

I want to join other Members of Congress in expressing my congratulations to Mr. Fox and the people of Mexico. I also want to commend President Zedillo, whose leadership helped to ensure the freest and fairest election in Mexico's history.

Mr. Fox's election has significance far beyond Mexico's borders. It represents an historic opportunity for our two countries to redefine, broaden and strengthen our relationship.

It is a relationship that has been burdened by history, and plagued by distrust, arrogance, and misunderstanding. There have been times when it seemed that on issues of hemispheric or international importance Mexico embraced whatever position was the opposite of the United States position, simply because we are the United States. At other times, our country has treated Mexico like a second-class cousin once or twice removed.

Problems that can only be solved through cooperation have too often been addressed with fences and sanctions, and self-serving assertions of sovereignty. It is time for a new approach. There is far too much at stake for us to continue down the road of missed opportunities.

Mexico is our neighbor, our friend, and our strategic partner. We share a 2,000-mile border. We have strong economic ties, with a two-way annual trade of \$174 billion. We have a common interest in combating transnational problems, and we have strong cultural bonds, as more than 20 million people of Mexico descent now live in the United States.

At present, there are several issues between the two countries that deserve immediate attention:

After more than 6 years, the situation in Chipas remains unresolved. Many innocent lives have been lost and thousands of people are displaced and living in squalor. Tens of thousands of Mexican troops have surrounded the area, which could explode in renewed violence at any time. There is an urgent need to demilitarize the area and embark on an enlightened, sustained, good faith process to address the underlying social, economic, and political issues and resolve this conflict peacefully.

Since the implementation of NAFTA, trade between our countries has doubled. While NAFTA has been beneficial for both nations, reports of violations of labor and environmental laws must be more effectively addressed and outstanding trade disputes must be resolved.

The Mexican Government has made progress in combating illegal narcotics trafficking by undertaking a number of measures, including firing more than 1400 federal police officers for corruption, cooperating with the FBI last year on an investigation that occurred on Mexican soil, and increasing seizures of illegal narcotics. However, major problems remain and far more needs to be done to reduce narco-traf-

ficking and official corruption in Mexico.

Illegal immigration continues to be a major concern for both countries. Although we must be sure that our immigration laws are effectively and fairly enforced, a long-term solution can only be achieved by improving the quality of life in Mexico where half the population—some 50 million people—struggles to survive on \$2 per day.

With thousands of United States and Mexican citizens traveling back and forth across the border every day, the spread of HIV/AIDS, TB and other infectious diseases is inevitable. These health problems, and shared environmental problems, can only be effectively addressed if we work together.

Human rights is another issue of importance to the Mexican people, and to Americans. These are universal rights, and it is very disturbing to read reports by the State Department and respected human rights organizations of widespread torture by Mexican police. It is also unacceptable that American citizens, including priests, some of whom have lived and worked in Mexico for decades, have been summarily deported for as little as being present at a demonstration against excessive force by the Mexican Army. Even when the Inter-American Human Rights Commission rejected the Mexican Government's arguments in these cases, the Mexican Government has refused to change its policy.

On August 24, 2000, President-elect Fox came to the United States, where he met with President Clinton and Vice President GORE. During those meetings, Mr. Fox expressed a strong commitment to democracy, economic development, and human rights, and to cooperate with the United States to combat corruption, illicit drug trafficking, and other transnational threats.

This bodes well for our future relationship. I hope that we would soon invite President-elect Fox to address a joint session of Congress. This should happen as soon as possible after the 107th convenes in January. Congress has had a major role in shaping United States policy toward Mexico, and we would all benefit from hearing directly from Mr. Fox. It would also give him an opportunity to outline in more detail his proposals to address key issues that affect our relations.

Like many Americans I was very encouraged by Vincente Fox's election, and am confident that he will be a strong partner of the United States. I look forward to making the most of this opportunity to strengthen the United States-Mexico relationship.

AIR FORCE MEMORIAL

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise today in support of extending enabling legislation for the proposed Air Force Memorial. Much has already been accomplished by the Air Force Memorial Foundation in its effort to make the

Memorial a reality. More time is necessary, however, to complete the work that is left to ensure that our Air Force heroes are properly recognized.

