

is going to happen when the largest and most powerful group will be older people.

I think it will be necessary for public officials to talk a lot more about how the satisfaction of building a better tomorrow outweighs the immediate appeal of greater and richer benefits. My personal experience is that older people are very receptive to that argument. The conventional view is that older people, as they wield ever greater power within our system of government, will lend their support to policies that serve their interests: higher spending on health, social services, and law and order, with spending on education taking a back seat. If this is the approach then that could spell trouble between generations. But I do not buy the view that we are headed in this country for intergenerational warfare. Most older people have children and they want the very best for those children, and that causes them to pursue their own interests less selfishly. Younger people want their parents to be adequately supported and everyone knows full well that they themselves will get older. They expect the next generation to help look after them in turn.

CONCLUSION

The aging of America will have a profound effect on our country. Rather than focus on the potential for intergenerational conflict, we need to see what can be done now to address the crunch we all know is coming. Steps should be taken soon to shore up both the Medicare/Medicaid and Social Security systems. In addition, each American needs to plan financially for their own later years. Proper planning and thought, on the part of the individual and of the government, will go a long way in helping the nation deal with these issues of an aging America.

CONGRATULATING THE HOUSTON COMETS, WNBA CHAMPIONS

HON. MAX SANDLIN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 9, 1998

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Houston Comets of the WNBA on their second consecutive WNBA championship. The women of the Houston Comets and the WNBA have brought a new respectability to professional sports—something that has at times been lacking in some of the male-dominated professional sports in recent years. These women, many of them working moms, are truly role models to young women across the United States.

At a time when our young people desperately need role models, these women have stepped up to the plate. The teams have dedicated themselves to community service and feel a real responsibility to their community and to their fans. Team members have done public service announcements to promote breast cancer awareness; they have volunteered their time to work with homeless children; and they have volunteered in soup kitchens to feed the homeless. In short they have given as much to their communities as they have received.

Another important result of the remarkable success of the WNBA has been its impact on women's sports in our high schools and colleges. It is a realization of the importance of Title IX programs. Today, a record 2.5 million girls compete on high school teams, compared with 300,000 in the early 1970s. The success

of professional women's sports should help continue this trend as our daughters are able to watch role models like Cynthia Cooper, Sheryl Swoopes, and Tina Thompson.

So again, Mr. Speaker, my congratulations to WNBA Coach of the Year Van Chancellor, League MVP and first team All-WNBA Cynthia Cooper, first team All-WNBA players Sheryl Swoopes and Tina Thompson, and the rest of the Houston Comets on their outstanding season and my thanks to them for providing our communities with such a positive image of professional athletes.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

SPEECH OF

HON. WILLIAM D. DELAHUNT

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 6, 1998

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4380) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes:

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Some who oppose this amendment will express their concern about the unwarranted intrusion this amendment represents into the lives of children and their families in the District of Columbia.

Others will address the impact of this amendment on the principle of local control, and wonder what in the world the Congress of the United States is doing meddling with local adoption rules.

I share both of those concerns, Mr. Chairman. But tonight I wish to speak as an adoptive parent, who is concerned first and foremost about the well-being of unwanted children.

Mr. Chairman, it is a sad fact that not all parents are fit parents. Child abuse and neglect occurs in all kinds of families. Among "birth families" no less than adoptive families. Among so-called "traditional two-parent families" no less than families of less conventional description.

Most of us do our best to love and nurture our children, but no parent is perfect. And we all make mistakes.

But I also know that good parents and families come in all shapes and sizes, too. Some of the most loving, nurturing and supportive families would fail Mr. LARGENT's litmus test.

And that would be a tremendous loss for the half a million children now in foster care who would be deprived of the chance to grow up in that kind of environment.

There are too many kids out there who need decent homes for us to start deciding which characteristics to require of adoptive parents. Some who value a religious upbringing might want to disqualify prospective parents who are not religious. Others might want to disqualify people who are. Some might feel that only people with a certain level of income, or education, are entitled to adopt. And so forth.

But such considerations are really beside the point when it comes to adoption. The only test we ought to apply is the test the law already uses to determine whether a child belongs in a particular family situation or not. That test is whether the situation is in the "best interests" of the child.

The application of that test is a complex matter. It requires the careful weighing of a multitude of factors by those with the requisite experience and expertise. One thing we can be sure of is that the Congress of the United States is not the agency that is best equipped to do that evaluation.

