. I introduced legislation last year that addressed the most serious problems caused by the McDade law, and I worked with the Chairman of the Judiciary Committee to refine and improve it. I described our approach when I spoke on this issue in May. Congress should take up and pass corrective legislation before the end of the session.

I ask unanimous consent to have several articles printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Tues., July 18, 2000]

JUSTICE DEPT. FACES UNEXPECTED  
ROADBLOCKS DUE TO ETHICS RULES  
(By Robert L. Jackson)

WASHINGTON.—Consider it further proof of the law of unintended consequences.

Aiming to prevent unethical conduct, Congress last year passed a law requiring federal prosecutors to abide by the ethics rules of the state bar where they are conducting investigations.

Instead, the Justice Department says, the move has hampered law enforcement in cases related to public safety—among them the investigation of the maintenance and safety practices of Alaska Airlines.

In documents submitted to the Senate Judiciary Committee by James Robinson, chief of Justice's criminal division, and Assistant Atty. Gen. Robert Raben, the department has argued that probes like this were "stalled for many months" by the McDade law.

The law blocked FBI agents and Justice Department lawyers from interviewing airline mechanics in a timely fashion for a grand jury investigation of whether Alaska's maintenance records were falsified in Northern California, the department says. And it reportedly is causing problems for prosecutors looking into complaints from corporate whistle-blowers elsewhere.

While the law seems harmless on its face, California—like many other states—has an ethics provision prohibiting lawyers or government investigators from directly contacting a person who is represented by counsel.

Federal officials say FBI agents who tried to interview workers at the airline's Oakland maintenance facility were blocked by company lawyers who claimed to represent all airline personnel.

When mechanics then were served with grand jury subpoenas, attorneys lined up by the airline were able to delay their appearances by insisting on grants of immunity from prosecution, which slowed the inquiry by months.

The federal investigation widened after the Jan. 31 crash of an Alaska Airlines jet in the Pacific Ocean that killed all 88 people on board. But FBI agents were similarly impeded from questioning ground mechanics, according to the Justice Department.

"Those interviews that are most often successful—simultaneous interviews of numerous employees—could not be conducted simply because of fear that an ethical rule . . . might result in proceedings against the prosecutor," said Sen. Patrick J. Leahy (D-Vt.), a Judiciary Committee member who is trying to amend the law.

Alaska Airlines insists it has cooperated with the FBI and denies wrongdoing in its maintenance practices. No criminal charges have been brought. The Federal Aviation Administration recently said it had uncovered "serious breakdowns in record-keeping, documentation and quality assurance" but that the airline has devised an acceptable plan to correct them.

Leahy said the airline case is only one example of the hurdles erected by the McDade law, which was sponsored by Rep. John M. McDade (R-Pa.), who retired from the House last year. McDade had been the target of an eight-year federal investigation into allegations that he accepted \$100,000 in gifts and other items from defense contractors and lobbyists.

Cleared by a jury after a 1996 trial, McDade maintained he was the victim of an investigation run amok.

His sponsorship of the Citizens Protection Act was supported by both the American Bar Assn. and the National Assn. of Criminal Defense Lawyers.

It was approved by Congress without any hearings.

Leahy, in a bipartisan effort with Sen. Orrin G. Hatch (R-Utah), the committee chairman, is trying to amend the McDade law.

Justice officials say the statute has made them "reluctant to authorize consensual monitoring"—a body mike worn by an informant, for example—in California and other states for fear that state ethics rules could be interpreted to prohibit this conduct and lead to disciplinary action against department prosecutors.

The law also is making officials reluctant to speak with corporate whistle-blowers without a company lawyer present.

Hatch would add a proviso to McDade saying federal prosecutors should follow state standards unless they are inconsistent with traditional federal policy, a qualification that would effectively gut the law. It is doubtful whether Congress will amend McDade this year.

[From the Legal Times, June 26, 2000]  
ETHICS LAW HURTS PROBE, DOJ SAYS  
(By Jim Oliphant)

The Justice Department says its criminal probe of safety problems at Alaska Airlines has been severely hampered by a controversial federal ethics law enacted last year.