Despite decades of unflagging commitment to America's national security, the U.S. Air Force is the only branch of the armed services without a memorial in the Nation's Capitol. The time has come to establish a site where the American people can honor their aviation heroes. Building the memorial will accomplish this by recognizing yesterday's aviation pioneers, serving as a tribute to those serving their country today, inspiring future generations to proudly serve in the Air Force in the future, and by preserving the airpower lessons of the 20th century.

American policymakers have long understood the importance of establishing air superiority during military crises. Time and again, the United States Air Force has answered the call of duty and performed with distinction. Mr. President, we owe these brave men and women the honor of their own memorial, and I urge my colleagues to support extension of this enabling legislation.

VICTIMS OF GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. DURBIN. 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.

October 3, 1999:

Jonos Baptiste, 21, Miami-Dade County, FL; Stephen Barnett, 39, Baltimore, MD; Brandon Brewer, 26, Nashville, TN; Frederick Darrington, 30, Kansas City, MO; Ernesto Galvan, 33, Dallas, TX; Charles Hart, 45, Detroit, MI; Lloyd Hilton, 24, Gary, IN; Herman M. Logan, 26, Chicago, IL; Pablo A. Martinez, 20, Oklahoma City, OK; Melvin B. McPhail, 51, Madison, WI; Arthur Michael, 50, San Antonio, TX; Joe Moore, 29, Fort Wayne, IN; Ryan Pearson, 22, Kansas City, MO; Michael J. Plancia, 18, Salt Lake City, UT; Miquel Rivas, 21, Houston, TX; William M. Smith, 52, Memphis, TN; Brandon A. Wakefield, 20, Longview, WA; Porsche Williams, 15, Miami-Dade County, FL; and unidentified male, 62, San Jose, CA.

One of the victims of gun violence I mentioned, 15-year-old Porsche Williams of Miami-Dade County, Florida, was a young mother. In addition to caring for her own three-year-old child, Porsche cared for her younger brothers

and sisters after her mother died of cancer. Porsche's life ended tragically when her ex-boyfriend shot and killed her one year ago today. The 21-year-old gunman later shot and killed himself.

We cannot sit back and allow such senseless gun violence to continue. The deaths of these people are a reminder to all of us that we need to enact sensible gun legislation now.

NETWORKS FAILURE TO CARRY PRESIDENTIAL DEBATES

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I rise today to express my displeasure and disappointment that two of the four major broadcast networks—NBC and Fox, have decided not to broadcast nationally, the presidential debate scheduled tonight between the Democratic and Republican candidates for President.

This election is likely to be among the closest national races in the last twenty years. In exchange for the use of spectrum without the imposition of a fee, broadcasters have to fulfill their public interest obligation. I do not believe it is too much to presume that showing vital news information such as a presidential debate is encompassed in a broadcaster's public interest obligation.

Instead of showing the debate, NBC is showing a divisional wildcard playoff baseball game, although they are apparently permitting their affiliates to broadcast the debate, if they so choose. Even more appalling, Fox is showing its new science fiction series produced by its own studio—Dark Angel—which I understand is particularly violent.

On Sunday, the Washington Post ran a story entitled—"Even Hits can Miss in TV's New Economy." That article outlined the enormous incentives the Networks have to air programs in which they possess a vested financial interest. I quote—

Just as a supermarket might reserve its best shelf space for its house brands, the networks have begun to favor their in house programs over shows created by others, which are often less profitable in the long term.

There it is Mr. President. Money trumps the political process once again. Fox has likely spent millions of dollars to develop and promote its new series, and NBC likely spent a significant amount of money to acquire the rights to broadcast a baseball playoff game. But Mr. President, when networks choose their own programming or sports programming over an event as significant as tonight's debate, they fail to meet their public interest obligation. Having to reschedule a baseball game or the debut of a new series created by their studios does not justify NBC or Fox precluding the public from having access to the presidential debates. I understand that one network, ABC, decided to postpone the debut of one of its new shows "Gideon's Crossing" by one night so as to air tonight's debate. That is called honoring your

public interest obligation. By choosing not to air the debates, these other networks have undermined the integrity of the political process and our democracy, and engaged in a disrespect of the American electorate.

