

adhering to the treaty's guidelines. This action sends a message loud and clear to women in this country and all over the world. The message is that we are unwilling to hold ourselves publicly accountable to the same basic standards of women's rights that other countries apply to themselves. This is despite the fact that since federal and state laws already prohibit many forms of discrimination against women, the United States could ratify the convention without changing domestic law.

The President, the Secretary of State, Madeleine Albright, and national and international women's groups have expressed their commitment to CEDAW. Let us ratify CEDAW this year and make the 21st century the first century in the history of humanity where women do not know government sanctioned discrimination.

I encourage my colleagues to join me on this resolution with 41 other original cosponsors and make our desires known loud and clear that we want CEDAW, we want it ratified and we want it now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MCINNIS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. WOLF addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BLUMENAUER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. HOYER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

TRIBUTE TO CHICAGO POLICE OFFICER JAMES H. CAMP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I solemnly rise today in tribute to a Chicago police officer who has fallen victim to the senseless violence that is suffocating far too many of our Nation's neighborhoods. Just today we are now mourning the death of Officer James H. Camp, a 35 year old gang tactical officer who

was gunned down during a routine traffic stop made across the street from the Albert Einstein Elementary School located in my district.

When Officer Camp approached the vehicle and ordered the driver out, the driver refused. As Officer Camp began to remove the driver from this vehicle, a struggle ensued. The driver grabbed Officer Camp's gun and fatally shot him in his face. Just like that Officer Camp lost his life and became the second Chicago police officer to die in the line of duty this year.

Mr. Speaker, many of his colleagues described him as a young, aggressive, effective police officer whose focus and whose hard work produced many good arrests. Others of his colleagues, his fellow officers, say that he was a polite man who was friendly, he was well liked and he was dependable. These are all wonderful descriptions of this man who committed his life and who contributed quality to his service to the citizens of Chicago.

Today I would like to also add another personal characteristic to this list describing Officer Camp. Officer James Camp was heroic. Every day for the last 4 and-a-half years he bravely and unselfishly served the citizens of Chicago. Yesterday his efforts cleared the way for the children of Einstein Elementary School so that they could walk home in peace. His efforts brought that neighborhood closer to a community that is free of drug activity. His efforts made the first congressional district of Illinois specifically and the City of Chicago in general a much better and a much safer place to live.

It is very important for us, Mr. Speaker, to remember at this time that Officer James Camp's service and dedication is duplicated a thousand times by brave members of the Chicago Police Department. Their bravery, which is exhibited day and night, should never ever be taken for granted. They literally risk everything that they have, including their lives, for our protection.

In closing I would like to reiterate that Officer James Camp in his short life of 35 years made quite a difference to the city, to our Nation. Indeed the Nation should thank Officer Camp for his service, for his commitment and for his dedication, and we as a Nation should extend to his widow of just three months our continued prayers for God's strength and God's grace during her time of bereavement.

HUNGER IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlelady from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, the Senate has proposed that the emergency supplement appropriation bill, a bill to help those ravaged by storm in Central America, be offset by hurting those ravaged by hunger in North

America. This proposal, inappropriately so, requires offset from the food stamps to pay for it. This proposal fails to recognize a hunger in America is more than just a word. It is a harsh and cruel reality that affects millions and millions of Americans, including children.

According to the Catholic charities, the demand for emergency food assistance increased by 26 percent in the first half of 1998. The United States Department of Agriculture and the Census Bureau report that one in eight families in America remain on the edge of hunger. We are in an economic boom, but many working people, their families, their children, far too many, face a food crisis and a hunger burst. Indeed the U.S. Conference of Mayors tells us that close to 40 percent of those seeking food aid in 1997 were members of families where at least one person in the household was working.

That is why I support allowing participants in the Food Stamp Program to own a reliable car. Under the current law, food stamp participants cannot own a car valued at more than \$4650. This limit in the law discourages progress and promotes poverty. A reliable car is essential for daily necessity, but more importantly, this is essential for getting to work. It is important, lifting the artificial cap on rent, mortgage payments and utility bills that are used in calculating food allowance for food, also indeed is addressed. Nearly a million households, the vast majority of which include children, receive low food allowance because a cap on their housing expense is there.

In addition, the food stamp program should be available to all legal immigrants, including elderly legal immigrants, especially those that were in the country before the welfare reform was enacted, and the WIC program should be fully funded so that the nearly 10 million women, infants and children who are now eligible can be covered by this vital program. Children Nutrition, the School Lunch Program, is very, very important.

It seems to me that if there is any Federal program that has worked consistently throughout the years and has stood the test of time, it is our National School Lunch Program. Nearly 26 million children are served every day. Through this program children have a healthy meal, a healthy start so they can be alert in school, thereby giving them a chance, a chance for a change, a chance for improvement in their lives.

□ 1930

One does not have to be a rocket scientist to know that a child needs to eat to function. To educate our workforce, we must have a good school system and good teachers. That is why I believe we should fully fund the school breakfast program authorized in the 1998 child nutrition authorization program.

Whether this Congress will make the substantial and significant investment

in the school breakfast program is yet to be seen. The debate over how to use this Nation's resources now, fortunately centers around what we do with the surplus.

Now that the deficit has been eliminated, we want to use our resources to help people, especially our children.