Another thing I'm sure of, Mr. Chairman, is that it is not in the best interests of a child to be in an institution or on the street when he or she could grow up in a stable, loving household.

We should ask whether the parents have the means to feed and clothe the child and see to its education. We should ask whether they maintain a home that will offer the child a harmonious, stable and nurturing environment. We should ask whether they have the skills and the commitment it takes to be a good parent.

When we find a family that offers all this to a child in need, what kind of society would reject that family because the parents are "not related by blood or marriage?"

I believe we should embrace that family, Mr. Chairman, and be thankful that a lost child has been given a new home and a second chance in life.

CLIFFORD MELBERGER HONORED

HON. PAUL E. KANJORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 9, 1998

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to my good friend, Mr. Clifford Melberger of my District in Pennsylvania. Cliff has been named "Community Leader of the Year" by the Eastern Pennsylvania Chapter of the Arthritis Foundation. I am pleased to have been asked to participate in honoring him.

Deborah D. Hannon, Chairperson of the Foundation's Board of Directors, describes this prestigious award as "an award that is given throughout each chapter area to a person who epitomizes the word 'leader' in both his personal and professional life." Cliff Melberger is certainly a fine example of this criteria. He is the founder and CEO of Diversified Information Technologies, Inc., a national information management and document imaging company. Cliff has been an innovator in the use of computer systems to service the information management industry. He received two research grants from Pennsylvania's Ben Franklin Partnership to develop electronic vaulting, which is the transmission of computerized media via satellite or Telecommunications.

For the last 16 years, Clifford Melberger has defined Diversified's migration from a traditional records storage and retrieval company to a state-of-the-art information management company, providing Fortune 500 companies with access to their corporate records via multiple media platforms.

Mr. Speaker, Cliff Melberger began his career in banking after receiving his undergraduate and graduate degrees from Bucknell University. He served as president of the University's Alumni Association. He currently serves

on the Board of Directors for the JPM Corporation, the Greater Scranton Chamber of Commerce, as well as the Board of Trustees of Wilkes University. He is an Elder in his church. He and his wife Ruth are parents of two grown children and have two grandchildren.

It is with great pleasure that I join with the Arthritis Foundation in honoring this distinguished businessman and community leader, Mr. Clifford Melberger. I send him and his family my sincere congratulations on this honor and best wishes for continued success and prosperity.

CONTRIBUTIONS OF WILLIAM A. TUCKER

HON. ROBERT C. SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 9, 1998

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to William A. Tucker, my good friend and long-term community leader in the Third Congressional District of Virginia.

Mr. Tucker was born on September 15, 1928 in Greenville, North Carolina and moved to the Hampton Roads area in 1962. Since that time, he has amassed a commendable record of community leadership based on a practice of leading by example. It began with the example he set as a dedicated family man, who, along with his wife Helen Hembly Tucker, raised five children who have given them three grandchildren.

Mr. Tucker served in the U.S. Air Force from 1948 to 1974. After leaving active duty in the military, he became involved in a number of community activities. He began work as a Longshoreman and was ultimately elected President of Newport News Local 846 of the International Longshoreman's Association. While in his position with Local 846, he also became involved in other community and civic organizations. He became a life member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

Mr. Tucker went on to hold membership in and serve on the Executive Board of the Hampton Democratic Party, the Virginia State Board of Corrections Education Subcommittee, the City of Hampton Charter Review Commission, the City of Hampton Citizen's Unity Commission, the Committee for the Beautification of the City of Hampton, and the Board of Hampton Roads Boys and Girls Club.

So, it is with honor that I call attention to the contributions of William A. Tucker before the Congress and the nation and I ask that these remarks be made a part of the permanent records of this body.

IN OPPOSITION TO HATE RALLIES

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 9, 1998

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, we are all well aware from media reports of the unfortunate incident in New York City this past Saturday,

in which fifteen police officers and one civilian were injured at the conclusion of what Mayor Rudolph Giuliani accurately predicted would be a hate rally. I wish to remind our colleagues that this untoward incident underscores the hard lesson which the world learned in the 1930s and 1940s: hatred and incitement to riot against any people, if unchallenged, will lead to greater and greater tragedy.