In documents provided to a Senate committee, the department says that a measure that forces federal prosecutors to adhere to state ethics rules has stymied the long-running investigation into the airline's safety and maintenance practices.

Seattle-based Alaska Airlines has been the target of a federal grand jury in San Francisco since early 1999, when a mechanic claimed that workers at the airline had falsified repair records for Alaska passenger jets.

Earlier this year, after Alaska Airlines Flight 261 plunged into the Pacific Ocean, killing all aboard, the Justice Department, along with the Federal Aviation Administration, widened its inquiry into the company's safety operations.

Department officials, as well as lawyers in the U.S. attorney's office in San Francisco, declined to discuss the grand jury's investigation, which has yet to produce a single indictment.

But in a report prepared for the Senate Judiciary Committee, the DOJ says the grand jury's work was "stalled for many months" because of the so-called McDade Amendment, a law implemented last year that forces federal prosecutors to follow state ethics codes.

California, like most states, has an ethics provision that prohibits lawyers from directly contacting a party who is represented by counsel. The Justice Department claims that lawyers for Alaska Airlines used the rule to prevent the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other investigators from speaking with mechanics and other airline employees.

In the early stages of the Alaska investigation, the department's report says, attempts by the FBI to seize documents and interview workers at Alaska Airlines' hangar facility in Oakland, Calif., were blocked by lawyers for the company who "interceded, claimed to represent all airline personnel, and halted the interviews."

Because of the California ethics law, the report says, the federal prosecutor was forced to end the interviews and recall the agents.

The report explains that prosecutors then attempted to subpoena the workers to the grand jury. Again, the request was met with a response by company lawyers, who lined up attorneys separate from the company to represent each worker before they testified before the grand jury.

"Because the attorney for each witness insisted on a grant of immunity, and because of scheduling conflicts with the various attorneys, the investigation was stalled for many months," the report says. "When the witnesses finally appeared before the grand jury, they had trouble remembering anything significant to the investigation."

The Justice Department report also mentions the Jan. 31 crash of Alaska Airlines Flight 261, which crashed into the Pacific Ocean, killing 88 people aboard. The National Transportation Safety Board's investigation has focused on defects in the plane's jack-screw assembly and horizontal stabilizer, which controls the up-and-down movement of the aircraft.

In the wake of the crash, the report says, the FBI received information that the plane had experienced mechanical problems on the first leg of its flight from Puerto Vallarta, Mexico, to Seattle.

But agents could not interview the airline's employees after the crash because of the ethics law, the report says.

"Those interviews that are most often successful—simultaneous interviews of numerous employees—could not be conducted because of fear that they might result in ethics proceedings against the prosecutor," the report says.

Alaska Airlines maintains that it has fully cooperated with FBI and FAA investigators during the government's investigation. It has denied any wrongdoing at its Oakland facility. The company has retained Los Ange-

les' O'Melveny & Myers to represent it in the criminal investigation.

#### CHANGE OF POLICY

For years, as a matter of Justice Department policy, federal prosecutors were told that they didn't have to follow state ethics rules—particularly ones related to bypassing lawyers and contacting potential witnesses directly.

The policy was intended to aid prosecutions of organized crime in the 1980s and was first detailed in a memo by then-Attorney General Richard Thornburgh in 1989. The department's rule was clarified under Janet Reno in 1994.

In October 1998, Congress passed a law that made federal prosecutors subject to state ethics codes. The law was named for former Rep. Joseph McDade (R-Pa.), who was the subject of an eight-year federal bribery investigation. McDade was eventually acquitted.

The law went into effect last year, over strenuous Justice Department objections. Since then, the department hasn't given up the fight to overturn it. And its efforts have support in the Senate Judiciary Committee, where bills offered by the committee's chairman, Sen. Orrin Hatch (R-Utah), and Sen. Patrick Leahy (D-Vt.) would establish separate ethical proscriptions for prosecutors.

The Hatch bill would repeal McDade. The Leahy bill would specifically allow prosecutors to contact witnesses regardless of whether they were represented by counsel. Neither bill has made it out of the judiciary committee.