I urge my colleagues in the House to reject the Senate proposal to help those in Central America by hurting those in North America.

Everyday, twenty-six million children are served.

When a child has breakfast, that child is going to be more attentive, more alert, and his grades will improve.

When a child has breakfast, he will not have to visit the school nurse or the school principal for discipline as often.

It doesn't take much to understand that.

If America is to be competitive in the world market, we must educate our workforce.

But, good teachers can only be effective if our children are fed and not hungry in the classroom.

As you know, the President, in his budget, has requested Thirteen million for Fiscal Year 2000 for the School Breakfast Pilot Program.

It is very important that we fight for these funds. We must not take them for granted. School breakfast is not a welfare program. It is an education program. School breakfast is not charity. It is a chance for our children.

Thirteen million dollars is a modest amount. But, for the children who will eat, it is an amount that will have a major impact. It seems strange that we must fight for food for those who can not fight for themselves. America is a strong Nation, and we are strong because we can provide quality food at affordable prices. There are many places in the World where the same can not be said.

But the real strength of America is not due to our advanced technology, our economic base or our military might.

The real strength of America is its compassion for people, those who live in the shadows of life.

The real strength of this Nation is its compassion for the poor, the weak, the frail, the disabled, our seniors, our children—the hungry.

America's compassion makes us strong.

It really is time to stop picking on the poor.

Less than three percent of America's Budget is targeted for feeding the hungry. Nutrition programs are essential to the well-being of millions of our children. They do not ask much. Just a little help to sustain them through the day. Nutrition programs, in many cases, provide the only nutritious food that millions of our Nation's children receive on a daily basis.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DEMINT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEMINT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DIAZ-BALART addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

COMMON CONCERN AND ENTHUSIASM FOR THE PROSPECTS OF REDUCING THE TAX BURDEN ON THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I am joined here on the floor by a number of Members from the Republican Conference, and those of us in particular tonight are gathered out of common concern and enthusiasm for the prospects of reducing the tax burden on the American people. There are many of us here in Congress who believe very firmly and passionately that the size of the Federal Government not only is too big but that this government collects far more income and revenue from the American people than is necessary.

Furthermore, we are united in the firm belief that this surplus, this additional revenue that the Federal Government collects, confiscates from the American people and transports here to Washington, D.C., would be better utilized and in fact more powerful if left in the hands of those who work hard to earn this income in the first place.

Very, very clearly, what President Kennedy and President Reagan as well, have shown the Nation is that by reducing the effective tax rates on the American people, through economic growth and productivity of the American people, that the Federal Government actually generates more revenue.

Again, it is the entire distinction between growth in a strong vibrant economy and strengthened family budgets as opposed to slower economic growth and larger government budgets that divides the Congress, quite frankly, and it is the ultimate basis and difference between the Republican Party and the Democrat party.

We do stand squarely for a smaller Federal Government, for a lower tax burden, for stronger family budgets, and for economic prosperity through a deliberate plan to grow the economy of the United States of America.

We are joined and honored to be joined tonight by the majority leader, and I yield the floor to him immediately, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY).

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER) for yielding and let me thank the gentleman from Colorado for reserving this hour for us to discuss this.

We are joined by a good many of our colleagues here. I thought it might be

interesting to sort of set the stage, for the American people to have a look at where it is we have brought this budget situation to, since we took over in the elections of 1994 and, of course, commencing in 1995.

Remember, in 1995 we had deficits for as far as the eye could see, and obviously because we were successful in restraining government spending, we have transformed this situation. The fascinating thing, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER) made a reference to it earlier, we have now in just these few short years, moved from the public policy discussions of deficits for as far as the eye can see to the current discussion of budget surpluses for as far as the eye can see.

Yet it seems like the terms of the debate between the two major political parties have not changed a bit. Republicans are still saying essentially that the Federal Government is too big and takes too much of your money and that we ought to use the surplus to fulfill our obligation to the American people. Whereas the Democrats seem to say, no, the problem is we really need to grow the government larger and we ought to do so by further prevailing upon the American people for tax increases.

This really centers around this next fiscal year, fiscal year 2000, the first new year of the millennium. We have now, as we look forward to next year, a \$137 billion surplus in the Federal budget; that surplus in the budget comes almost exclusively from payroll taxes that are paid in excess of current, particularly Social Security outlays.

Let me just talk about that a little. My daughter, who is a young working professional in her early thirties, who probably represents that generation of Americans that is most worried about their own retirement security in America today, wears a little pin on her lapel and the little pin says, who in the devil is FICA and why is he taking my money?

I think that question is being asked by a lot of our young working people starting their new families and trying to get started in their life.

FICA, or the payroll taxes that we all have withdrawn from our check, is the money that the Federal Government takes for the purpose of fulfilling our obligations to our senior citizens for their retirement.

The youngsters, who are feeling the burden of this tax, are indeed a very loving and generous generation of Americans. We will hear them talk, and I hear them across the country, and they will say, look, these taxes are tough on us, they are tough on our young families. We have our own hopes for our children and our own retirement, but if it is for grandma's and grandpa's retirement, we will pay the taxes.

Now what these youngsters are discovering is, in just next year alone, they will pay \$137 billion more in those taxes to that entity called FICA, in