The political process should be covered. The American people deserve such coverage. The grant of free spectrum worth billions of dollars to broadcasters comes with a public interest obligation that requires them to inform the public of issues of vital importance—not simply to do what is financially expedient.

OLDER AMERICANS ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I am pleased to be a cosponsor for the Older Americans Act Amendments of 1999, which would authorize and expand the programs first set up under the Older Americans Act of 1965.

The Older Americans Act authorizes a series of absolutely essential services for our country's seniors. Among others, the Act provides nutrition services, legal assistance, disease promotion, elder abuse prevention, employment assistance, and numerous informational programs, including the long-term care ombudsmen. There is hardly a senior in this country that is not touched, directly or indirectly, by one or more of the provisions of the Older Americans Act. These programs have become an integral part of the infrastructure that helps keep our most experienced citizens vital and constructive members of society.

I am particularly pleased that this bill includes a much-needed new service, the National Family Caregivers Program. The major medical advances of the past 50 years have led not only to an overall aging of the population but also to an increasing proportion of the elderly who are living with chronic diseases and disabilities. Many of these infirm elderly are cared for at home, putting a severe financial and emotional strain on family caregivers. This new program will provide such caregivers with a panoply of assistive services, including provision of information, assistance with access, counseling and training, respite care, and other supplemental services (home care, personal care, adult day care).

It is absolutely essential to assist caregivers as much as possible in order to allow our infirm seniors to maintain their autonomy and sense of self-worth, to permit them to live in the company of their loved ones and in the least restrictive environment compatible with their needs. This is what our seniors fervently desire and it is the right thing to do; the likelihood that such programs will save the government money in the long run is an added bonus.

There is little time left in this session of Congress, and there are many things that must be finished before adjournment. Yet as we struggle with our

workload, I hope we can take a few minutes to find a way to pass the Older Americans Act Amendments this year, on behalf of all of our older loved ones.

MEMPHIS POLICE DEPARTMENT AND AMERICA'S LAW ENFORCE- MENT OFFICIALS

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, two years ago this revered but relatively insulated complex we affectionately call Capitol Hill was rocked by a lone gunman who shot his way through two security checkpoints and, in a rampage, not only terrorized tourists and staff but took the lives of two dedicated U.S. Capitol Police officers who died defending them and the institution in which we all serve.

As a trauma surgeon, I am used to blood and death, but it is one thing to treat the result of violence in a hospital; quite another to walk straight into its midst in a place you'd never expect. That day brought home not only at what great risk these dedicated police officers serve, but also how much we take their service—and their courage—for granted.

But the U.S. Capitol Police are not the only ones who deserve our respect and support. Every officer, in every city and town across America, who walks a beat, patrols a street, intercepts a drug push, responds to the call of an angry neighbor or spouse, or even pulls over a speeding motorist, runs the same risk of death or serious injury from spontaneous violence that Officers Chestnut and Gibson faced that day. Each of those officers deserve our thanks and admiration, but most of all, they deserve our support.

That is why I have consistently fought for more Federal block grant funds for local police departments, as well as the flexibility to use those funds wherever they're needed most—not just to hire more police officers, but to purchase the equipment or training they need to protect not only the lives of our citizens—which they are more than willing to do—but their own lives as well.

Three weeks ago, I had the honor of meeting with the Board of the Memphis Police Association in Memphis, Tennessee—a hard-working group of law enforcement officials who represent the 1,800 police men and women who respond to over 800,000 calls annually, protecting lives and property in Tennessee's largest city.

As always, they offered many constructive suggestions about how Congress might address a variety of law enforcement issues, including the issues of recruitment and quality of life. As the people who man the front lines in the war against crime and see first-hand the challenge that faces all of us, their perspective is invaluable, and I hope to translate some of their ideas into legislation for the Senate's consideration next year.

One of the advantages of being a U.S. Senator is the opportunity to undergo