Khalid Abdul Muhammad first rose to prominence in 1993 when, at a well publicized speech at Kean College, at which he hurled racial insults at Jews, Roman Catholics, and mainstream Afro-American civil rights leaders. In subsequent orations, he attacked His Holiness Pope John Paul II and even South African President Nelson Mandela.

In 1994, after a speech in which he referred to Jews as "bloodsuckers", condemned gays, and again attacked His Holiness the Pope, who he called "a no-good cracker," the Rev. Louis Farrakhan demanded, and received, Khalid Muhammad's resignation from the Nation of Islam.

It is no wonder that Mayor Giuliani, contending that the proposed "million youth march" would be what he called a "hate march," initially refused to allow a permit to be granted to the organizers. That decision was overturned by a higher court decision.

It is no wonder then that the New York City Police Department, fearing in incitement to riot, arranged for 3,000 uniformed police to be on hand to keep order. The 50,000 attendance which Muhammad and his followers had predicted turned out to be only 6,000, thus underscoring the limited appeal that the racist sentiments expressed by Muhammad have in the community.

The rally itself proved to be an incitement to riot. Malik Zulu Shabazz, a rally organizer and one of its attorneys, characterized opponents of the march as "Uncle Tom, boot-licking, buck-dancing politicians" who must be voted out of office. Other speakers lashed out at Jews, whites, and Afro-American opponents of the march. According to reports from Mayor Giuliani's office, others called for death to Jews and to police officers.

Muhammad himself withheld his own speech until near 4 o'clock, the time the court had imposed for the end of the rally. In his remarks, Muhammad urged the crowd to defend themselves by taking the police guns away from the officers. "And if you don't have a gun, every one of them [police] has one gun, two guns, maybe three guns. If they attack you take their goddamn guns and use them," he cried. He urged youths to take apart police barricades and "beat the hell out of [police] with the railings. You take their night sticks and ram them up their behinds."

Despite this blatant invitation to riot, and despite the police being assaulted by having chairs and debris hurled at them, the police acted with notable restraint. In the resultant melee, only one civilian was injured—as opposed to 15 police officers.

New York State Senator David Paterson, a highly-regarded Afro-American legislator, stated that Muhammad should be arrested for exhorting young people to violence.

Yvonne Scruggs-Leftwich, head of the Black Leadership Forum, which includes most of our nation's leading civil rights groups, stated: "I think Muhammad is a lunatic and has a mental problem. I don't know anybody who has been left out of his vitriolic sweep."

Mr. Speaker, no one in America denies the First Amendment or our Bill of rights guaranteeing free speech. But we must never forget the admonition of Supreme Court Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes who stated that the right of free speech does not allow any individual to cry "fire!" in a crowded theater.

We especially must not forget the horrible fruits which resulted when the hateful, racist propaganda of Adolf Hitler and his Nazi goons went unchallenged for too many years not too long ago.

The brand of racist hatred spewed by Khalid Abdul Muhammad and his followers not only incite violence, causing harm to countless innocent persons, it also proves to be divisive, counterproductive, playing into the hands of the racists of the other side who seek to thwart those who work towards a true reconciliation of the races.

Mr. Speaker, I invite my colleagues to join me in condemning this vicious manifestation of hate and prejudice and to pledge to work towards the eradication of all such manifestations of injustice in our nation and throughout the world.

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, AND JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

SPEECH OF

HON. WILLIAM D. DELAHUNT

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1998

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4276) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Chairman, one of the greatest powers wielded by every American today is the power to choose how we spend our money. In the American marketplace—the strongest economy in the world—the manner in which we make our purchasing decisions is a vote. It's a vote of confidence in a product and a vote of support for the way a company treats its employees, services its customers, or protects the environment.

That's not a power to be taken lightly. It reminds corporations that we, as consumers, have a choice. We can reward them for good conduct, or punish them by purchasing from their competitors.

The problem is that so-called "free trade" agreements take away that choice. Not only do they take it away from you and me, but they take it away from our states, counties, and cities. And although the opponents of this amendment claim that it challenges the balance of power established by the Constitution, all that the amendment strives to do is re-establish the power to choose how we spend our money.

In 1996, the Massachusetts state legislature overwhelmingly endorsed a law prohibiting the state from doing any procurement business with companies that invest in Burma, whose abominable human rights record we are all familiar with. The taxpayers of Massachusetts made it clear that they wanted their elected