"This law has resulted in significant delays in important criminal prosecutions, chilled the use of federally authorized investigative techniques and posed multiple hurdles for federal prosecutors," Leahy said on the floor of the Senate last month.

Both the American Bar Association and the National Association for Criminal Defense Lawyers lobbied Congress hard for the McDade law. Kevin Driscoll, a senior legislative counsel for the ABA, said that his organization is reviewing the Justice Department's complaints about the law's implementation. But, he added, the ABA's support of McDade has not changed.

William Moffitt, a D.C. criminal defense lawyer who is president of the NACDL, says that the Justice Department is "looking for reasons to complain" about McDade.

"They don't have the unfettered ability to intimidate and they don't like that," Moffitt said. "People ought to be able to go to the general counsel (of a corporation) if they are subpoenaed and they ought to be able to be told to get a lawyer."

Few details of the grand jury's investigation of Alaska Airlines have come to light. The airline says that it has received three subpoenas for information related to 12 specific aircraft. In a filing with the Securities and Exchange Commission last month, the airline's parent company, Alaska Air Group Inc., said one subpoena asked for the repair records for the MD-83 craft that crashed in January.

Matt Jacobs, a spokesman for the U.S. attorney's office in San Francisco, declined comment on the status of the investigation, as did the press office for Justice Department in Washington.

The FAA conducted a separate probe of the Alaska Airline's maintenance procedures and proposed a \$44,000 fine, which the airline is contesting. The agency recently threatened to shut down the airline's repair facilities in Oakland and Seattle if it did not provide a sound plan for improving its safety protocols.

## THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Wednesday, September 13, 2000, the Federal debt stood at \$5,685,088,778,465.03 (five trillion, six hundred eighty-five billion, eighty-eight million, seven hundred seventy-eight thousand, four hundred sixty-five dollars and three cents).

One year ago, September 13, 1999, the Federal debt stood at \$5,654,838,000,000 (five trillion, six hundred fifty-four billion, eight hundred thirty-eight million).

Five years ago, September 13, 1995, the Federal debt stood at \$4,967,411,000,000 (four trillion, nine hundred sixty-seven billion, four hundred eleven million).

Ten years ago, September 13, 1990, the Federal debt stood at \$3,234,805,000,000 (three trillion, two hundred thirty-four billion, eight hundred five million).

Fifteen years ago, September 13, 1985, the Federal debt stood at \$1,823,101,000,000 (one trillion, eight hundred twenty-three billion, one hundred one million) which reflects a debt increase of almost \$4 trillion—\$3,861,987,778,465.03 (three trillion, eight hundred sixty-one billion, nine hundred eighty-seven million, seven hundred seventy-eight thousand, four hundred sixty-five dollars and three cents) during the past 15 years.

## ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

## POW-MIA DAY

• Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I rise today to pay my respects and to acknowledge our prisoners of war (POW) and those still missing in action (MIA).

In the year 2000, fewer and fewer Americans understand the meaning of POW/MIA Day, Memorial Day, or Veterans Day. I feel it is important that I and my fellow veterans help our Nation understand that freedom is not free. It is paid for by the service and sacrifices of those who served our country.

The United States of America has been honored and blessed with the service and sacrifice of our men and women in uniform. Our Nation has been kept strong and safe by these great Americans and for this we owe a debt we can never fully repay. Nobody knows this more than the friends and families of those souls who became prisoners of war or are still listed as missing in action. Their anguish and pain is unimaginable. I believe it is important to acknowledge those friends and family members on this day as well.

On September 15, 2000, we acknowledge with upmost respect and gratitude those who have given their freedom to preserve ours. Those who have been prisoners of war have demonstrated steadfastly the beliefs of duty, honor, and country. They never gave up on these beliefs and the United States must never give up on them. We must take care of those who have taken care

of us and this includes making every effort to account for those patriots who are missing in action. Our Nation must bring them home to their loved ones.

To those who paid the ultimate sacrifice by giving their lives for our country, we must always be thankful. We must never take for granted the freedoms we have due to the men and women who have faithfully served our country in times of war and peace.

May God bless all these American heroes and their families on this and everyday. ●

## TEENS FAVOR SENSIBLE GUN LAWS

• Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, a new study conducted by researchers at Hamilton College reveals that students across the country are strongly in favor of sensible gun laws. According to the report, approximately ninety percent of high school students surveyed support proposals such as the registration of handguns and licensing of handgun owners, criminal background checks for prospective gun purchasers, and five-day "cooling off periods." In addition, eighty to ninety percent of the teens surveyed in the poll support laws that would require all guns to be sold with trigger locks, require all gun buyers to pass a safety course, and hold adults criminally responsible for keeping a loaded firearm where it could be reasonably accessed by a child and that child harms himself or others.

Here are some of the other findings from the report: "High school students back handgun regulation at higher levels than respondents in recent adult surveys; High school students believe that the Constitution protects the right of citizens to own guns. But they reject the idea that government regulation of the sale and use of handguns violates this right; Almost half of high school students say it would be easy for a teenager to obtain a handgun in their neighborhood. A third report that they know of someone at their school who has been threatened with a gun or shot at."

The Hamilton College researchers were the first to nationally survey high school students about their feelings toward gun issues. I am not surprised that the results show overwhelming support for the gun safety proposals that many of us in Congress have been trying to enact into law. Students are well-versed on the dangers of guns in their homes and schools. In this survey, more than twenty-five percent of students reported that they or someone close to them has been "shot by a gun."

Mr. President, with just a few weeks remaining until the Senate's target adjournment date, it's long past time to act. Let's listen to our young people and enact the sensible gun laws they want and need to keep American schools safer from gun violence. ●

## TRIBUTE TO DR. MILO FRITZ

• Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, Alaska lost one of its true pioneers when Dr. Milo Fritz died at his home in Anchor Point at the age of 91.

One of America's pre-eminent eye, ear, nose, and throat surgeons, Milo treated patients throughout Alaska. Dr. Fritz came to Alaska 60 years ago. With his wife Betsy, a nurse by his side, he began a practice that took him into almost every remote community of our State—to areas where there were no doctors, no clinics, no health care facilities of any kind.

The area he served covered almost a quarter of our State's 586,000 square miles, from Anchorage northeast to the Canadian border near Fort Yukon, west to Bettles and Huslia, south to Anvik and Shageluk, and east again over the Chugach Mountains to Anchorage.

Dozens of villages in that vast expanse would never have seen a doctor if Milo Fritz had not traveled by dog sled or small boat, or piloted his own single-engine airplane, because in that region there were no health-care facilities.

A command surgeon for the 11th Air force in World War II, Milo spent much of his service time in Alaska. After the war, and a brief sojourn in New York, he and Betsy returned to Alaska at the request of our then-territory's commissioner of health to investigate problems of blindness and deafness among children in Alaska Native communities.

Sterilizing his surgical instruments in boiling water heated on a portable stove he carried with him, Dr. Fritz performed tonsillectomies and sometimes, in the absence of a dentist, even had to extract infected teeth.

He specialized in treating otitis media, a terrible and common disease among Alaskan rural children.

He wrote this brief account of one of his typical visits, this one in the village of Allakaket, which rests on the Arctic Circle in the foothills of the Brooks Range:

In Allakaket, we operated in a log community hall and slept in the schoolteacher's quarters. In this village we did 22 T and A's (combined removal of tonsils and adenoids), five tonsillectomies, extracted a few teeth, and prescribed two pairs of glasses.

We took one night off and in my airplane went into the wilderness into a heavenly spot called Selby Lake, where we fished for grayling and lake trout amid majestic surroundings that were as simple and beautiful and unspoiled as they must have been on the seventh day (a reference to the biblical account of creation).

After our territory of Alaska became the 49th State, Dr. Fritz took advantage of an opportunity to bring the health problems he encountered to the attention of State government, and ran successfully for the Alaska State legislature. In the 1960s and early in the 1970s he represented Anchorage in our State house. In 1982 he represented the Kenai Peninsula. I had the privilege to serve with him from 1966 to 1968.

Just as he was a perfectionist in the practice of medicine, Dr. Fritz was a